

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 100 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro To Contemp Mathema</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Slowikowski,Wil</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>49</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	6	20	11	10	3.48	1528/1644	3.48	4.14	4.32	4.16	3.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	4	15	14	14	3.75	1385/1644	3.75	4.20	4.28	4.23	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	4	8	14	21	4.04	1075/1419	4.04	4.29	4.35	4.25	4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	18	1	3	5	9	11	3.90	1220/1596	3.90	4.12	4.24	4.09	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	13	2	4	5	6	16	3.91	1068/1535	3.91	3.91	4.15	4.02	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	32	0	3	1	5	6	3.93	998/1510	3.93	4.10	4.13	3.91	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	8	8	28	4.28	864/1620	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	33	14	4.30	1375/1642	4.30	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	2	3	19	11	7	3.43	1424/1596	3.43	3.96	4.12	4.07	3.43
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	2	1	6	12	21	4.17	1220/1534	4.17	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	2	0	7	14	20	4.16	1461/1539	4.16	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.16
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	3	5	7	13	13	3.68	1342/1531	3.68	4.06	4.33	4.30	3.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	6	7	8	20	3.88	1243/1530	3.88	4.13	4.35	4.30	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	24	1	4	5	4	5	3.42	1202/1409	3.42	3.87	4.08	3.97	3.42
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	4	5	8	6	4	3.04	1276/1366	3.04	3.58	4.18	3.96	3.04
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	7	6	5	5	4	2.74	1331/1364	2.74	3.53	4.33	4.10	2.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	6	4	5	7	5	3.04	1307/1361	3.04	3.66	4.39	4.17	3.04
4. Were special techniques successful	22	22	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/1019	****	3.85	4.09	3.97	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 100 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro To Contemp Mathema</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Slowikowski,Wil</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>49</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/209	****	3.64	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.22	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/72	****	4.38	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/71	****	4.27	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/68	****	4.10	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/71	****	3.98	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/73	****	4.22	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/48	****	3.05	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/45	****	3.70	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	47	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/30	****	4.50	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/27	****	4.50	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	47	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/25	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/51	****	3.76	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	3.90	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/36	****	3.62	4.33	4.38	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 100 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro To Contemp Mathema</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Slowikowski,Wil</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>49</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/19	****	3.54	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/14	****	4.00	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	10	General	39	Under-grad	49	Non-major	49
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 106 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Algebra &amp; Element Funct</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>37</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	5	10	19	4.25	975/1644	4.19	4.14	4.32	4.16	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	4	9	20	4.25	988/1644	4.44	4.20	4.28	4.23	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	4	10	20	4.28	925/1419	4.41	4.29	4.35	4.25	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	2	0	5	8	12	4.04	1113/1596	4.35	4.12	4.24	4.09	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	24	2	0	2	4	4	3.67	1235/1535	4.23	3.91	4.15	4.02	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	21	3	0	2	3	7	3.73	1146/1510	4.34	4.10	4.13	3.91	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	12	18	4.25	894/1620	4.45	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	34	4.94	379/1642	4.74	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	1	4	3	13	7	3.75	1240/1596	4.24	3.96	4.12	4.07	3.75
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	3	9	22	4.39	1047/1534	4.56	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	33	4.89	666/1539	4.86	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	1	7	9	15	3.83	1278/1531	4.55	4.06	4.33	4.30	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	11	20	4.33	940/1530	4.64	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	21	2	1	3	2	7	3.73	1043/1409	4.07	3.87	4.08	3.97	3.73
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	4	0	5	6	10	3.72	1067/1366	3.83	3.58	4.18	3.96	3.72
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	1	6	6	11	4.00	1014/1364	3.95	3.53	4.33	4.10	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	8	7	8	3.80	1139/1361	3.98	3.66	4.39	4.17	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	13	20	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1019	4.41	3.85	4.09	3.97	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 106 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Algebra &amp; Element Funct</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>37</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/185	4.77	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/209	4.26	3.64	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/181	4.65	4.65	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/183	4.83	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/172	4.73	4.73	4.14	4.22	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/72	4.63	4.38	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/71	4.43	4.27	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	4.33	4.10	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/71	4.33	3.98	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	4.57	4.22	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/48	4.00	3.05	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/45	4.50	3.70	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/30	4.50	4.50	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	4.50	4.50	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/51	3.79	3.76	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	4.17	3.90	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/36	4.40	3.62	4.33	4.38	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 106 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Algebra &amp; Element Funct</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>37</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	4.33	3.54	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	4.50	4.00	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	8	General	10	Under-grad	37	Non-major	37
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	4						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 106 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Algebra &amp; Element Funct</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Muscedere,Micha</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>34</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	5	5	11	9	3.63	1475/1644	4.19	4.14	4.32	4.16	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	4	7	6	15	4.00	1210/1644	4.44	4.20	4.28	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	4	5	10	12	3.88	1172/1419	4.41	4.29	4.35	4.25	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	8	1	1	4	9	9	4.00	1129/1596	4.35	4.12	4.24	4.09	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	10	4	1	2	7	7	3.57	1287/1535	4.23	3.91	4.15	4.02	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	18	2	0	1	3	7	4.00	921/1510	4.34	4.10	4.13	3.91	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	1	4	5	19	4.45	621/1620	4.45	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	0	9	21	4.61	1100/1642	4.74	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	3	9	7	6	3.54	1373/1596	4.24	3.96	4.12	4.07	3.54
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	2	7	9	11	3.90	1351/1534	4.56	4.38	4.48	4.45	3.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	9	22	4.66	1149/1539	4.86	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	6	4	7	12	3.77	1309/1531	4.55	4.06	4.33	4.30	3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	1	10	15	4.06	1133/1530	4.64	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	3	4	4	6	7	3.42	1206/1409	4.07	3.87	4.08	3.97	3.42
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	5	2	1	9	5	3.32	1217/1366	3.83	3.58	4.18	3.96	3.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	1	6	7	6	3.64	1185/1364	3.95	3.53	4.33	4.10	3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	5	6	9	3.95	1064/1361	3.98	3.66	4.39	4.17	3.95
4. Were special techniques successful	12	13	2	0	2	3	2	3.33	911/1019	4.41	3.85	4.09	3.97	3.33

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 106 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Algebra &amp; Element Funct</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Muscedere,Micha</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>34</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	2	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/185	4.77	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/209	4.26	3.64	4.19	4.18	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/183	4.83	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/72	4.63	4.38	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/71	4.43	4.27	4.38	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/71	4.33	3.98	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	4.57	4.22	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/48	4.00	3.05	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/45	4.50	3.70	4.19	3.97	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/25	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/51	3.79	3.76	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/31	4.17	3.90	4.18	4.46	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 106 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Algebra &amp; Element Funct</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Muscedere,Micha</b>

Term - Fall 2013

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>34</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/36	4.40	3.62	4.33	4.38	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A	6	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	10	General	13	Under-grad	33	Non-major	34
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	11						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 106 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Algebra &amp; Element Funct</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Sharma,Neeraj</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>24</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	3	0	9	11	4.22	1017/1644	4.19	4.14	4.32	4.16	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	6	14	4.43	751/1644	4.44	4.20	4.28	4.23	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	6	14	4.39	787/1419	4.41	4.29	4.35	4.25	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	5	6	9	4.20	963/1596	4.35	4.12	4.24	4.09	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	970/1535	4.23	3.91	4.15	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	304/1510	4.34	4.10	4.13	3.91	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	0	3	17	4.48	574/1620	4.45	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	21	1	4.05	1514/1642	4.74	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	13	6	4.19	781/1596	4.24	3.96	4.12	4.07	4.19
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	20	4.78	473/1534	4.56	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	723/1539	4.86	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	377/1531	4.55	4.06	4.33	4.30	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	18	4.65	581/1530	4.64	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	1	1	2	2	10	4.19	693/1409	4.07	3.87	4.08	3.97	4.19
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	862/1366	3.83	3.58	4.18	3.96	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	817/1364	3.95	3.53	4.33	4.10	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	1125/1361	3.98	3.66	4.39	4.17	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	18	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1019	4.41	3.85	4.09	3.97	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 106 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Algebra &amp; Element Funct</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Sharma,Neeraj</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>24</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/185	4.77	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/209	4.26	3.64	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/181	4.65	4.65	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/183	4.83	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/172	4.73	4.73	4.14	4.22	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/72	4.63	4.38	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/71	4.43	4.27	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/68	4.33	4.10	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/71	4.33	3.98	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/73	4.57	4.22	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/48	4.00	3.05	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/45	4.50	3.70	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/30	4.50	4.50	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/27	4.50	4.50	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/25	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/51	3.79	3.76	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/31	4.17	3.90	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/36	4.40	3.62	4.33	4.38	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 106 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Algebra &amp; Element Funct</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Sharma,Neeraj</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>24</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/19	4.33	3.54	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/14	4.50	4.00	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	9	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 106 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Algebra &amp; Element Funct</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kelly,Brian</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>26</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	1	2	5	7	6	3.71	1433/1644	4.19	4.14	4.32	4.16	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	1	0	4	6	10	4.14	1105/1644	4.44	4.20	4.28	4.23	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	5	3	6	7	3.71	1224/1419	4.41	4.29	4.35	4.25	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	8	0	2	5	2	4	3.62	1386/1596	4.35	4.12	4.24	4.09	3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	18	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1535	4.23	3.91	4.15	4.02	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	16	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	****/1510	4.34	4.10	4.13	3.91	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	712/1620	4.45	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	869/1642	4.74	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	1	0	1	12	3	3.94	1071/1596	4.24	3.96	4.12	4.07	3.94
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	0	2	5	11	4.32	1108/1534	4.56	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	751/1539	4.86	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	1	2	3	12	4.26	981/1531	4.55	4.06	4.33	4.30	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	4	3	12	4.30	965/1530	4.64	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	12	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	957/1409	4.07	3.87	4.08	3.97	3.86
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	4	0	4	4	3	3.13	1262/1366	3.83	3.58	4.18	3.96	3.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	2	4	3	4	3.33	1258/1364	3.95	3.53	4.33	4.10	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	4	6	1	4	3.33	1284/1361	3.98	3.66	4.39	4.17	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	11	12	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1019	4.41	3.85	4.09	3.97	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 106 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Algebra &amp; Element Funct</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kelly,Brian</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>26</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/185	4.77	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	5	0	1	1	2	2.44	202/209	4.26	3.64	4.19	4.18	2.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	4	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/181	4.65	4.65	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	3	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/183	4.83	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	5	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/172	4.73	4.73	4.14	4.22	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/72	4.63	4.38	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/71	4.43	4.27	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/68	4.33	4.10	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/71	4.33	3.98	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	4.57	4.22	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	****/48	4.00	3.05	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/45	4.50	3.70	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	3	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/30	4.50	4.50	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	2	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/27	4.50	4.50	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/25	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	39/51	3.79	3.76	4.03	4.19	3.57
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	2	0	1	0	3	3.33	****/31	4.17	3.90	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/36	4.40	3.62	4.33	4.38	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 106 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Algebra &amp; Element Funct</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kelly,Brian</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>26</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	2	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/19	4.33	3.54	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/14	4.50	4.00	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 2	A 5	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 4	General 11	Under-grad 26
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 26
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 7		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 106 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Algebra &amp; Element Funct</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Riley,Samantha</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	0	1	2	12	4.50	688/1644	4.19	4.14	4.32	4.16	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	0	15	4.76	288/1644	4.44	4.20	4.28	4.23	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	208/1419	4.41	4.29	4.35	4.25	4.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	160/1596	4.35	4.12	4.24	4.09	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1535	4.23	3.91	4.15	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1510	4.34	4.10	4.13	3.91	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	1	14	4.65	353/1620	4.45	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1642	4.74	4.89	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	178/1596	4.24	3.96	4.12	4.07	4.75
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	439/1534	4.56	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	694/1539	4.86	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	113/1531	4.55	4.06	4.33	4.30	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	141/1530	4.64	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	0	14	4.75	181/1409	4.07	3.87	4.08	3.97	4.75
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	685/1366	3.83	3.58	4.18	3.96	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	649/1364	3.95	3.53	4.33	4.10	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	703/1361	3.98	3.66	4.39	4.17	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	137/1019	4.41	3.85	4.09	3.97	4.78

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 106 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Algebra &amp; Element Funct</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Riley,Samantha</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	106/185	4.77	4.77	4.23	4.19	4.22
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	52/209	4.26	3.64	4.19	4.18	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	80/181	4.65	4.65	4.53	4.68	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	65/183	4.83	4.83	4.46	4.50	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	2	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	62/172	4.73	4.73	4.14	4.22	4.43
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	42/72	4.63	4.38	4.53	4.35	4.63
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	1	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	40/71	4.43	4.27	4.38	4.21	4.43
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	2	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	42/68	4.33	4.10	4.41	4.22	4.33
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	2	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	47/71	4.33	3.98	4.40	4.19	4.33
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	23/73	4.57	4.22	4.09	3.85	4.57
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	32/48	4.00	3.05	4.16	3.97	4.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	22/45	4.50	3.70	4.19	3.97	4.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	19/30	4.50	4.50	4.57	4.58	4.50
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	15/27	4.50	4.50	4.25	4.37	4.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	16/25	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.63	4.50
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	2	0	0	4	4.00	29/51	3.79	3.76	4.03	4.19	4.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	20/31	4.17	3.90	4.18	4.46	4.17
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	22/36	4.40	3.62	4.33	4.38	4.40

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 106 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Algebra &amp; Element Funct</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Riley,Samantha</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	9/19	4.33	3.54	4.17	4.29	4.33
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	6/14	4.50	4.00	4.17	4.35	4.50

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	A	7	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	6	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 106 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Algebra &amp; Element Funct</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Riley,Samantha</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	428/1644	4.19	4.14	4.32	4.16	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	143/1644	4.44	4.20	4.28	4.23	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	170/1419	4.41	4.29	4.35	4.25	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	141/1596	4.35	4.12	4.24	4.09	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	970/1535	4.23	3.91	4.15	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	429/1510	4.34	4.10	4.13	3.91	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	331/1620	4.45	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1642	4.74	4.89	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	322/1596	4.24	3.96	4.12	4.07	4.57
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	248/1534	4.56	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1539	4.86	4.70	4.76	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1531	4.55	4.06	4.33	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1530	4.64	4.13	4.35	4.30	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	598/1409	4.07	3.87	4.08	3.97	4.29
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	963/1366	3.83	3.58	4.18	3.96	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	3	0	4	3.75	1142/1364	3.95	3.53	4.33	4.10	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1107/1361	3.98	3.66	4.39	4.17	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	125/1019	4.41	3.85	4.09	3.97	4.80

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 106 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Algebra &amp; Element Funct</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Riley,Samantha</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/185	4.77	4.77	4.23	4.19	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/209	4.26	3.64	4.19	4.18	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	80/181	4.65	4.65	4.53	4.68	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/183	4.83	4.83	4.46	4.50	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/172	4.73	4.73	4.14	4.22	5.00
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/72	4.63	4.38	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/71	4.43	4.27	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	4.33	4.10	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/71	4.33	3.98	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	4.57	4.22	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/48	4.00	3.05	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/45	4.50	3.70	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	4.50	4.50	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	4.50	4.50	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/51	3.79	3.76	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	4.17	3.90	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/36	4.40	3.62	4.33	4.38	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 106 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Algebra &amp; Element Funct</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Riley,Samantha</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/19	4.33	3.54	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/14	4.50	4.00	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 11 Non-major 11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 106 07</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Algebra &amp; Element Funct</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Riley,Samantha</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>13</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	400/1644	4.19	4.14	4.32	4.16	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	533/1644	4.44	4.20	4.28	4.23	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	462/1419	4.41	4.29	4.35	4.25	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	437/1596	4.35	4.12	4.24	4.09	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1535	4.23	3.91	4.15	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	107/1510	4.34	4.10	4.13	3.91	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	475/1620	4.45	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1277/1642	4.74	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	164/1596	4.24	3.96	4.12	4.07	4.78
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	675/1534	4.56	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	548/1539	4.86	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	241/1531	4.55	4.06	4.33	4.30	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	340/1530	4.64	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	627/1409	4.07	3.87	4.08	3.97	4.25
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	660/1366	3.83	3.58	4.18	3.96	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	1014/1364	3.95	3.53	4.33	4.10	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	999/1361	3.98	3.66	4.39	4.17	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	125/1019	4.41	3.85	4.09	3.97	4.80

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 106 07</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Algebra &amp; Element Funct</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Riley,Samantha</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>13</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	26/185	4.77	4.77	4.23	4.19	4.88
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	82/209	4.26	3.64	4.19	4.18	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	91/181	4.65	4.65	4.53	4.68	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	2	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/183	4.83	4.83	4.46	4.50	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	22/172	4.73	4.73	4.14	4.22	4.75
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/72	4.63	4.38	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/71	4.43	4.27	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	4.33	4.10	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/71	4.33	3.98	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	4.57	4.22	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/48	4.00	3.05	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/45	4.50	3.70	4.19	3.97	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/27	4.50	4.50	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/51	3.79	3.76	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/31	4.17	3.90	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	4.40	3.62	4.33	4.38	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	4.33	3.54	4.17	4.29	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 106 07</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Algebra &amp; Element Funct</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Riley,Samantha</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>13</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/14	4.50	4.00	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1 A 6	Required for Majors	5 Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0 C 0	General	1 Under-grad 13 Non-major 12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1 F 0	Electives	0 **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 4		

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 106 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Algebra &amp; Element Funct</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Riley,Samantha</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>10</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	1028/1644	4.19	4.14	4.32	4.16	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	633/1644	4.44	4.20	4.28	4.23	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	775/1419	4.41	4.29	4.35	4.25	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	302/1596	4.35	4.12	4.24	4.09	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	578/1535	4.23	3.91	4.15	4.02	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1182/1510	4.34	4.10	4.13	3.91	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1057/1620	4.45	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	632/1642	4.74	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	382/1596	4.24	3.96	4.12	4.07	4.50
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	286/1534	4.56	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	951/1539	4.86	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1531	4.55	4.06	4.33	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1530	4.64	4.13	4.35	4.30	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	711/1409	4.07	3.87	4.08	3.97	4.17
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	581/1366	3.83	3.58	4.18	3.96	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1014/1364	3.95	3.53	4.33	4.10	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	795/1361	3.98	3.66	4.39	4.17	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	381/1019	4.41	3.85	4.09	3.97	4.33

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 106 08</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Algebra &amp; Element Funct</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Riley,Samantha</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>10</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/185	4.77	4.77	4.23	4.19	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	52/209	4.26	3.64	4.19	4.18	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/181	4.65	4.65	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	65/183	4.83	4.83	4.46	4.50	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/172	4.73	4.73	4.14	4.22	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1 A 4	Required for Majors	2 Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0 C 0	General	5 Under-grad 10 Non-major 9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1 F 0	Electives	0 **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 2		

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 106 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Algebra &amp; Element Funct</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Webb,Deborah P.</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	4	1	6	3.77	1407/1644	4.19	4.14	4.32	4.16	3.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	829/1644	4.44	4.20	4.28	4.23	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	529/1419	4.41	4.29	4.35	4.25	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	879/1596	4.35	4.12	4.24	4.09	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1535	4.23	3.91	4.15	4.02	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1510	4.34	4.10	4.13	3.91	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	488/1620	4.45	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	505/1642	4.74	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	795/1596	4.24	3.96	4.12	4.07	4.18
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	1064/1534	4.56	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	609/1539	4.86	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	660/1531	4.55	4.06	4.33	4.30	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	606/1530	4.64	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	825/1409	4.07	3.87	4.08	3.97	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1183/1366	3.83	3.58	4.18	3.96	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1014/1364	3.95	3.53	4.33	4.10	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1034/1361	3.98	3.66	4.39	4.17	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1019	4.41	3.85	4.09	3.97	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 106 10</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Algebra &amp; Element Funct</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Webb,Deborah P.</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/209	4.26	3.64	4.19	4.18	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		Major 1
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 8	Under-grad 14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Non-major 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 3		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 131 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Math For Elem Tchrs I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tighe,Bonny J</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>25</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	18	4.60	564/1644	4.60	4.14	4.32	4.16	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	1	21	4.75	302/1644	4.75	4.20	4.28	4.23	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	136/1419	4.92	4.29	4.35	4.25	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	3	2	16	4.62	423/1596	4.62	4.12	4.24	4.09	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	3	1	7	12	4.22	772/1535	4.22	3.91	4.15	4.02	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	225/1510	4.73	4.10	4.13	3.91	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	3	17	4.50	527/1620	4.50	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	673/1642	4.88	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	255/1596	4.65	3.96	4.12	4.07	4.65
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	643/1534	4.68	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	780/1539	4.84	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	3	18	4.52	692/1531	4.52	4.06	4.33	4.30	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	544/1530	4.68	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	338/1409	4.56	3.87	4.08	3.97	4.56
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	660/1366	4.33	3.58	4.18	3.96	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	609/1364	4.56	3.53	4.33	4.10	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	875/1361	4.33	3.66	4.39	4.17	4.33

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 131 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Math For Elem Tchrs I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tighe,Bonny J</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>25</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	16	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	381/1019	4.33	3.85	4.09	3.97	4.33

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		Major 1
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 3	General 5	Under-grad 24
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 24
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 5		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 150 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Precalculus Mathematics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>41</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	3	10	15	10	3.70	1439/1644	4.02	4.14	4.32	4.16	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	3	12	8	13	3.58	1475/1644	4.24	4.20	4.28	4.23	3.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	12	12	11	3.68	1240/1419	4.23	4.29	4.35	4.25	3.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	3	4	10	11	6	3.38	1475/1596	4.01	4.12	4.24	4.09	3.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	4	4	12	8	10	3.42	1366/1535	3.76	3.91	4.15	4.02	3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	2	5	6	9	2	3.17	1422/1510	3.78	4.10	4.13	3.91	3.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	7	5	7	12	9	3.28	1501/1620	4.04	4.28	4.20	4.13	3.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	38	4.95	316/1642	4.91	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	6	5	6	9	4	3.00	1524/1596	3.73	3.96	4.12	4.07	3.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	2	6	16	14	3.95	1323/1534	4.44	4.38	4.48	4.45	3.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	2	2	10	24	4.30	1425/1539	4.60	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	8	2	13	7	10	3.23	1442/1531	3.91	4.06	4.33	4.30	3.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	1	7	10	16	3.73	1304/1530	4.08	4.13	4.35	4.30	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	2	6	12	8	7	3.34	1238/1409	3.61	3.87	4.08	3.97	3.34
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	3	8	15	10	3.67	1098/1366	3.96	3.58	4.18	3.96	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	4	5	14	7	9	3.31	1264/1364	3.48	3.53	4.33	4.10	3.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	6	6	13	8	5	3.00	1308/1361	3.54	3.66	4.39	4.17	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	12	3	5	7	5	7	3.30	924/1019	3.66	3.85	4.09	3.97	3.30

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 150 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Precalculus Mathematics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>41</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	8	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	3	4	3	0	1	2.27	206/209	2.80	3.64	4.19	4.18	2.27
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	7	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	8	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	8	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.22	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	1	3	4	9	8	3.80	66/72	4.34	4.38	4.53	4.35	3.80
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	7	0	2	9	4	3	3.44	65/71	4.24	4.27	4.38	4.21	3.44
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	16	1	1	6	0	1	2.89	****/68	4.04	4.10	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	10	1	4	4	3	3	3.20	67/71	3.93	3.98	4.40	4.19	3.20
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	5	1	3	7	3	5	3.42	60/73	4.15	4.22	4.09	3.85	3.42
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	7	0	2	0	2	2.09	46/48	2.09	3.05	4.16	3.97	2.09
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	3	0	5	1	2	2.91	40/45	2.91	3.70	4.19	3.97	2.91
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	6	0	3	1	0	2	3.17	****/30	****	4.50	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	6	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	****/27	****	4.50	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	8	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/25	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	3	2	2	5	4	3.31	44/51	3.31	3.76	4.03	4.19	3.31
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	1	2	0	3	5	4	3.64	26/31	3.64	3.90	4.18	4.46	3.64
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	3	2	3	4	1	2	2.83	35/36	2.83	3.62	4.33	4.38	2.83

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 150 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Precalculus Mathematics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>41</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	3	1	4	5	1	1	2.75	18/19	2.75	3.54	4.17	4.29	2.75
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	3	1	1	5	1	4	3.50	11/14	3.50	4.00	4.17	4.35	3.50

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	1	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	16	General	10	Under-grad	41	Non-major	40
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 150 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Precalculus Mathematics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>32</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	16	10	4.03	1195/1644	4.02	4.14	4.32	4.16	4.03
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	13	17	4.41	802/1644	4.24	4.20	4.28	4.23	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	10	19	4.47	689/1419	4.23	4.29	4.35	4.25	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	9	9	8	3.79	1283/1596	4.01	4.12	4.24	4.09	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	3	6	9	9	3.60	1270/1535	3.76	3.91	4.15	4.02	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	3	6	7	4	3.60	1215/1510	3.78	4.10	4.13	3.91	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	6	9	14	4.03	1110/1620	4.04	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1642	4.91	4.89	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	9	15	2	3.57	1353/1596	3.73	3.96	4.12	4.07	3.57
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	3	10	17	4.31	1108/1534	4.44	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	27	4.84	808/1539	4.60	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	3	6	15	5	3.58	1372/1531	3.91	4.06	4.33	4.30	3.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	5	13	10	3.94	1213/1530	4.08	4.13	4.35	4.30	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	3	2	4	9	7	3.60	1126/1409	3.61	3.87	4.08	3.97	3.60
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	15	12	4.22	749/1366	3.96	3.58	4.18	3.96	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	9	9	7	7	3.38	1251/1364	3.48	3.53	4.33	4.10	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	4	13	8	7	3.56	1225/1361	3.54	3.66	4.39	4.17	3.56
4. Were special techniques successful	0	9	1	0	9	9	4	3.65	788/1019	3.66	3.85	4.09	3.97	3.65

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 150 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Precalculus Mathematics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>32</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/209	2.80	3.64	4.19	4.18	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	4	10	15	4.38	55/72	4.34	4.38	4.53	4.35	4.38
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	11	1	0	3	3	11	4.28	49/71	4.24	4.27	4.38	4.21	4.28
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	20	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	65/68	4.04	4.10	4.41	4.22	3.22
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	10	1	1	5	9	3	3.63	65/71	3.93	3.98	4.40	4.19	3.63
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	12	0	1	0	8	8	4.35	33/73	4.15	4.22	4.09	3.85	4.35

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	3	Under-grad	32	Non-major	32
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 150 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Precalculus Mathematics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>59</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	3	11	20	21	4.02	1210/1644	4.02	4.14	4.32	4.16	4.02
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	5	4	19	27	4.18	1071/1644	4.24	4.20	4.28	4.23	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	2	7	20	26	4.27	925/1419	4.23	4.29	4.35	4.25	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	14	0	6	12	14	10	3.67	1361/1596	4.01	4.12	4.24	4.09	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	6	6	12	13	15	3.48	1336/1535	3.76	3.91	4.15	4.02	3.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	22	1	2	15	6	9	3.61	1215/1510	3.78	4.10	4.13	3.91	3.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	1	5	12	13	23	3.96	1176/1620	4.04	4.28	4.20	4.13	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	1	0	53	4.96	253/1642	4.91	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	8	2	3	12	19	4	3.50	1388/1596	3.73	3.96	4.12	4.07	3.50
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	9	20	24	4.24	1163/1534	4.44	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	7	12	36	4.53	1281/1539	4.60	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	5	17	17	12	3.60	1367/1531	3.91	4.06	4.33	4.30	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	5	9	15	22	3.94	1206/1530	4.08	4.13	4.35	4.30	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	9	5	5	10	13	11	3.45	1189/1409	3.61	3.87	4.08	3.97	3.45
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	4	9	16	23	3.95	910/1366	3.96	3.58	4.18	3.96	3.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	7	4	14	12	18	3.55	1211/1364	3.48	3.53	4.33	4.10	3.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	7	15	15	15	3.58	1220/1361	3.54	3.66	4.39	4.17	3.58
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	1	9	16	8	14	3.52	834/1019	3.66	3.85	4.09	3.97	3.52

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 150 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Precalculus Mathematics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>59</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	2	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	****/209	2.80	3.64	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	53	1	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	53	1	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.22	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	2	1	2	8	13	24	4.19	61/72	4.34	4.38	4.53	4.35	4.19
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	23	1	0	4	12	9	4.08	56/71	4.24	4.27	4.38	4.21	4.08
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	33	0	0	4	9	3	3.94	61/68	4.04	4.10	4.41	4.22	3.94
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	12	2	0	12	16	7	3.70	63/71	3.93	3.98	4.40	4.19	3.70
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	13	0	1	14	10	10	3.83	52/73	4.15	4.22	4.09	3.85	3.83
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	1	0	4	0	0	2.60	****/48	2.09	3.05	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/45	2.91	3.70	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/30	****	4.50	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/27	****	4.50	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/25	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/51	3.31	3.76	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/31	3.64	3.90	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/36	2.83	3.62	4.33	4.38	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 150 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Precalculus Mathematics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>59</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	54	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/19	2.75	3.54	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/14	3.50	4.00	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27    12	0.00-0.99    2	A    13	Required for Majors    38	Graduate    0	Major    1
28-55    3	1.00-1.99    0	B    19			
56-83    2	2.00-2.99    2	C    13	General    4	Under-grad    59	Non-major    58
84-150    0	3.00-3.49    1	D    2			
Grad.    0	3.50-4.00    4	F    0	Electives    1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
		P    0			
		I    0	Other    2		
		?    12			

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 150 13</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Precalculus Mathematics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	7	13	11	4.06	1172/1644	4.02	4.14	4.32	4.16	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	9	17	4.25	988/1644	4.24	4.20	4.28	4.23	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	4	8	16	4.06	1068/1419	4.23	4.29	4.35	4.25	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	3	3	8	13	4.15	1030/1596	4.01	4.12	4.24	4.09	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	3	8	6	10	3.57	1292/1535	3.76	3.91	4.15	4.02	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	16	3	0	6	1	5	3.33	1374/1510	3.78	4.10	4.13	3.91	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	8	10	11	3.94	1208/1620	4.04	4.28	4.20	4.13	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	1	29	4.84	777/1642	4.91	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	1	4	13	7	4.04	944/1596	3.73	3.96	4.12	4.07	4.04
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	7	23	4.63	739/1534	4.44	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	29	4.91	609/1539	4.60	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	6	12	11	3.94	1221/1531	3.91	4.06	4.33	4.30	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	5	8	15	4.03	1148/1530	4.08	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	1	11	5	8	3.69	1071/1409	3.61	3.87	4.08	3.97	3.69
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	2	6	19	4.19	772/1366	3.96	3.58	4.18	3.96	4.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	4	5	5	16	4.00	1014/1364	3.48	3.53	4.33	4.10	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	3	5	6	14	3.90	1094/1361	3.54	3.66	4.39	4.17	3.90
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	2	1	5	6	13	4.00	559/1019	3.66	3.85	4.09	3.97	4.00

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 150 13</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Precalculus Mathematics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	3	0	3	1	1	2	3.29	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	1	3	0	2	3	3.33	189/209	2.80	3.64	4.19	4.18	3.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	5	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	6	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.22	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	3	1	1	2	3	14	4.33	57/72	4.34	4.38	4.53	4.35	4.33
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	12	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	54/71	4.24	4.27	4.38	4.21	4.17
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	20	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/68	4.04	4.10	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	12	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	57/71	3.93	3.98	4.40	4.19	4.09
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	16	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	****/73	4.15	4.22	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/48	2.09	3.05	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	****/45	2.91	3.70	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/30	****	4.50	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	2	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/27	****	4.50	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/25	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	****/51	3.31	3.76	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/31	3.64	3.90	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	****/36	2.83	3.62	4.33	4.38	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 150 13</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Precalculus Mathematics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/19	2.75	3.54	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/14	3.50	4.00	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	6	Under-grad	33	Non-major	33
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 150 17</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Precalculus Mathematics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Dean,Brian J</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>67</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	35	0	0	1	6	14	11	4.09	1149/1644	4.02	4.14	4.32	4.16	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	35	0	0	1	5	10	16	4.28	958/1644	4.24	4.20	4.28	4.23	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	35	0	1	1	5	7	18	4.25	942/1419	4.23	4.29	4.35	4.25	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	35	5	2	1	5	5	14	4.04	1113/1596	4.01	4.12	4.24	4.09	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	35	3	2	1	8	11	7	3.69	1223/1535	3.76	3.91	4.15	4.02	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	35	19	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	****/1510	3.78	4.10	4.13	3.91	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	35	0	0	4	5	8	15	4.06	1087/1620	4.04	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	35	1	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	253/1642	4.91	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	37	4	0	0	5	13	8	4.12	891/1596	3.73	3.96	4.12	4.07	4.12
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	35	0	0	0	4	4	24	4.63	739/1534	4.44	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	35	0	0	0	6	7	19	4.41	1367/1539	4.60	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	35	0	0	0	5	8	19	4.44	813/1531	3.91	4.06	4.33	4.30	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	35	1	1	0	4	7	19	4.39	898/1530	4.08	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	35	6	3	1	9	8	5	3.42	1202/1409	3.61	3.87	4.08	3.97	3.42
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	36	0	2	1	6	11	11	3.90	942/1366	3.96	3.58	4.18	3.96	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	36	0	4	2	10	6	9	3.45	1233/1364	3.48	3.53	4.33	4.10	3.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	36	0	2	6	9	4	10	3.45	1255/1361	3.54	3.66	4.39	4.17	3.45
4. Were special techniques successful	36	11	5	0	4	4	7	3.40	888/1019	3.66	3.85	4.09	3.97	3.40

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 150 17</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Precalculus Mathematics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Dean,Brian J</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>67</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	64	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	65	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/209	2.80	3.64	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	65	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	65	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	2	0	2	0	3	7	4.25	****/72	4.34	4.38	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	7	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	****/71	4.24	4.27	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	10	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/68	4.04	4.10	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	6	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	****/71	3.93	3.98	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	8	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	****/73	4.15	4.22	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	66	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/48	2.09	3.05	4.16	3.97	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 150 17</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Precalculus Mathematics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Dean, Brian J</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>67</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Field Work</b>														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	66	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/45	2.91	3.70	4.19	3.97	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 20	Graduate 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 15		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 4	General 7	Under-grad 67
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	D 1		Non-major 67
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 40		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 150 17</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Precalculus Mathematics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>67</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	35	0	0	1	6	14	11	4.09	1149/1644	4.02	4.14	4.32	4.16	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	35	0	0	1	5	10	16	4.28	958/1644	4.24	4.20	4.28	4.23	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	35	0	1	1	5	7	18	4.25	942/1419	4.23	4.29	4.35	4.25	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	35	5	2	1	5	5	14	4.04	1113/1596	4.01	4.12	4.24	4.09	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	35	3	2	1	8	11	7	3.69	1223/1535	3.76	3.91	4.15	4.02	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	35	19	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	****/1510	3.78	4.10	4.13	3.91	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	35	0	0	4	5	8	15	4.06	1087/1620	4.04	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	35	1	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	253/1642	4.91	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	59	4	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/1596	3.73	3.96	4.12	4.07	4.12
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	62	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/1534	4.44	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	62	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/1539	4.60	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	62	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/1531	3.91	4.06	4.33	4.30	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	62	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1530	4.08	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	62	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/1409	3.61	3.87	4.08	3.97	3.42
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	36	0	2	1	6	11	11	3.90	942/1366	3.96	3.58	4.18	3.96	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	36	0	4	2	10	6	9	3.45	1233/1364	3.48	3.53	4.33	4.10	3.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	36	0	2	6	9	4	10	3.45	1255/1361	3.54	3.66	4.39	4.17	3.45
4. Were special techniques successful	36	11	5	0	4	4	7	3.40	888/1019	3.66	3.85	4.09	3.97	3.40

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 150 17</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Precalculus Mathematics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>67</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	64	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	65	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/209	2.80	3.64	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	65	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	65	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	2	0	2	0	3	7	4.25	****/72	4.34	4.38	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	7	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	****/71	4.24	4.27	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	10	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/68	4.04	4.10	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	6	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	****/71	3.93	3.98	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	8	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	****/73	4.15	4.22	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	66	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/48	2.09	3.05	4.16	3.97	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 150 17</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Precalculus Mathematics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>67</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Field Work</b>														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	66	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/45	2.91	3.70	4.19	3.97	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 20	Graduate 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 15		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 4	General 7	Under-grad 67
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	D 1		Non-major 67
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 40		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 150 21</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Precalculus Mathematics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Dean,Brian J</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>36</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	0	8	11	13	4.06	1172/1644	4.02	4.14	4.32	4.16	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	4	10	19	4.45	717/1644	4.24	4.20	4.28	4.23	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	4	8	20	4.42	746/1419	4.23	4.29	4.35	4.25	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	5	0	0	2	9	16	4.52	554/1596	4.01	4.12	4.24	4.09	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	1	0	4	7	15	4.30	701/1535	3.76	3.91	4.15	4.02	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	13	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	429/1510	3.78	4.10	4.13	3.91	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	4	8	21	4.52	514/1620	4.04	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	1	0	0	2	29	4.81	819/1642	4.91	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	2	2	12	10	4.15	836/1596	3.73	3.96	4.12	4.07	4.15
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	30	4.88	286/1534	4.44	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	3	3	27	4.62	1200/1539	4.60	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	0	5	27	4.68	464/1531	3.91	4.06	4.33	4.30	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	1	6	24	4.44	831/1530	4.08	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	0	2	5	8	13	4.14	729/1409	3.61	3.87	4.08	3.97	4.14
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	8	5	14	3.93	918/1366	3.96	3.58	4.18	3.96	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	6	5	3	4	12	3.37	1253/1364	3.48	3.53	4.33	4.10	3.37
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	4	3	2	11	10	3.67	1192/1361	3.54	3.66	4.39	4.17	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	13	2	1	2	2	10	4.00	559/1019	3.66	3.85	4.09	3.97	4.00

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 150 21</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Precalculus Mathematics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Dean, Brian J</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>36</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	****/209	2.80	3.64	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.22	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	36/72	4.34	4.38	4.53	4.35	4.68
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	7	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	26/71	4.24	4.27	4.38	4.21	4.73
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	11	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	33/68	4.04	4.10	4.41	4.22	4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	7	1	0	0	4	10	4.47	39/71	3.93	3.98	4.40	4.19	4.47
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	6	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	24/73	4.15	4.22	4.09	3.85	4.56
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/48	2.09	3.05	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/45	2.91	3.70	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	4.50	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/27	****	4.50	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/25	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/51	3.31	3.76	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/31	3.64	3.90	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/36	2.83	3.62	4.33	4.38	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 150 21</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Precalculus Mathematics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Dean,Brian J</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>36</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/19	2.75	3.54	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/14	3.50	4.00	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	2	A	8	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	5	Under-grad	36	Non-major	36
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	12						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 150 21</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Precalculus Mathematics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>36</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	0	8	11	13	4.06	1172/1644	4.02	4.14	4.32	4.16	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	4	10	19	4.45	717/1644	4.24	4.20	4.28	4.23	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	4	8	20	4.42	746/1419	4.23	4.29	4.35	4.25	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	5	0	0	2	9	16	4.52	554/1596	4.01	4.12	4.24	4.09	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	1	0	4	7	15	4.30	701/1535	3.76	3.91	4.15	4.02	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	13	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	429/1510	3.78	4.10	4.13	3.91	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	4	8	21	4.52	514/1620	4.04	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	1	0	0	2	29	4.81	819/1642	4.91	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	32	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/1596	3.73	3.96	4.12	4.07	4.15
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	32	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1534	4.44	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	32	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1539	4.60	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	32	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1531	3.91	4.06	4.33	4.30	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1530	4.08	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	32	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1409	3.61	3.87	4.08	3.97	4.14
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	8	5	14	3.93	918/1366	3.96	3.58	4.18	3.96	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	6	5	3	4	12	3.37	1253/1364	3.48	3.53	4.33	4.10	3.37
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	4	3	2	11	10	3.67	1192/1361	3.54	3.66	4.39	4.17	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	13	2	1	2	2	10	4.00	559/1019	3.66	3.85	4.09	3.97	4.00

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 150 21</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Precalculus Mathematics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

Term - Fall 2013

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>36</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	****/209	2.80	3.64	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.22	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	36/72	4.34	4.38	4.53	4.35	4.68
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	7	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	26/71	4.24	4.27	4.38	4.21	4.73
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	11	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	33/68	4.04	4.10	4.41	4.22	4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	7	1	0	0	4	10	4.47	39/71	3.93	3.98	4.40	4.19	4.47
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	6	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	24/73	4.15	4.22	4.09	3.85	4.56
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/48	2.09	3.05	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/45	2.91	3.70	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	4.50	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/27	****	4.50	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/25	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/51	3.31	3.76	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/31	3.64	3.90	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/36	2.83	3.62	4.33	4.38	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 150 21</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Precalculus Mathematics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

Term - Fall 2013

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>36</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/19	2.75	3.54	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/14	3.50	4.00	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	2	A	8	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	5	Under-grad	36	Non-major	36
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	12						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 151 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geomtry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tighe,Bonny J</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>164</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>110</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	1	0	15	31	59	4.39	835/1644	4.03	4.14	4.32	4.16	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	1	4	22	78	4.69	401/1644	4.20	4.20	4.28	4.23	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	1	1	7	26	68	4.54	596/1419	4.19	4.29	4.35	4.25	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	31	2	4	4	29	33	4.21	963/1596	4.03	4.12	4.24	4.09	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	42	11	5	17	19	10	3.19	1437/1535	3.47	3.91	4.15	4.02	3.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	68	2	1	7	16	10	3.86	1064/1510	3.94	4.10	4.13	3.91	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	1	9	26	68	4.51	514/1620	4.33	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.51
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	3	98	4.97	190/1642	4.92	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	2	0	1	7	24	54	4.52	365/1596	3.98	3.96	4.12	4.07	4.52
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	2	16	84	4.80	439/1534	4.28	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	2	12	88	4.84	780/1539	4.35	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	7	31	61	4.55	660/1531	3.81	4.06	4.33	4.30	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	5	15	81	4.73	486/1530	4.08	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	17	1	5	15	16	45	4.21	675/1409	3.75	3.87	4.08	3.97	4.21
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	17	13	25	16	26	3.22	1243/1366	3.72	3.58	4.18	3.96	3.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	17	14	25	22	20	3.14	1287/1364	3.44	3.53	4.33	4.10	3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	10	12	28	19	26	3.41	1267/1361	3.76	3.66	4.39	4.17	3.41
4. Were special techniques successful	14	71	3	2	12	6	2	3.08	****/1019	3.62	3.85	4.09	3.97	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 151 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geomtry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tighe, Bonny J</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>164</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>110</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	78	23	2	2	0	4	1	3.00	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	86	0	1	4	2	6	11	3.92	****/209	****	3.64	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	82	21	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	82	19	1	2	1	3	2	3.33	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	82	21	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.22	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	84	17	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	****/72	****	4.38	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	89	17	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/71	****	4.27	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	89	19	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/68	****	4.10	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	89	15	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	****/71	****	3.98	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	89	15	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	****/73	****	4.22	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	96	0	4	1	2	3	4	3.14	****/48	****	3.05	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	96	0	3	1	2	3	5	3.43	****/45	****	3.70	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	91	10	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	****/30	****	4.50	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	92	12	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	****/27	****	4.50	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	92	13	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/25	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	95	0	3	2	3	2	5	3.27	****/51	****	3.76	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	93	7	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	****/31	****	3.90	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	93	6	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	****/36	****	3.62	4.33	4.38	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 151 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geomtry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tighe,Bonny J</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>164</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>110</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	93	8	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	****/19	****	3.54	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	93	8	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	****/14	****	4.00	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	36	0.00-0.99	5	A	46	Required for Majors	97	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	16	1.00-1.99	0	B	25						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	3	C	19	General	1	Under-grad	110	Non-major	107
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	9	D	5						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	33	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	12						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 151 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geomtry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>164</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>110</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	1	0	15	31	59	4.39	835/1644	4.03	4.14	4.32	4.16	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	1	4	22	78	4.69	401/1644	4.20	4.20	4.28	4.23	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	1	1	7	26	68	4.54	596/1419	4.19	4.29	4.35	4.25	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	31	2	4	4	29	33	4.21	963/1596	4.03	4.12	4.24	4.09	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	42	11	5	17	19	10	3.19	1437/1535	3.47	3.91	4.15	4.02	3.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	68	2	1	7	16	10	3.86	1064/1510	3.94	4.10	4.13	3.91	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	1	9	26	68	4.51	514/1620	4.33	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.51
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	3	98	4.97	190/1642	4.92	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	82	20	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	****/1596	3.98	3.96	4.12	4.07	4.52
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	100	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	****/1534	4.28	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	99	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	****/1539	4.35	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	101	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	****/1531	3.81	4.06	4.33	4.30	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	101	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	****/1530	4.08	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	101	1	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	****/1409	3.75	3.87	4.08	3.97	4.21
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	17	13	25	16	26	3.22	1243/1366	3.72	3.58	4.18	3.96	3.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	17	14	25	22	20	3.14	1287/1364	3.44	3.53	4.33	4.10	3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	10	12	28	19	26	3.41	1267/1361	3.76	3.66	4.39	4.17	3.41
4. Were special techniques successful	14	71	3	2	12	6	2	3.08	****/1019	3.62	3.85	4.09	3.97	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 151 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geomtry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>164</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>110</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	78	23	2	2	0	4	1	3.00	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	86	0	1	4	2	6	11	3.92	****/209	****	3.64	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	82	21	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	82	19	1	2	1	3	2	3.33	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	82	21	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.22	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	84	17	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	****/72	****	4.38	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	89	17	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/71	****	4.27	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	89	19	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/68	****	4.10	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	89	15	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	****/71	****	3.98	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	89	15	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	****/73	****	4.22	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	96	0	4	1	2	3	4	3.14	****/48	****	3.05	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	96	0	3	1	2	3	5	3.43	****/45	****	3.70	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	91	10	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	****/30	****	4.50	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	92	12	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	****/27	****	4.50	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	92	13	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/25	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	95	0	3	2	3	2	5	3.27	****/51	****	3.76	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	93	7	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	****/31	****	3.90	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	93	6	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	****/36	****	3.62	4.33	4.38	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 151 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geomtry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>164</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>110</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	93	8	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	****/19	****	3.54	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	93	8	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	****/14	****	4.00	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	36	0.00-0.99	5	A	46	Required for Majors	97	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	16	1.00-1.99	0	B	25						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	3	C	19	General	1	Under-grad	110	Non-major	107
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	9	D	5						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	33	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	12						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 151 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geomtry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Nanes,Kalman M</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>160</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>78</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	1	15	23	36	4.17	1073/1644	4.03	4.14	4.32	4.16	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	6	20	49	4.51	633/1644	4.20	4.20	4.28	4.23	4.51
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	9	17	46	4.32	875/1419	4.19	4.29	4.35	4.25	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	23	2	2	9	14	27	4.15	1030/1596	4.03	4.12	4.24	4.09	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	18	5	5	16	11	22	3.68	1229/1535	3.47	3.91	4.15	4.02	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	39	1	2	9	10	16	4.00	921/1510	3.94	4.10	4.13	3.91	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	7	17	51	4.51	527/1620	4.33	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.51
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	72	4.94	442/1642	4.92	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	1	10	28	25	4.20	768/1596	3.98	3.96	4.12	4.07	4.20
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	13	61	4.80	439/1534	4.28	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	6	69	4.92	487/1539	4.35	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	3	8	18	45	4.42	839/1531	3.81	4.06	4.33	4.30	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	1	4	14	53	4.60	644/1530	4.08	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	10	1	4	5	17	34	4.30	588/1409	3.75	3.87	4.08	3.97	4.30
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	10	5	18	15	17	3.37	1198/1366	3.72	3.58	4.18	3.96	3.37
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	8	12	17	12	16	3.25	1271/1364	3.44	3.53	4.33	4.10	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	6	7	13	14	24	3.67	1188/1361	3.76	3.66	4.39	4.17	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	13	36	5	2	10	2	10	3.34	908/1019	3.62	3.85	4.09	3.97	3.34

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 151 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geomtry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Nanes,Kalman M</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>160</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>78</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	74	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	74	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/209	****	3.64	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	74	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	74	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	74	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.22	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	74	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/72	****	4.38	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	74	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/71	****	4.27	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	74	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	4.10	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	74	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/71	****	3.98	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	74	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	4.22	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	76	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/48	****	3.05	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	76	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/45	****	3.70	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	76	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	4.50	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	76	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/27	****	4.50	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	76	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/25	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	76	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/51	****	3.76	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	76	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/31	****	3.90	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	76	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/36	****	3.62	4.33	4.38	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 151 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geomtry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Nanes,Kalman M</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>160</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>78</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	76	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/19	****	3.54	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	76	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/14	****	4.00	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	23	0.00-0.99	3	A	28	Required for Majors	65	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	23						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	18	General	4	Under-grad	78	Non-major	73
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	4						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	3						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 151 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geomtry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>160</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>78</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	1	15	23	36	4.17	1073/1644	4.03	4.14	4.32	4.16	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	6	20	49	4.51	633/1644	4.20	4.20	4.28	4.23	4.51
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	9	17	46	4.32	875/1419	4.19	4.29	4.35	4.25	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	23	2	2	9	14	27	4.15	1030/1596	4.03	4.12	4.24	4.09	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	18	5	5	16	11	22	3.68	1229/1535	3.47	3.91	4.15	4.02	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	39	1	2	9	10	16	4.00	921/1510	3.94	4.10	4.13	3.91	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	7	17	51	4.51	527/1620	4.33	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.51
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	72	4.94	442/1642	4.92	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	66	8	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1596	3.98	3.96	4.12	4.07	4.20
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	73	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/1534	4.28	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	74	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1539	4.35	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	73	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/1531	3.81	4.06	4.33	4.30	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	74	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1530	4.08	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	74	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1409	3.75	3.87	4.08	3.97	4.30
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	10	5	18	15	17	3.37	1198/1366	3.72	3.58	4.18	3.96	3.37
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	8	12	17	12	16	3.25	1271/1364	3.44	3.53	4.33	4.10	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	6	7	13	14	24	3.67	1188/1361	3.76	3.66	4.39	4.17	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	13	36	5	2	10	2	10	3.34	908/1019	3.62	3.85	4.09	3.97	3.34

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 151 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geomtry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>160</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>78</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	74	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	74	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/209	****	3.64	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	74	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	74	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	74	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.22	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	74	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/72	****	4.38	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	74	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/71	****	4.27	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	74	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	4.10	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	74	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/71	****	3.98	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	74	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	4.22	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	76	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/48	****	3.05	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	76	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/45	****	3.70	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	76	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	4.50	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	76	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/27	****	4.50	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	76	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/25	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	76	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/51	****	3.76	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	76	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/31	****	3.90	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	76	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/36	****	3.62	4.33	4.38	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 151 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geomtry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>160</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>78</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	76	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/19	****	3.54	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	76	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/14	****	4.00	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	23	0.00-0.99	3	A	28	Required for Majors	65	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	23						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	18	General	4	Under-grad	78	Non-major	73
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	4						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	3						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 151 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geomtry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Dean,Brian J</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>164</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>84</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	1	4	16	18	40	4.16	1073/1644	4.03	4.14	4.32	4.16	4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	1	9	24	45	4.43	751/1644	4.20	4.20	4.28	4.23	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	1	10	20	47	4.45	717/1419	4.19	4.29	4.35	4.25	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	21	1	1	10	14	30	4.27	900/1596	4.03	4.12	4.24	4.09	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	31	4	2	12	10	20	3.83	1119/1535	3.47	3.91	4.15	4.02	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	45	0	0	7	8	19	4.35	603/1510	3.94	4.10	4.13	3.91	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	6	22	50	4.53	488/1620	4.33	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	1	13	64	4.81	840/1642	4.92	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	9	34	28	4.27	692/1596	3.98	3.96	4.12	4.07	4.27
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	3	5	69	4.82	400/1534	4.28	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	2	5	12	58	4.64	1174/1539	4.35	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	2	6	23	46	4.42	826/1531	3.81	4.06	4.33	4.30	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	2	7	13	54	4.47	793/1530	4.08	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	32	4	1	13	6	18	3.79	1007/1409	3.75	3.87	4.08	3.97	3.79
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	7	1	9	16	36	4.06	848/1366	3.72	3.58	4.18	3.96	4.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	4	9	18	11	27	3.70	1165/1364	3.44	3.53	4.33	4.10	3.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	3	2	17	10	36	4.09	1010/1361	3.76	3.66	4.39	4.17	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	16	40	1	1	10	2	14	3.96	599/1019	3.62	3.85	4.09	3.97	3.96

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 151 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geomtry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Dean,Brian J</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>164</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>84</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	71	1	2	0	4	2	4	3.50	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	72	0	0	1	5	0	6	3.92	****/209	****	3.64	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	72	3	1	1	3	1	3	3.44	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	72	1	1	4	2	0	4	3.18	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	72	4	0	2	2	0	4	3.75	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.22	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	80	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/72	****	4.38	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	80	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/71	****	4.27	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	80	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/68	****	4.10	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	80	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/71	****	3.98	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	80	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/73	****	4.22	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	82	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/48	****	3.05	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	82	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/45	****	3.70	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	81	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/30	****	4.50	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	81	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/27	****	4.50	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	81	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/25	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	81	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/51	****	3.76	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	81	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/31	****	3.90	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	81	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/36	****	3.62	4.33	4.38	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 151 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geomtry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Dean,Brian J</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>164</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>84</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	81	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/19	****	3.54	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	81	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/14	****	4.00	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	20	0.00-0.99	2	A	36	Required for Majors	63	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	24						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	8	General	6	Under-grad	84	Non-major	77
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	8	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	13						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 151 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geomtry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>164</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>84</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	1	4	16	18	40	4.16	1073/1644	4.03	4.14	4.32	4.16	4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	1	9	24	45	4.43	751/1644	4.20	4.20	4.28	4.23	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	1	10	20	47	4.45	717/1419	4.19	4.29	4.35	4.25	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	21	1	1	10	14	30	4.27	900/1596	4.03	4.12	4.24	4.09	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	31	4	2	12	10	20	3.83	1119/1535	3.47	3.91	4.15	4.02	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	45	0	0	7	8	19	4.35	603/1510	3.94	4.10	4.13	3.91	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	6	22	50	4.53	488/1620	4.33	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	1	13	64	4.81	840/1642	4.92	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	60	5	1	2	3	9	4	3.68	****/1596	3.98	3.96	4.12	4.07	4.27
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	69	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	****/1534	4.28	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	69	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	****/1539	4.35	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	69	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	****/1531	3.81	4.06	4.33	4.30	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	69	0	1	0	5	1	8	4.00	****/1530	4.08	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	69	8	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	****/1409	3.75	3.87	4.08	3.97	3.79
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	7	1	9	16	36	4.06	848/1366	3.72	3.58	4.18	3.96	4.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	4	9	18	11	27	3.70	1165/1364	3.44	3.53	4.33	4.10	3.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	3	2	17	10	36	4.09	1010/1361	3.76	3.66	4.39	4.17	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	16	40	1	1	10	2	14	3.96	599/1019	3.62	3.85	4.09	3.97	3.96

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 151 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geomtry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

Term - Fall 2013

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>164</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>84</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	71	1	2	0	4	2	4	3.50	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	72	0	0	1	5	0	6	3.92	****/209	****	3.64	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	72	3	1	1	3	1	3	3.44	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	72	1	1	4	2	0	4	3.18	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	72	4	0	2	2	0	4	3.75	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.22	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	80	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/72	****	4.38	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	80	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/71	****	4.27	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	80	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/68	****	4.10	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	80	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/71	****	3.98	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	80	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/73	****	4.22	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	82	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/48	****	3.05	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	82	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/45	****	3.70	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	81	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/30	****	4.50	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	81	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/27	****	4.50	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	81	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/25	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	81	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/51	****	3.76	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	81	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/31	****	3.90	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	81	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/36	****	3.62	4.33	4.38	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 151 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geomtry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>164</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>84</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	81	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/19	****	3.54	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	81	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/14	****	4.00	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	20	0.00-0.99	2	A	36	Required for Majors	63	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	24						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	8	General	6	Under-grad	84	Non-major	77
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	8	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	13						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 151 16</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geomtry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Budimirovic,Tat</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>158</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>118</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	12	0	9	16	28	30	23	3.40	1545/1644	4.03	4.14	4.32	4.16	3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	15	16	31	25	19	3.16	1571/1644	4.20	4.20	4.28	4.23	3.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	15	0	9	20	15	36	23	3.43	1324/1419	4.19	4.29	4.35	4.25	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	15	24	6	12	20	20	21	3.48	1437/1596	4.03	4.12	4.24	4.09	3.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	17	35	11	10	16	15	14	3.17	1445/1535	3.47	3.91	4.15	4.02	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	17	54	4	7	8	16	12	3.53	1247/1510	3.94	4.10	4.13	3.91	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	15	0	7	10	21	25	40	3.79	1315/1620	4.33	4.28	4.20	4.13	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	16	1	0	0	1	2	98	4.96	253/1642	4.92	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	43	2	16	8	25	13	11	2.93	1542/1596	3.98	3.96	4.12	4.07	2.93
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	40	0	10	6	21	15	26	3.53	1458/1534	4.28	4.38	4.48	4.45	3.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	41	0	8	7	14	21	27	3.68	1516/1539	4.35	4.70	4.76	4.72	3.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	42	0	19	16	19	6	16	2.79	1496/1531	3.81	4.06	4.33	4.30	2.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	43	10	11	14	13	10	17	3.12	1461/1530	4.08	4.13	4.35	4.30	3.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	45	8	13	16	20	8	8	2.72	1367/1409	3.75	3.87	4.08	3.97	2.72
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	5	4	11	20	58	4.24	728/1366	3.72	3.58	4.18	3.96	4.24
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	9	11	17	26	34	3.67	1172/1364	3.44	3.53	4.33	4.10	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	11	6	12	27	43	3.86	1116/1361	3.76	3.66	4.39	4.17	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	20	51	3	6	14	10	14	3.55	824/1019	3.62	3.85	4.09	3.97	3.55

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 151 16</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geomtry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Budimirovic,Tat</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>158</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>118</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	101	3	2	1	1	5	5	3.71	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	104	0	4	1	3	1	5	3.14	****/209	****	3.64	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	104	6	1	1	1	0	5	3.88	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	105	4	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	105	6	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.22	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	110	5	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/72	****	4.38	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	111	4	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/71	****	4.27	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	111	4	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/68	****	4.10	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	112	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/71	****	3.98	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	111	4	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	4.22	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	112	0	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	****/48	****	3.05	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	112	0	3	0	1	2	0	2.33	****/45	****	3.70	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	112	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/30	****	4.50	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	113	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/27	****	4.50	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	113	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/25	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	112	0	2	0	1	3	0	2.83	****/51	****	3.76	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	112	2	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/31	****	3.90	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	112	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/36	****	3.62	4.33	4.38	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 151 16</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geomtry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Budimirovic,Tat</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>158</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>118</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	111	3	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/19	****	3.54	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	112	2	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/14	****	4.00	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	3	A	24	Required for Majors	60	Graduate	2	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	28						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	18	General	9	Under-grad	116	Non-major	118
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	5	F	2	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	43						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 151 16</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geomtry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>158</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>118</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	12	0	9	16	28	30	23	3.40	1545/1644	4.03	4.14	4.32	4.16	3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	15	16	31	25	19	3.16	1571/1644	4.20	4.20	4.28	4.23	3.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	15	0	9	20	15	36	23	3.43	1324/1419	4.19	4.29	4.35	4.25	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	15	24	6	12	20	20	21	3.48	1437/1596	4.03	4.12	4.24	4.09	3.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	17	35	11	10	16	15	14	3.17	1445/1535	3.47	3.91	4.15	4.02	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	17	54	4	7	8	16	12	3.53	1247/1510	3.94	4.10	4.13	3.91	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	15	0	7	10	21	25	40	3.79	1315/1620	4.33	4.28	4.20	4.13	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	16	1	0	0	1	2	98	4.96	253/1642	4.92	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	82	7	7	4	7	6	5	2.93	****/1596	3.98	3.96	4.12	4.07	2.93
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	77	0	3	9	9	7	13	3.44	1474/1534	4.28	4.38	4.48	4.45	3.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	84	0	2	1	11	12	8	3.68	1516/1539	4.35	4.70	4.76	4.72	3.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	83	0	8	7	9	4	7	2.86	1491/1531	3.81	4.06	4.33	4.30	2.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	82	6	6	1	7	5	11	3.47	1394/1530	4.08	4.13	4.35	4.30	3.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	84	6	9	5	6	5	3	2.57	****/1409	3.75	3.87	4.08	3.97	2.72
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	5	4	11	20	58	4.24	728/1366	3.72	3.58	4.18	3.96	4.24
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	9	11	17	26	34	3.67	1172/1364	3.44	3.53	4.33	4.10	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	11	6	12	27	43	3.86	1116/1361	3.76	3.66	4.39	4.17	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	20	51	3	6	14	10	14	3.55	824/1019	3.62	3.85	4.09	3.97	3.55

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 151 16</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geomtry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>158</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>118</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	101	3	2	1	1	5	5	3.71	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	104	0	4	1	3	1	5	3.14	****/209	****	3.64	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	104	6	1	1	1	0	5	3.88	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	105	4	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	105	6	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.22	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	110	5	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/72	****	4.38	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	111	4	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/71	****	4.27	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	111	4	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/68	****	4.10	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	112	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/71	****	3.98	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	111	4	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	4.22	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	112	0	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	****/48	****	3.05	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	112	0	3	0	1	2	0	2.33	****/45	****	3.70	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	112	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/30	****	4.50	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	113	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/27	****	4.50	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	113	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/25	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	112	0	2	0	1	3	0	2.83	****/51	****	3.76	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	112	2	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/31	****	3.90	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	112	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/36	****	3.62	4.33	4.38	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 151 16</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geomtry I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>158</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>118</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	111	3	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/19	****	3.54	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	112	2	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/14	****	4.00	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	3	A	24	Required for Majors	60	Graduate	2	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	28						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	18	General	9	Under-grad	116	Non-major	118
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	5	F	2	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	43						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 152 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geometry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tighe,Bonny J</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>82</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	5	20	54	4.56	626/1644	3.95	4.14	4.32	4.16	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	16	61	4.68	414/1644	3.96	4.20	4.28	4.23	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	16	61	4.68	449/1419	4.04	4.29	4.35	4.25	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	21	0	0	3	19	38	4.58	463/1596	4.00	4.12	4.24	4.09	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	33	8	4	13	7	16	3.40	1378/1535	3.52	3.91	4.15	4.02	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	54	0	1	3	7	15	4.38	564/1510	3.68	4.10	4.13	3.91	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	14	64	4.73	261/1620	4.32	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	73	4.90	632/1642	4.94	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	0	0	2	23	40	4.58	314/1596	3.79	3.96	4.12	4.07	4.58
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	10	70	4.85	343/1534	4.18	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	77	4.95	305/1539	4.83	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	6	19	55	4.57	628/1531	3.75	4.06	4.33	4.30	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	10	68	4.78	404/1530	3.93	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	2	1	5	21	37	4.36	523/1409	3.73	3.87	4.08	3.97	4.36
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	7	21	47	4.42	581/1366	4.02	3.58	4.18	3.96	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	4	5	13	20	36	4.01	1008/1364	3.70	3.53	4.33	4.10	4.01
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	3	1	15	17	41	4.19	962/1361	3.88	3.66	4.39	4.17	4.19
4. Were special techniques successful	5	18	1	1	2	13	42	4.59	220/1019	4.04	3.85	4.09	3.97	4.59

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 152 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geometry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tighe, Bonny J</b>

Term - Fall 2013

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>82</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	73	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	76	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/209	****	3.64	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	76	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	76	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	75	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/72	****	4.38	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	76	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/71	****	4.27	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	76	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	4.10	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	76	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/71	****	3.98	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	76	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/73	****	4.22	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	77	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/48	****	3.05	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	77	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/45	****	3.70	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	77	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/30	****	4.50	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	77	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/27	****	4.50	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	77	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/25	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	78	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/51	****	3.76	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	78	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/31	****	3.90	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	78	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/36	****	3.62	4.33	4.38	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	78	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/19	****	3.54	4.17	4.29	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 152 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geometry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tighe, Bonny J</b>

Term - Fall 2013

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>82</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	78	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/14	****	4.00	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	3 A 42	Required for Majors	68 Graduate 0 Major 7
28-55	17	1.00-1.99	1 B 23		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	7 C 10	General	3 Under-grad 82 Non-major 75
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	8 D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15 F 0	Electives	1 **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	2
			? 4		

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 152 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geometry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>82</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	5	20	54	4.56	626/1644	3.95	4.14	4.32	4.16	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	16	61	4.68	414/1644	3.96	4.20	4.28	4.23	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	16	61	4.68	449/1419	4.04	4.29	4.35	4.25	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	21	0	0	3	19	38	4.58	463/1596	4.00	4.12	4.24	4.09	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	33	8	4	13	7	16	3.40	1378/1535	3.52	3.91	4.15	4.02	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	54	0	1	3	7	15	4.38	564/1510	3.68	4.10	4.13	3.91	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	14	64	4.73	261/1620	4.32	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	73	4.90	632/1642	4.94	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	73	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1596	3.79	3.96	4.12	4.07	4.58
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	80	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1534	4.18	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	80	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1539	4.83	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	80	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1531	3.75	4.06	4.33	4.30	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	80	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1530	3.93	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	80	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1409	3.73	3.87	4.08	3.97	4.36
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	7	21	47	4.42	581/1366	4.02	3.58	4.18	3.96	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	4	5	13	20	36	4.01	1008/1364	3.70	3.53	4.33	4.10	4.01
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	3	1	15	17	41	4.19	962/1361	3.88	3.66	4.39	4.17	4.19
4. Were special techniques successful	5	18	1	1	2	13	42	4.59	220/1019	4.04	3.85	4.09	3.97	4.59

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 152 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geometry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>82</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	73	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	76	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/209	****	3.64	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	76	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	76	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	75	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/72	****	4.38	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	76	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/71	****	4.27	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	76	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	4.10	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	76	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/71	****	3.98	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	76	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/73	****	4.22	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	77	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/48	****	3.05	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	77	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/45	****	3.70	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	77	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/30	****	4.50	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	77	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/27	****	4.50	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	77	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/25	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	78	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/51	****	3.76	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	78	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/31	****	3.90	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	78	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/36	****	3.62	4.33	4.38	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	78	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/19	****	3.54	4.17	4.29	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 152 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geometry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>82</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	78	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/14	****	4.00	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	16	0.00-0.99 3	A 42	Required for Majors 68	Graduate 0
28-55	17	1.00-1.99 1	B 23		Major 7
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 7	C 10	General 3	Under-grad 82
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 8	D 1		Non-major 75
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 15	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 4		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 152 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geometry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Saraswat,Jyoti</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>85</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	26	0	6	3	15	20	15	3.59	1487/1644	3.95	4.14	4.32	4.16	3.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	27	0	2	9	17	17	13	3.52	1497/1644	3.96	4.20	4.28	4.23	3.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	27	1	2	7	17	15	16	3.63	1256/1419	4.04	4.29	4.35	4.25	3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	27	12	3	4	9	17	13	3.72	1334/1596	4.00	4.12	4.24	4.09	3.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	28	13	3	2	11	17	11	3.70	1212/1535	3.52	3.91	4.15	4.02	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	29	28	4	1	11	7	5	3.29	1394/1510	3.68	4.10	4.13	3.91	3.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	31	0	1	3	14	18	18	3.91	1241/1620	4.32	4.28	4.20	4.13	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	30	0	0	0	1	3	51	4.91	632/1642	4.94	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	36	2	6	6	20	11	4	3.02	1522/1596	3.79	3.96	4.12	4.07	3.02
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	31	0	0	5	14	14	21	3.94	1329/1534	4.18	4.38	4.48	4.45	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	31	0	0	0	4	10	40	4.67	1136/1539	4.83	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	31	0	9	8	16	10	11	3.11	1461/1531	3.75	4.06	4.33	4.30	3.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	31	0	6	13	9	8	18	3.35	1425/1530	3.93	4.13	4.35	4.30	3.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	8	6	5	10	13	14	3.50	1168/1409	3.73	3.87	4.08	3.97	3.50
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	35	0	5	5	4	16	20	3.82	999/1366	4.02	3.58	4.18	3.96	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	35	0	3	2	10	16	19	3.92	1073/1364	3.70	3.53	4.33	4.10	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	37	0	3	3	13	14	15	3.73	1169/1361	3.88	3.66	4.39	4.17	3.73
4. Were special techniques successful	36	18	3	5	4	12	7	3.48	851/1019	4.04	3.85	4.09	3.97	3.48

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 152 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geometry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Saraswat,Jyoti</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>85</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	75	4	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	75	0	3	1	1	2	3	3.10	****/209	****	3.64	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	75	9	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	75	6	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	75	7	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.22	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	80	0	4	0	0	0	1	1.80	****/48	****	3.05	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	80	0	4	0	0	0	1	1.80	****/45	****	3.70	4.19	3.97	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	80	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/51	****	3.76	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	80	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/31	****	3.90	4.18	4.46	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 152 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geometry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Saraswat,Jyoti</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>85</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	80	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/36	****	3.62	4.33	4.38	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	47	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	B	19						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	15	General	1	Under-grad	85	Non-major	85
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	2	Electives	1				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	33						

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 152 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geometry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>85</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	26	0	6	3	15	20	15	3.59	1487/1644	3.95	4.14	4.32	4.16	3.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	27	0	2	9	17	17	13	3.52	1497/1644	3.96	4.20	4.28	4.23	3.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	27	1	2	7	17	15	16	3.63	1256/1419	4.04	4.29	4.35	4.25	3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	27	12	3	4	9	17	13	3.72	1334/1596	4.00	4.12	4.24	4.09	3.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	28	13	3	2	11	17	11	3.70	1212/1535	3.52	3.91	4.15	4.02	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	29	28	4	1	11	7	5	3.29	1394/1510	3.68	4.10	4.13	3.91	3.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	31	0	1	3	14	18	18	3.91	1241/1620	4.32	4.28	4.20	4.13	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	30	0	0	0	1	3	51	4.91	632/1642	4.94	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	70	8	2	0	3	1	1	2.86	****/1596	3.79	3.96	4.12	4.07	3.02
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	78	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	****/1534	4.18	4.38	4.48	4.45	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	80	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/1539	4.83	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	80	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	****/1531	3.75	4.06	4.33	4.30	3.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	80	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	****/1530	3.93	4.13	4.35	4.30	3.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	80	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/1409	3.73	3.87	4.08	3.97	3.50
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	35	0	5	5	4	16	20	3.82	999/1366	4.02	3.58	4.18	3.96	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	35	0	3	2	10	16	19	3.92	1073/1364	3.70	3.53	4.33	4.10	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	37	0	3	3	13	14	15	3.73	1169/1361	3.88	3.66	4.39	4.17	3.73
4. Were special techniques successful	36	18	3	5	4	12	7	3.48	851/1019	4.04	3.85	4.09	3.97	3.48

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 152 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geometry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>85</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	75	4	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	75	0	3	1	1	2	3	3.10	****/209	****	3.64	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	75	9	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	75	6	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	75	7	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.22	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	80	0	4	0	0	0	1	1.80	****/48	****	3.05	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	80	0	4	0	0	0	1	1.80	****/45	****	3.70	4.19	3.97	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	80	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/51	****	3.76	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	80	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/31	****	3.90	4.18	4.46	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 152 06</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geometry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>85</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	80	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/36	****	3.62	4.33	4.38	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	47	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	B	19						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	15	General	1	Under-grad	85	Non-major	85
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	2	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	33						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 152 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geometry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>69</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	4	7	14	17	21	3.70	1443/1644	3.95	4.14	4.32	4.16	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	3	8	12	22	18	3.70	1415/1644	3.96	4.20	4.28	4.23	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	1	12	7	20	22	3.81	1197/1419	4.04	4.29	4.35	4.25	3.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	18	1	9	9	10	16	3.69	1351/1596	4.00	4.12	4.24	4.09	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	27	3	5	9	9	9	3.46	1351/1535	3.52	3.91	4.15	4.02	3.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	38	2	5	3	10	4	3.38	1355/1510	3.68	4.10	4.13	3.91	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	5	9	9	39	4.32	793/1620	4.32	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	1	0	0	0	0	61	5.00	1/1642	4.94	4.89	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	50	8	1	2	4	2	2	3.18	****/1596	3.79	3.96	4.12	4.07	3.78
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	55	0	1	2	5	2	4	3.43	****/1534	4.18	4.38	4.48	4.45	3.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	54	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	****/1539	4.83	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	55	0	2	2	5	4	1	3.00	****/1531	3.75	4.06	4.33	4.30	3.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	55	0	2	2	4	4	2	3.14	****/1530	3.93	4.13	4.35	4.30	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	56	3	5	0	3	2	0	2.20	****/1409	3.73	3.87	4.08	3.97	3.32
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	6	14	15	21	3.81	1006/1366	4.02	3.58	4.18	3.96	3.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	8	12	17	5	16	3.16	1286/1364	3.70	3.53	4.33	4.10	3.16
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	3	6	16	12	20	3.70	1177/1361	3.88	3.66	4.39	4.17	3.70
4. Were special techniques successful	11	42	4	2	6	3	1	2.69	****/1019	4.04	3.85	4.09	3.97	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 152 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geometry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

Term - Fall 2013

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>69</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	60	6	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	60	0	3	0	3	2	1	2.78	****/209	****	3.64	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	61	5	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	62	2	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	63	4	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.22	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	63	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/72	****	4.38	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	63	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/71	****	4.27	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	64	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	4.10	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	64	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/71	****	3.98	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	64	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/73	****	4.22	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	64	0	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	****/48	****	3.05	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	65	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/45	****	3.70	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	65	2	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/30	****	4.50	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	66	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/27	****	4.50	4.25	4.37	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	64	0	2	0	1	2	0	2.60	****/51	****	3.76	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	65	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/31	****	3.90	4.18	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	65	1	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/19	****	3.54	4.17	4.29	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 152 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geometry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>69</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	65	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/14	****	4.00	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 3	A 15	Required for Majors 57	Graduate 0
28-55	15	1.00-1.99 1	B 30		Major 4
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 3	C 13	General 0	Under-grad 69
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 8	D 2		Non-major 65
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	F 1	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 8		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 152 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geometry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Glezen,John</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>69</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	4	7	14	17	21	3.70	1443/1644	3.95	4.14	4.32	4.16	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	3	8	12	22	18	3.70	1415/1644	3.96	4.20	4.28	4.23	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	1	12	7	20	22	3.81	1197/1419	4.04	4.29	4.35	4.25	3.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	18	1	9	9	10	16	3.69	1351/1596	4.00	4.12	4.24	4.09	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	27	3	5	9	9	9	3.46	1351/1535	3.52	3.91	4.15	4.02	3.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	38	2	5	3	10	4	3.38	1355/1510	3.68	4.10	4.13	3.91	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	5	9	9	39	4.32	793/1620	4.32	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	1	0	0	0	0	61	5.00	1/1642	4.94	4.89	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	2	1	3	11	20	10	3.78	1225/1596	3.79	3.96	4.12	4.07	3.78
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	2	8	10	15	18	3.74	1410/1534	4.18	4.38	4.48	4.45	3.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	1	0	3	46	4.88	666/1539	4.83	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	3	8	9	17	13	3.58	1372/1531	3.75	4.06	4.33	4.30	3.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	4	6	11	12	18	3.67	1326/1530	3.93	4.13	4.35	4.30	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	17	6	2	7	13	6	3.32	1247/1409	3.73	3.87	4.08	3.97	3.32
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	6	14	15	21	3.81	1006/1366	4.02	3.58	4.18	3.96	3.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	8	12	17	5	16	3.16	1286/1364	3.70	3.53	4.33	4.10	3.16
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	3	6	16	12	20	3.70	1177/1361	3.88	3.66	4.39	4.17	3.70
4. Were special techniques successful	11	42	4	2	6	3	1	2.69	****/1019	4.04	3.85	4.09	3.97	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 152 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geometry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Glezen,John</b>

Term - Fall 2013

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>69</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	60	6	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	60	0	3	0	3	2	1	2.78	****/209	****	3.64	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	61	5	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	62	2	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	63	4	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.22	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	63	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/72	****	4.38	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	63	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/71	****	4.27	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	64	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	4.10	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	64	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/71	****	3.98	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	64	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/73	****	4.22	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	64	0	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	****/48	****	3.05	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	65	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/45	****	3.70	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	65	2	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/30	****	4.50	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	66	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/27	****	4.50	4.25	4.37	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	64	0	2	0	1	2	0	2.60	****/51	****	3.76	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	65	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/31	****	3.90	4.18	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	65	1	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/19	****	3.54	4.17	4.29	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 152 11</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Calc &amp; Analy Geometry II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Glezen,John</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>69</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	65	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/14	****	4.00	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 3	A 15	Required for Majors 57	Graduate 0
28-55	15	1.00-1.99 1	B 30		Major 4
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 3	C 13	General 0	Under-grad 69
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 8	D 2		Non-major 65
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	F 1	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 8		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 155 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Applied Calculus</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>160</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>77</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	1	3	12	24	31	4.14	1096/1644	4.24	4.14	4.32	4.16	4.14
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	1	3	12	24	31	4.14	1096/1644	4.24	4.14	4.32	4.16	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	1	0	6	21	40	4.46	717/1644	4.52	4.20	4.28	4.23	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	1	0	6	21	40	4.46	717/1644	4.52	4.20	4.28	4.23	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	4	11	16	41	4.31	900/1419	4.39	4.29	4.35	4.25	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	4	11	16	41	4.31	900/1419	4.39	4.29	4.35	4.25	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	10	0	0	19	20	23	4.06	1097/1596	4.03	4.12	4.24	4.09	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	10	0	0	19	20	23	4.06	1097/1596	4.03	4.12	4.24	4.09	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	21	2	5	13	17	13	3.68	1223/1535	3.80	3.91	4.15	4.02	3.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	21	2	5	13	17	13	3.68	1223/1535	3.80	3.91	4.15	4.02	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	14	8	9	12	16	12	3.26	1399/1510	3.54	4.10	4.13	3.91	3.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	14	8	9	12	16	12	3.26	1399/1510	3.54	4.10	4.13	3.91	3.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	3	15	15	39	4.25	894/1620	4.37	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	3	15	15	39	4.25	894/1620	4.37	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	6	66	4.92	568/1642	4.94	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	6	66	4.92	568/1642	4.94	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	55	2	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	642/1596	4.52	3.96	4.12	4.07	4.48
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	72	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/1596	4.52	3.96	4.12	4.07	4.48
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	50	0	0	0	1	11	15	4.52	879/1534	4.75	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.66
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	75	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1534	4.75	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.66

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 155 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Applied Calculus</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>160</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>77</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Lecture</b>														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	53	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	990/1539	4.89	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	75	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1539	4.89	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	54	0	0	0	5	7	11	4.26	981/1531	4.57	4.06	4.33	4.30	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	76	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1531	4.57	4.06	4.33	4.30	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	1	5	6	10	4.14	1092/1530	4.52	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	76	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1530	4.52	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	56	2	0	1	7	5	6	3.84	****/1409	4.24	3.87	4.08	3.97	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	76	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1409	4.24	3.87	4.08	3.97	4.24
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	25	8	18	6	15	2.69	1325/1366	2.94	3.58	4.18	3.96	2.69
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	25	8	18	6	15	2.69	1325/1366	2.94	3.58	4.18	3.96	2.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	19	12	11	11	19	2.99	1301/1364	3.19	3.53	4.33	4.10	2.99
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	19	12	11	11	19	2.99	1301/1364	3.19	3.53	4.33	4.10	2.99
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	13	4	15	17	21	3.41	1267/1361	3.53	3.66	4.39	4.17	3.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	13	4	15	17	21	3.41	1267/1361	3.53	3.66	4.39	4.17	3.41
4. Were special techniques successful	5	50	1	5	7	4	5	3.32	918/1019	3.32	3.85	4.09	3.97	3.32
4. Were special techniques successful	5	50	1	5	7	4	5	3.32	918/1019	3.32	3.85	4.09	3.97	3.32
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	7	1	2	5	4	5	3.59	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	7	1	2	5	4	5	3.59	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	5	3	7	3	7	3.16	191/209	3.16	3.64	4.19	4.18	3.16
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	5	3	7	3	7	3.16	191/209	3.16	3.64	4.19	4.18	3.16

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	3	3	7	3	7	3.10	191/209	3.10	3.07	4.13	4.10	3.10
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	5	3	0	5	2	8	3.67	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.68	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	5	3	0	5	2	8	3.67	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	56	5	5	0	3	3	5	3.19	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	56	5	5	0	3	3	5	3.19	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	6	0	1	5	3	7	4.00	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	6	0	1	5	3	7	4.00	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.22	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	4	3	0	5	3	5	3.44	****/72	****	4.38	4.53	4.35	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	4	3	0	5	3	5	3.44	****/72	****	4.38	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	59	4	1	0	5	4	4	3.71	****/71	****	4.27	4.38	4.21	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	59	4	1	0	5	4	4	3.71	****/71	****	4.27	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	59	4	3	2	3	2	4	3.14	****/68	****	4.10	4.41	4.22	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	59	4	3	2	3	2	4	3.14	****/68	****	4.10	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	59	4	3	1	4	3	3	3.14	****/71	****	3.98	4.40	4.19	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	59	4	3	1	4	3	3	3.14	****/71	****	3.98	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	4	2	1	5	1	6	3.53	****/73	****	4.22	4.09	3.85	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	4	2	1	5	1	6	3.53	****/73	****	4.22	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	59	0	4	2	3	4	5	3.22	****/48	****	3.05	4.16	3.97	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	59	0	4	2	3	4	5	3.22	****/48	****	3.05	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	59	0	4	1	3	3	7	3.44	****/45	****	3.70	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	59	0	4	1	3	3	7	3.44	****/45	****	3.70	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	59	3	1	1	5	2	6	3.73	****/30	****	4.50	4.57	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	59	3	1	1	5	2	6	3.73	****/30	****	4.50	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	59	5	1	1	4	4	3	3.54	****/27	****	4.50	4.25	4.37	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	59	5	1	1	4	4	3	3.54	****/27	****	4.50	4.25	4.37	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 155 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Applied Calculus</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>160</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>77</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Field Work</b>														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	59	6	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	****/25	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	59	6	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	****/25	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	1	7	5	7	3.90	35/51	3.90	3.76	4.03	4.19	3.90
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	1	7	5	7	3.90	35/51	3.90	3.76	4.03	4.19	3.90
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	57	1	0	4	3	2	10	3.95	****/31	****	3.90	4.18	4.46	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	57	1	0	4	3	2	10	3.95	****/31	****	3.90	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	57	3	1	2	4	3	7	3.76	****/36	****	3.62	4.33	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	57	3	1	2	4	3	7	3.76	****/36	****	3.62	4.33	4.38	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	57	3	1	3	3	5	5	3.59	****/19	****	3.54	4.17	4.29	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	57	3	1	3	3	5	5	3.59	****/19	****	3.54	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	2	1	5	5	4	3	3.17	****/14	****	4.00	4.17	4.35	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	2	1	5	5	4	3	3.17	****/14	****	4.00	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	20	0.00-0.99	5	A	26	Required for Majors	59	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B	29						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	11	General	6	Under-grad	77	Non-major	77
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

? 10

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 155 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Applied Calculus</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kelly,Brian</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>160</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>77</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	1	3	12	24	31	4.14	1096/1644	4.24	4.14	4.32	4.16	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	1	0	6	21	40	4.46	717/1644	4.52	4.20	4.28	4.23	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	4	11	16	41	4.31	900/1419	4.39	4.29	4.35	4.25	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	10	0	0	19	20	23	4.06	1097/1596	4.03	4.12	4.24	4.09	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	21	2	5	13	17	13	3.68	1223/1535	3.80	3.91	4.15	4.02	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	14	8	9	12	16	12	3.26	1399/1510	3.54	4.10	4.13	3.91	3.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	3	15	15	39	4.25	894/1620	4.37	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	6	66	4.92	568/1642	4.94	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	0	0	0	1	15	34	4.66	246/1596	4.52	3.96	4.12	4.07	4.48
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	0	0	1	8	42	4.80	439/1534	4.75	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	0	0	0	4	47	4.92	487/1539	4.89	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	0	0	1	8	42	4.80	275/1531	4.57	4.06	4.33	4.30	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	3	6	41	4.76	421/1530	4.52	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	28	8	3	1	3	10	24	4.24	636/1409	4.24	3.87	4.08	3.97	4.24
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	25	8	18	6	15	2.69	1325/1366	2.94	3.58	4.18	3.96	2.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	19	12	11	11	19	2.99	1301/1364	3.19	3.53	4.33	4.10	2.99
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	13	4	15	17	21	3.41	1267/1361	3.53	3.66	4.39	4.17	3.41
4. Were special techniques successful	5	50	1	5	7	4	5	3.32	918/1019	3.32	3.85	4.09	3.97	3.32

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 155 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Applied Calculus</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kelly,Brian</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>160</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>77</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	7	1	2	5	4	5	3.59	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	5	3	7	3	7	3.16	191/209	3.16	3.64	4.19	4.18	3.16
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	5	3	0	5	2	8	3.67	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	56	5	5	0	3	3	5	3.19	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	6	0	1	5	3	7	4.00	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.22	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	4	3	0	5	3	5	3.44	****/72	****	4.38	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	59	4	1	0	5	4	4	3.71	****/71	****	4.27	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	59	4	3	2	3	2	4	3.14	****/68	****	4.10	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	59	4	3	1	4	3	3	3.14	****/71	****	3.98	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	4	2	1	5	1	6	3.53	****/73	****	4.22	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	59	0	4	2	3	4	5	3.22	****/48	****	3.05	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	59	0	4	1	3	3	7	3.44	****/45	****	3.70	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	59	3	1	1	5	2	6	3.73	****/30	****	4.50	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	59	5	1	1	4	4	3	3.54	****/27	****	4.50	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	59	6	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	****/25	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	1	7	5	7	3.90	35/51	3.90	3.76	4.03	4.19	3.90
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	57	1	0	4	3	2	10	3.95	****/31	****	3.90	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	57	3	1	2	4	3	7	3.76	****/36	****	3.62	4.33	4.38	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 155 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Applied Calculus</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kelly,Brian</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>160</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>77</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	57	3	1	3	3	5	5	3.59	****/19	****	3.54	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	2	1	5	5	4	3	3.17	****/14	****	4.00	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors			
00-27	20	0.00-0.99	5	A	26	Required for Majors	59	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B	29						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	11	General	6	Under-grad	77	Non-major	77
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	10						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 155 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Applied Calculus</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Stanwyck, Elizab</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>175</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>80</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	2	4	6	13	50	4.40	814/1644	4.24	4.14	4.32	4.16	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	1	4	17	52	4.62	481/1644	4.52	4.20	4.28	4.23	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	2	8	14	51	4.52	614/1419	4.39	4.29	4.35	4.25	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	12	1	5	16	13	28	3.98	1146/1596	4.03	4.12	4.24	4.09	3.98
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	27	4	5	4	9	25	3.98	999/1535	3.80	3.91	4.15	4.02	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	24	5	2	8	10	25	3.96	965/1510	3.54	4.10	4.13	3.91	3.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	2	0	4	17	51	4.55	462/1620	4.37	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	1	74	4.99	127/1642	4.94	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.99
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	1	0	2	18	43	4.59	305/1596	4.52	3.96	4.12	4.07	4.59
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	5	64	4.93	198/1534	4.75	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	1	68	4.99	122/1539	4.89	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.99
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	0	4	13	51	4.64	521/1531	4.57	4.06	4.33	4.30	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	1	2	8	56	4.67	569/1530	4.52	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	13	2	3	7	9	32	4.25	636/1409	4.24	3.87	4.08	3.97	4.25
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	13	6	15	16	19	3.32	1217/1366	2.94	3.58	4.18	3.96	3.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	9	9	14	12	24	3.49	1226/1364	3.19	3.53	4.33	4.10	3.49
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	6	7	15	14	27	3.71	1173/1361	3.53	3.66	4.39	4.17	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	11	22	8	9	5	10	15	3.32	918/1019	3.32	3.85	4.09	3.97	3.32

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 155 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Applied Calculus</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Stanwyck, Elizab</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>175</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>80</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	72	3	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	76	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/209	3.16	3.64	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	76	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	76	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	76	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.22	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	76	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/72	****	4.38	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	77	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/71	****	4.27	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	77	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/68	****	4.10	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	77	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/71	****	3.98	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	77	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/73	****	4.22	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	78	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/48	****	3.05	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	79	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/45	****	3.70	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	79	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	4.50	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	79	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/27	****	4.50	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	79	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/25	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	77	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/51	3.90	3.76	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	77	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/31	****	3.90	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	77	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/36	****	3.62	4.33	4.38	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 155 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Applied Calculus</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Stanwyck, Elizab</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>175</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>80</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	77	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/19	****	3.54	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	77	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/14	****	4.00	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	2	A	23	Required for Majors	62	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	28						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	16	General	3	Under-grad	80	Non-major	80
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	11						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 155 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Applied Calculus</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>175</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>80</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	2	4	6	13	50	4.40	814/1644	4.24	4.14	4.32	4.16	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	1	4	17	52	4.62	481/1644	4.52	4.20	4.28	4.23	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	2	8	14	51	4.52	614/1419	4.39	4.29	4.35	4.25	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	12	1	5	16	13	28	3.98	1146/1596	4.03	4.12	4.24	4.09	3.98
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	27	4	5	4	9	25	3.98	999/1535	3.80	3.91	4.15	4.02	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	24	5	2	8	10	25	3.96	965/1510	3.54	4.10	4.13	3.91	3.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	2	0	4	17	51	4.55	462/1620	4.37	4.28	4.20	4.13	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	1	74	4.99	127/1642	4.94	4.89	4.68	4.68	4.99
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	75	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/1596	4.52	3.96	4.12	4.07	4.59
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	76	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1534	4.75	4.38	4.48	4.45	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	76	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1539	4.89	4.70	4.76	4.72	4.99
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	76	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1531	4.57	4.06	4.33	4.30	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	76	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1530	4.52	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	77	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1409	4.24	3.87	4.08	3.97	4.25
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	13	6	15	16	19	3.32	1217/1366	2.94	3.58	4.18	3.96	3.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	9	9	14	12	24	3.49	1226/1364	3.19	3.53	4.33	4.10	3.49
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	6	7	15	14	27	3.71	1173/1361	3.53	3.66	4.39	4.17	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	11	22	8	9	5	10	15	3.32	918/1019	3.32	3.85	4.09	3.97	3.32

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 155 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Applied Calculus</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>175</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>80</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	72	3	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	76	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/209	3.16	3.64	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	76	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	76	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	76	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.22	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	76	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/72	****	4.38	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	77	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/71	****	4.27	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	77	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/68	****	4.10	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	77	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/71	****	3.98	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	77	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/73	****	4.22	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	78	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/48	****	3.05	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	79	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/45	****	3.70	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	79	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	4.50	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	79	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/27	****	4.50	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	79	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/25	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	77	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/51	3.90	3.76	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	77	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/31	****	3.90	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	77	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/36	****	3.62	4.33	4.38	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 155 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Applied Calculus</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>175</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>80</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	77	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/19	****	3.54	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	77	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/14	****	4.00	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	2	A	23	Required for Majors	62	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	28						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	16	General	3	Under-grad	80	Non-major	80
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	11						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 215 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Appl. Finite Mathematics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kapoor,Jagmohan</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>28</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	4	5	4	6	8	3.33	1561/1644	3.33	4.14	4.32	4.36	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	4	9	9	3.74	1390/1644	3.74	4.20	4.28	4.35	3.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	3	8	12	4.00	1090/1419	4.00	4.29	4.35	4.42	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	5	0	1	7	3	3.19	1521/1596	3.19	4.12	4.24	4.31	3.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	2	4	3	4	2	3.00	1469/1535	3.00	3.91	4.15	4.20	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	20	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1426/1510	3.14	4.10	4.13	4.17	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	11	10	4.04	1110/1620	4.04	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.89	4.68	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	3	1	4	12	2	3.41	1433/1596	3.41	3.96	4.12	4.13	3.41
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	3	7	15	4.26	1155/1534	4.26	4.38	4.48	4.51	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	3	5	4	13	3.85	1505/1539	3.85	4.70	4.76	4.80	3.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	7	6	10	3.74	1318/1531	3.74	4.06	4.33	4.38	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	2	8	12	4.00	1163/1530	4.00	4.13	4.35	4.41	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	2	0	5	4	4	3.53	1155/1409	3.53	3.87	4.08	4.23	3.53
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	4	1	2	4	3	3.07	1272/1366	3.07	3.58	4.18	4.24	3.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	7	2	3	2	0	2.00	1354/1364	2.00	3.53	4.33	4.39	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	5	1	3	3	1	2.54	1340/1361	2.54	3.66	4.39	4.48	2.54
4. Were special techniques successful	16	10	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1019	****	3.85	4.09	4.14	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 215 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Appl. Finite Mathematics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kapoor,Jagmohan</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>28</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	3	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.42	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/209	****	3.64	4.19	4.45	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	1	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.67	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	2	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	2	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.50	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/72	****	4.38	4.53	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/71	****	4.27	4.38	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/68	****	4.10	4.41	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/71	****	3.98	4.40	4.47	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	4.22	4.09	3.99	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/48	****	3.05	4.16	4.81	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/45	****	3.70	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/30	****	4.50	4.57	4.57	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/27	****	4.50	4.25	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/25	****	4.50	4.35	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/51	****	3.76	4.03	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	3.90	4.18	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/36	****	3.62	4.33	****	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 215 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Appl. Finite Mathematics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kapoor,Jagmohan</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>28</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/19	****	3.54	4.17	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/14	****	4.00	4.17	****	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	8						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 215 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Appl. Finite Mathematics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>28</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	4	5	4	6	8	3.33	1561/1644	3.33	4.14	4.32	4.36	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	4	9	9	3.74	1390/1644	3.74	4.20	4.28	4.35	3.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	3	8	12	4.00	1090/1419	4.00	4.29	4.35	4.42	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	5	0	1	7	3	3.19	1521/1596	3.19	4.12	4.24	4.31	3.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	2	4	3	4	2	3.00	1469/1535	3.00	3.91	4.15	4.20	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	20	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1426/1510	3.14	4.10	4.13	4.17	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	11	10	4.04	1110/1620	4.04	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.89	4.68	4.67	5.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1534	4.26	4.38	4.48	4.51	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1539	3.85	4.70	4.76	4.80	3.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1531	3.74	4.06	4.33	4.38	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1530	4.00	4.13	4.35	4.41	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1409	3.53	3.87	4.08	4.23	3.53
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	4	1	2	4	3	3.07	1272/1366	3.07	3.58	4.18	4.24	3.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	7	2	3	2	0	2.00	1354/1364	2.00	3.53	4.33	4.39	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	5	1	3	3	1	2.54	1340/1361	2.54	3.66	4.39	4.48	2.54
4. Were special techniques successful	16	10	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1019	****	3.85	4.09	4.14	****
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	3	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.42	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 215 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Appl. Finite Mathematics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baradwaj,Rajala</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>28</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/209	****	3.64	4.19	4.45	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	1	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.67	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	2	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	2	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.50	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/72	****	4.38	4.53	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/71	****	4.27	4.38	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/68	****	4.10	4.41	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/71	****	3.98	4.40	4.47	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	4.22	4.09	3.99	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/48	****	3.05	4.16	4.81	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/45	****	3.70	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/30	****	4.50	4.57	4.57	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/27	****	4.50	4.25	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/25	****	4.50	4.35	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/51	****	3.76	4.03	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	3.90	4.18	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/36	****	3.62	4.33	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/19	****	3.54	4.17	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/14	****	4.00	4.17	****	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

9. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	0.00 / 17	0.00	7.00	7.17	0.00	0.00
--	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	------	-----------	------	------	------	------	------

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	8						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 221 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introduction To Linear A</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kogan,Jacob</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	953/1644	3.91	4.14	4.32	4.36	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	6	6	3.94	1267/1644	3.90	4.20	4.28	4.35	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	5	7	3.83	1186/1419	4.07	4.29	4.35	4.42	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	4	2	4	3.82	1263/1596	3.87	4.12	4.24	4.31	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	5	4	6	3.94	1038/1535	4.17	3.91	4.15	4.20	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	1	6	0	3	3.50	1261/1510	3.97	4.10	4.13	4.17	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	621/1620	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	17	4.83	777/1642	4.77	4.89	4.68	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	5	5	4.00	971/1596	3.56	3.96	4.12	4.13	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	3	3	3	7	3.88	1362/1534	3.96	4.38	4.48	4.51	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	1086/1539	4.65	4.70	4.76	4.80	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	4	4	7	3.94	1213/1531	3.44	4.06	4.33	4.38	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	2	4	5	3.44	1403/1530	3.40	4.13	4.35	4.41	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	957/1409	3.42	3.87	4.08	4.23	3.86
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	1	2	2	1	2.88	1308/1366	2.37	3.58	4.18	4.24	2.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	1333/1364	2.40	3.53	4.33	4.39	2.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	2	2	2	1	3.00	1308/1361	2.77	3.66	4.39	4.48	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1019	****	3.85	4.09	4.14	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 221 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introduction To Linear A</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kogan,Jacob</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.42	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/209	****	3.64	4.19	4.45	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.67	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.50	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/72	****	4.38	4.53	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/71	****	4.27	4.38	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	4.10	4.41	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/71	****	3.98	4.40	4.47	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/73	****	4.22	4.09	3.99	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/48	****	3.05	4.16	4.81	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/45	****	3.70	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/30	****	4.50	4.57	4.57	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/27	****	4.50	4.25	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/25	****	4.50	4.35	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/51	****	3.76	4.03	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/31	****	3.90	4.18	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/36	****	3.62	4.33	****	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 221 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introduction To Linear A</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kogan,Jacob</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/19	****	3.54	4.17	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/14	****	4.00	4.17	****	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 221 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introduction To Linear A</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Draganescu,Andr</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	5	6	11	9	3.69	1448/1644	3.91	4.14	4.32	4.36	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	4	6	10	9	3.56	1479/1644	3.90	4.20	4.28	4.35	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	7	6	6	12	3.66	1248/1419	4.07	4.29	4.35	4.42	3.66
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	3	2	2	5	6	3.50	1429/1596	3.87	4.12	4.24	4.31	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	7	8	11	4.07	912/1535	4.17	3.91	4.15	4.20	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	16	0	2	1	6	6	4.07	893/1510	3.97	4.10	4.13	4.17	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	3	4	11	12	3.88	1260/1620	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.25	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1642	4.77	4.89	4.68	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	3	4	7	11	2	3.19	1498/1596	3.56	3.96	4.12	4.13	3.19
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	6	11	14	4.26	1155/1534	3.96	4.38	4.48	4.51	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	6	5	20	4.45	1332/1539	4.65	4.70	4.76	4.80	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	5	5	7	9	5	3.13	1459/1531	3.44	4.06	4.33	4.38	3.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	3	6	10	8	3.48	1388/1530	3.40	4.13	4.35	4.41	3.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	21	2	2	4	0	2	2.80	1359/1409	3.42	3.87	4.08	4.23	2.80
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	6	2	1	1	0	1.70	1364/1366	2.37	3.58	4.18	4.24	1.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	4	5	0	1	1	2.09	1353/1364	2.40	3.53	4.33	4.39	2.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	2	4	0	3	1	2.70	1331/1361	2.77	3.66	4.39	4.48	2.70

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 221 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introduction To Linear A</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Draganescu,Andr</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>33</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	23	7	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1019	****	3.85	4.09	4.14	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	2	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	33	Non-major	30
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	2				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 221 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introduction To Linear A</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Potra,Florian A</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>44</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	5	2	13	11	12	3.53	1510/1644	3.91	4.14	4.32	4.36	3.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	4	18	12	5	3.23	1558/1644	3.90	4.20	4.28	4.35	3.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	4	10	14	13	3.74	1215/1419	4.07	4.29	4.35	4.42	3.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	19	2	1	7	9	5	3.58	1398/1596	3.87	4.12	4.24	4.31	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	2	2	6	7	21	4.13	855/1535	4.17	3.91	4.15	4.20	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	2	1	4	10	7	3.79	1117/1510	3.97	4.10	4.13	4.17	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	8	17	15	4.00	1134/1620	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	39	4	4.09	1497/1642	4.77	4.89	4.68	4.67	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	7	7	10	13	2	2.90	1551/1596	3.56	3.96	4.12	4.13	2.90
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	7	6	14	12	2	2.90	1509/1534	3.96	4.38	4.48	4.51	2.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	2	12	25	4.44	1346/1539	4.65	4.70	4.76	4.80	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	11	11	11	7	1	2.41	1515/1531	3.44	4.06	4.33	4.38	2.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	13	10	12	4	2	2.32	1515/1530	3.40	4.13	4.35	4.41	2.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	31	3	4	1	2	0	2.20	****/1409	3.42	3.87	4.08	4.23	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	4	4	4	1	2	2.53	1339/1366	2.37	3.58	4.18	4.24	2.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	5	3	4	2	1	2.40	1346/1364	2.40	3.53	4.33	4.39	2.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	3	4	6	0	2	2.60	1338/1361	2.77	3.66	4.39	4.48	2.60
4. Were special techniques successful	29	12	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/1019	****	3.85	4.09	4.14	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 221 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introduction To Linear A</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Potra, Florian A</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>44</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.42	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/209	****	3.64	4.19	4.45	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	42	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.67	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.50	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/72	****	4.38	4.53	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	42	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/71	****	4.27	4.38	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/68	****	4.10	4.41	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/71	****	3.98	4.40	4.47	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/73	****	4.22	4.09	3.99	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	42	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/48	****	3.05	4.16	4.81	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/45	****	3.70	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	42	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	4.50	4.57	4.57	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	42	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/27	****	4.50	4.25	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	42	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/25	****	4.50	4.35	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	42	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/51	****	3.76	4.03	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	42	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	3.90	4.18	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	42	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/36	****	3.62	4.33	****	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 221 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introduction To Linear A</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Potra, Florian A</b>

Term - Fall 2013

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>44</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	42	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/19	****	3.54	4.17	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	42	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/14	****	4.00	4.17	****	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27    4	0.00-0.99    4	A    20	Required for Majors	Graduate	Major    8
28-55    10	1.00-1.99    1	B    14			
56-83    1	2.00-2.99    1	C    8	General	Under-grad	Non-major    36
84-150    5	3.00-3.49    8	D    0			
Grad.    0	3.50-4.00    4	F    0	Electives		
		P    0			
		I    0	Other		
		?    1			

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 221 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introduction To Linear A</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Peercy,Bradford</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>51</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	20	26	4.39	824/1644	3.91	4.14	4.32	4.36	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	12	33	4.51	633/1644	3.90	4.20	4.28	4.35	4.51
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	13	35	4.61	543/1419	4.07	4.29	4.35	4.42	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	24	0	0	4	7	16	4.44	657/1596	3.87	4.12	4.24	4.31	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	20	0	0	4	9	18	4.45	510/1535	4.17	3.91	4.15	4.20	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	28	0	0	3	2	18	4.65	287/1510	3.97	4.10	4.13	4.17	4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	10	38	4.69	309/1620	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	46	4.90	632/1642	4.77	4.89	4.68	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	2	4	14	23	4.35	591/1596	3.56	3.96	4.12	4.13	4.35
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	11	37	4.65	707/1534	3.96	4.38	4.48	4.51	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	45	4.86	723/1539	4.65	4.70	4.76	4.80	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	16	31	4.51	724/1531	3.44	4.06	4.33	4.38	4.51
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	9	9	31	4.33	940/1530	3.40	4.13	4.35	4.41	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	24	3	4	4	6	10	3.59	1130/1409	3.42	3.87	4.08	4.23	3.59
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	3	1	0	3	3.43	****/1366	2.37	3.58	4.18	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	44	0	0	0	4	0	3	3.86	****/1364	2.40	3.53	4.33	4.39	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	44	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	****/1361	2.77	3.66	4.39	4.48	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 221 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introduction To Linear A</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Peercy,Bradford</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>51</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	44	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1019	****	3.85	4.09	4.14	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 22	Required for Majors 44	Graduate 0
28-55	12	1.00-1.99 0	B 22		Major 12
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 6	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 51
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 15	D 0		Non-major 39
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 18	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 2		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 221 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introduction To Linear A</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Lo,James T</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>24</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	3	6	7	5	3.67	1457/1644	3.91	4.14	4.32	4.36	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	2	9	9	4.24	1008/1644	3.90	4.20	4.28	4.35	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	2	3	15	4.52	614/1419	4.07	4.29	4.35	4.42	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	9	0	2	2	2	6	4.00	1129/1596	3.87	4.12	4.24	4.31	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	0	2	3	1	11	4.24	754/1535	4.17	3.91	4.15	4.20	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	13	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	1072/1510	3.97	4.10	4.13	4.17	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	2	3	14	4.38	712/1620	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1642	4.77	4.89	4.68	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	3	4	6	4	3.37	1447/1596	3.56	3.96	4.12	4.13	3.37
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	6	7	8	4.10	1264/1534	3.96	4.38	4.48	4.51	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	894/1539	4.65	4.70	4.76	4.80	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	6	4	8	2	3.19	1447/1531	3.44	4.06	4.33	4.38	3.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	5	2	2	9	3.43	1406/1530	3.40	4.13	4.35	4.41	3.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	16	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/1409	3.42	3.87	4.08	4.23	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/1366	2.37	3.58	4.18	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	****/1364	2.40	3.53	4.33	4.39	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/1361	2.77	3.66	4.39	4.48	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1019	****	3.85	4.09	4.14	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 221 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introduction To Linear A</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Lo,James T</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>24</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/209	****	3.64	4.19	4.45	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.67	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.50	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/72	****	4.38	4.53	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/71	****	4.27	4.38	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	4.10	4.41	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/71	****	3.98	4.40	4.47	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.22	4.09	3.99	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/48	****	3.05	4.16	4.81	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/45	****	3.70	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.50	4.57	4.57	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	4.50	4.25	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	4.50	4.35	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/51	****	3.76	4.03	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	3.90	4.18	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	3.62	4.33	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	3.54	4.17	****	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 221 05</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introduction To Linear A</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Lo,James T</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>24</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	4.00	4.17	****	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 7	General 1	Under-grad 24
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 3		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 225 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Differentl Equatio</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Dean,Brian J</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>36</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	8	28	4.78	330/1644	4.38	4.14	4.32	4.36	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	7	27	4.79	244/1644	4.27	4.20	4.28	4.35	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	32	4.89	189/1419	4.36	4.29	4.35	4.42	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	20	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	627/1596	4.18	4.12	4.24	4.31	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	14	2	2	4	4	9	3.76	1169/1535	3.79	3.91	4.15	4.20	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	196/1510	4.53	4.10	4.13	4.17	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	6	28	4.77	198/1620	4.54	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1642	4.99	4.89	4.68	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	10	22	4.69	229/1596	3.73	3.96	4.12	4.13	4.69
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	32	4.91	223/1534	4.33	4.38	4.48	4.51	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	8	27	4.77	951/1539	4.70	4.70	4.76	4.80	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	31	4.89	184/1531	3.89	4.06	4.33	4.38	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	30	4.86	279/1530	3.99	4.13	4.35	4.41	4.86

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 225 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Differentl Equatio</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Dean,Brian J</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>36</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Lecture</b>														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	24	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	693/1409	4.16	3.87	4.08	4.23	4.18

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 28	Required for Majors 33	Graduate 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		Major 7
56-83	18	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 36
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		Non-major 29
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 20	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 3		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 225 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Differentl Equatio</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kang,Hye Won</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>27</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	8	15	4.41	814/1644	4.38	4.14	4.32	4.36	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	16	4.41	802/1644	4.27	4.20	4.28	4.35	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	189/1419	4.36	4.29	4.35	4.42	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	567/1596	4.18	4.12	4.24	4.31	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	1	3	3	11	4.16	834/1535	3.79	3.91	4.15	4.20	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	89/1510	4.53	4.10	4.13	4.17	4.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	131/1620	4.54	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	253/1642	4.99	4.89	4.68	4.67	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	3	8	9	4	3.58	1348/1596	3.73	3.96	4.12	4.13	3.58
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	10	15	4.54	855/1534	4.33	4.38	4.48	4.51	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	1111/1539	4.70	4.70	4.76	4.80	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	7	8	8	3.84	1274/1531	3.89	4.06	4.33	4.38	3.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	7	13	4.16	1071/1530	3.99	4.13	4.35	4.41	4.16
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	729/1409	4.16	3.87	4.08	4.23	4.14
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	****/1366	****	3.58	4.18	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/1364	****	3.53	4.33	4.39	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 225 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Differentl Equatio</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kang,Hye Won</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>27</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1361	****	3.66	4.39	4.48	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 14	Required for Majors	22 Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1 B 7		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2 C 2	General	1 Under-grad 27 Non-major 25
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8 F 0	Electives	0 **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 4		

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 225 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Differentl Equatio</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Lo,James T</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>22</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	2	3	5	9	3.95	1265/1644	4.38	4.14	4.32	4.36	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	1	4	9	4	3.60	1465/1644	4.27	4.20	4.28	4.35	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	2	6	4	5	3.30	1351/1419	4.36	4.29	4.35	4.42	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	1	3	2	3	5	3.57	1402/1596	4.18	4.12	4.24	4.31	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	1	6	5	4	3.44	1356/1535	3.79	3.91	4.15	4.20	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	0	7	1	6	3.93	1009/1510	4.53	4.10	4.13	4.17	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	3	4	10	4.00	1134/1620	4.54	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1642	4.99	4.89	4.68	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	2	1	8	4	0	2.93	1542/1596	3.73	3.96	4.12	4.13	2.93
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	2	3	9	4	3.55	1451/1534	4.33	4.38	4.48	4.51	3.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	1149/1539	4.70	4.70	4.76	4.80	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	6	4	7	1	2.95	1480/1531	3.89	4.06	4.33	4.38	2.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	3	3	6	3	2.95	1477/1530	3.99	4.13	4.35	4.41	2.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/1409	4.16	3.87	4.08	4.23	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1366	****	3.58	4.18	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1364	****	3.53	4.33	4.39	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 225 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Differentl Equatio</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Lo,James T</b>

Term - Fall 2013

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>22</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1361	****	3.66	4.39	4.48	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	1	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 251 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Multivariable Calculus</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Nanes,Kalman M</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>122</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>106</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	1	15	23	63	4.42	801/1644	4.30	4.14	4.32	4.36	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	3	8	20	72	4.56	558/1644	4.05	4.20	4.28	4.35	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	3	11	23	66	4.48	674/1419	4.32	4.29	4.35	4.42	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	35	1	2	6	21	37	4.36	788/1596	3.70	4.12	4.24	4.31	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	3	1	7	13	23	54	4.24	745/1535	3.98	3.91	4.15	4.20	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	62	1	0	4	10	22	4.41	538/1510	3.97	4.10	4.13	4.17	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	2	6	14	79	4.68	309/1620	4.53	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	0	0	100	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.89	4.68	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	0	0	0	11	25	47	4.43	475/1596	3.88	3.96	4.12	4.13	4.43
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	2	7	22	70	4.58	795/1534	4.41	4.38	4.48	4.51	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	13	87	4.85	751/1539	4.51	4.70	4.76	4.80	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	3	10	23	65	4.49	749/1531	3.71	4.06	4.33	4.38	4.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	6	5	12	16	61	4.21	1036/1530	3.77	4.13	4.35	4.41	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	13	2	0	10	15	56	4.48	402/1409	3.36	3.87	4.08	4.23	4.48
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	9	10	24	18	18	3.33	1213/1366	3.57	3.58	4.18	4.24	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	2	10	13	20	34	3.94	1065/1364	3.69	3.53	4.33	4.39	3.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	2	5	20	18	33	3.96	1058/1361	3.70	3.66	4.39	4.48	3.96
4. Were special techniques successful	30	7	4	3	6	19	37	4.19	477/1019	4.19	3.85	4.09	4.14	4.19

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 251 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Multivariable Calculus</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Nanes, Kalman M</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>122</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>106</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	102	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.42	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	102	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/209	****	3.64	4.19	4.45	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	102	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.67	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	102	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	102	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.50	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	104	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/48	****	3.05	4.16	4.81	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	104	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/45	****	3.70	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	104	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	4.50	4.57	4.57	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	105	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/51	****	3.76	4.03	5.00	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 251 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Multivariable Calculus</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Nanes, Kalman M</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>122</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>106</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	105	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	3.62	4.33	****	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	45	Required for Majors	89	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	29	1.00-1.99	0	B	42						
56-83	15	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	106	Non-major	91
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	22	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	38	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	11						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 251 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Multivariable Calculus</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Biswas,Animikh</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>115</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>70</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	1	9	20	37	4.39	835/1644	4.30	4.14	4.32	4.36	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	2	10	19	35	4.32	925/1644	4.05	4.20	4.28	4.35	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	2	3	16	45	4.58	569/1419	4.32	4.29	4.35	4.42	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	30	1	2	6	15	13	4.00	1129/1596	3.70	4.12	4.24	4.31	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	18	4	6	7	14	17	3.71	1212/1535	3.98	3.91	4.15	4.20	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	47	0	2	3	6	9	4.10	875/1510	3.97	4.10	4.13	4.17	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	4	17	46	4.63	375/1620	4.53	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	0	0	0	0	65	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.89	4.68	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	0	2	11	28	20	4.08	918/1596	3.88	3.96	4.12	4.13	4.08
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	3	21	42	4.55	831/1534	4.41	4.38	4.48	4.51	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	4	11	51	4.67	1124/1539	4.51	4.70	4.76	4.80	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	4	9	22	30	4.15	1078/1531	3.71	4.06	4.33	4.38	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	7	9	18	32	4.09	1123/1530	3.77	4.13	4.35	4.41	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	22	2	7	12	9	14	3.59	1130/1409	3.36	3.87	4.08	4.23	3.59
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	6	4	11	14	26	3.82	1006/1366	3.57	3.58	4.18	4.24	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	6	8	15	17	15	3.44	1236/1364	3.69	3.53	4.33	4.39	3.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	9	3	18	11	18	3.44	1258/1361	3.70	3.66	4.39	4.48	3.44
4. Were special techniques successful	10	47	1	3	5	1	3	3.15	****/1019	4.19	3.85	4.09	4.14	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 251 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Multivariable Calculus</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Biswas,Animikh</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>115</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>70</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	65	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.42	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	66	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/209	****	3.64	4.19	4.45	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	67	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.67	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	67	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	67	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.50	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	68	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/72	****	4.38	4.53	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	68	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/71	****	4.27	4.38	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	68	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	4.10	4.41	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	68	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/71	****	3.98	4.40	4.47	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	68	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.22	4.09	3.99	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	69	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/48	****	3.05	4.16	4.81	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	69	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/45	****	3.70	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	68	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	4.50	4.57	4.57	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	68	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	4.50	4.25	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	68	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/25	****	4.50	4.35	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	69	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/51	****	3.76	4.03	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	68	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	3.90	4.18	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	68	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	3.62	4.33	****	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 251 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Multivariable Calculus</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Biswas,Animikh</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>115</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>70</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	68	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	3.54	4.17	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	68	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	4.00	4.17	****	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 3	A 27	Required for Majors 57	Graduate 0 Major 8
28-55	17	1.00-1.99 0	B 28		
56-83	9	2.00-2.99 7	C 7	General 0	Under-grad 70 Non-major 62
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 14	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 17	F 0	Electives 4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 6		

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 251 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Multivariable Calculus</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Armstrong,Thoma</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	1149/1644	4.30	4.14	4.32	4.36	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	2	3	2	3.27	1550/1644	4.05	4.20	4.28	4.35	3.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	6	3	3.91	1162/1419	4.32	4.29	4.35	4.42	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	1566/1596	3.70	4.12	4.24	4.31	2.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	970/1535	3.98	3.91	4.15	4.20	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1341/1510	3.97	4.10	4.13	4.17	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	864/1620	4.53	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.89	4.68	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	2	5	1	1	3.11	1512/1596	3.88	3.96	4.12	4.13	3.11
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	1264/1534	4.41	4.38	4.48	4.51	4.09
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1484/1539	4.51	4.70	4.76	4.80	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	2	3	1	1	2.50	1509/1531	3.71	4.06	4.33	4.38	2.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	2	2	2	3.00	1469/1530	3.77	4.13	4.35	4.41	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1398/1409	3.36	3.87	4.08	4.23	2.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1366	3.57	3.58	4.18	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1364	3.69	3.53	4.33	4.39	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 251 09</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Multivariable Calculus</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Armstrong,Thoma</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1361	3.70	3.66	4.39	4.48	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 1	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Non-major 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 301 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro to Mathematic Anal</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Nanes,Kalman M</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>29</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	20	4.62	536/1644	4.37	4.14	4.32	4.31	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	21	4.69	401/1644	4.48	4.20	4.28	4.25	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	21	4.72	380/1419	4.56	4.29	4.35	4.31	4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	1	5	18	4.60	437/1596	4.46	4.12	4.24	4.25	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	9	17	4.48	469/1535	4.40	3.91	4.15	4.14	4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	215/1510	4.43	4.10	4.13	4.16	4.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	7	20	4.59	423/1620	4.46	4.28	4.20	4.18	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	253/1642	4.61	4.89	4.68	4.65	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	7	17	4.71	213/1596	4.34	3.96	4.12	4.09	4.71
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	400/1534	4.48	4.38	4.48	4.44	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1539	4.91	4.70	4.76	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	22	4.75	348/1531	4.37	4.06	4.33	4.30	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	340/1530	4.45	4.13	4.35	4.32	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	77/1409	4.15	3.87	4.08	4.09	4.92
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	492/1366	4.44	3.58	4.18	4.22	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	398/1364	4.50	3.53	4.33	4.37	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	286/1361	4.50	3.66	4.39	4.39	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	21	1	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	****/1019	****	3.85	4.09	4.04	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 301 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro to Mathematic Anal</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Nanes, Kalman M</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>29</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/72	****	4.38	4.53	4.68	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/71	****	4.27	4.38	4.61	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/71	****	3.98	4.40	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	4.22	4.09	4.57	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	Graduate	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9			Major
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	Under-grad	28
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	8	D	0			Non-major
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives		
				P	0			
				I	0	Other		
				?	4			

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 301 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro to Mathematic Anal</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Potra, Florian A</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>35</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	16	0	0	1	5	3	10	4.16	1085/1644	4.37	4.14	4.32	4.31	4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	16	0	0	1	4	8	6	4.00	1210/1644	4.48	4.20	4.28	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	16	0	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	976/1419	4.56	4.29	4.35	4.31	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	16	6	0	2	2	1	8	4.15	1019/1596	4.46	4.12	4.24	4.25	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	16	2	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	564/1535	4.40	3.91	4.15	4.14	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	17	5	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	831/1510	4.43	4.10	4.13	4.16	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	16	0	1	1	3	4	10	4.11	1057/1620	4.46	4.28	4.20	4.18	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	16	0	0	0	1	14	4	4.16	1463/1642	4.61	4.89	4.68	4.65	4.16
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	0	2	5	6	5	3.78	1225/1596	4.34	3.96	4.12	4.09	3.78
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	1	2	4	4	7	3.78	1398/1534	4.48	4.38	4.48	4.44	3.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	637/1539	4.91	4.70	4.76	4.74	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	0	6	1	4	7	3.67	1348/1531	4.37	4.06	4.33	4.30	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	3	3	3	9	4.00	1163/1530	4.45	4.13	4.35	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	9	1	1	1	0	6	4.00	825/1409	4.15	3.87	4.08	4.09	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	****/1366	4.44	3.58	4.18	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	****/1364	4.50	3.53	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/1361	4.50	3.66	4.39	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	29	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1019	****	3.85	4.09	4.04	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 301 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro to Mathematic Anal</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Potra,Florian A</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>35</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.16	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/209	****	3.64	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.07	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/72	****	4.38	4.53	4.68	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/71	****	4.27	4.38	4.61	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	4.10	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/71	****	3.98	4.40	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	4.22	4.09	4.57	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/48	****	3.05	4.16	4.95	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/45	****	3.70	4.19	4.95	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	4.50	4.57	4.93	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	4.50	4.25	4.90	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/25	****	4.50	4.35	4.90	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/51	****	3.76	4.03	4.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	3.90	4.18	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	3.62	4.33	4.83	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 301 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro to Mathematic Anal</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Potra, Florian A</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>35</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	3.54	4.17	4.20	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/14	****	4.00	4.17	4.60	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	2	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	33	Non-major	30
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	17						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 301 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro to Mathematic Anal</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Suri,Manil</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>24</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	8	12	4.33	889/1644	4.37	4.14	4.32	4.31	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	302/1644	4.48	4.20	4.28	4.25	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	365/1419	4.56	4.29	4.35	4.31	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	410/1596	4.46	4.12	4.24	4.25	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	681/1535	4.40	3.91	4.15	4.14	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	538/1510	4.43	4.10	4.13	4.16	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	309/1620	4.46	4.28	4.20	4.18	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	1000/1642	4.61	4.89	4.68	4.65	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	10	12	4.55	348/1596	4.34	3.96	4.12	4.09	4.55
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	400/1534	4.48	4.38	4.48	4.44	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	837/1539	4.91	4.70	4.76	4.74	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	435/1531	4.37	4.06	4.33	4.30	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	6	15	4.52	732/1530	4.45	4.13	4.35	4.32	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	2	2	2	7	4	3.53	1159/1409	4.15	3.87	4.08	4.09	3.53
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	628/1366	4.44	3.58	4.18	4.22	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	877/1364	4.50	3.53	4.33	4.37	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	994/1361	4.50	3.66	4.39	4.39	4.13

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 301 03</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro to Mathematic Anal</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Suri,Manil</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>24</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	16	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1019	****	3.85	4.09	4.04	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 19	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		Major 11
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 6	General 0	Under-grad 24
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 4	D 1		Non-major 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 1		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 302 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Math Analysis II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gowda,Muddappa</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>29</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	0	2	5	19	4.52	675/1644	4.52	4.14	4.32	4.31	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	2	24	4.81	221/1644	4.81	4.20	4.28	4.25	4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	0	2	24	4.78	308/1419	4.78	4.29	4.35	4.31	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	10	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	463/1596	4.59	4.12	4.24	4.25	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	16	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	719/1535	4.27	3.91	4.15	4.14	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	1	0	0	4	14	4.58	359/1510	4.58	4.10	4.13	4.16	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	0	1	4	20	4.48	558/1620	4.48	4.28	4.20	4.18	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.89	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	3	22	4.77	171/1596	4.77	3.96	4.12	4.09	4.77
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	25	4.89	286/1534	4.89	4.38	4.48	4.44	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	25	4.89	666/1539	4.89	4.70	4.76	4.74	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	0	1	25	4.81	263/1531	4.81	4.06	4.33	4.30	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	23	4.78	404/1530	4.78	4.13	4.35	4.32	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	551/1409	4.33	3.87	4.08	4.09	4.33
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	****/1366	****	3.58	4.18	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	****/1364	****	3.53	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/1361	****	3.66	4.39	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	22	3	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/1019	****	3.85	4.09	4.04	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 302 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Math Analysis II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gowda,Muddappa</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>29</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/185	****	4.77	4.23	4.16	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/209	****	3.64	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.65	4.53	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/183	****	4.83	4.46	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/172	****	4.73	4.14	4.07	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	7
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 306 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Geometry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Seidman,Thomas</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	1006/1644	4.22	4.14	4.32	4.31	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	1018/1644	4.22	4.20	4.28	4.25	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	862/1419	4.33	4.29	4.35	4.31	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	759/1596	4.38	4.12	4.24	4.25	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	523/1535	4.44	3.91	4.15	4.14	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	822/1510	4.17	4.10	4.13	4.16	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	0	3	1	1	2.86	1560/1620	2.86	4.28	4.20	4.18	2.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.89	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	5	1	3.75	1240/1596	3.75	3.96	4.12	4.09	3.75
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	0	5	2	3.67	1427/1534	3.67	4.38	4.48	4.44	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	951/1539	4.78	4.70	4.76	4.74	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1256/1531	3.89	4.06	4.33	4.30	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	940/1530	4.33	4.13	4.35	4.32	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1409	****	3.87	4.08	4.09	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1329/1366	2.67	3.58	4.18	4.22	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1258/1364	3.33	3.53	4.33	4.37	3.33

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 306 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Geometry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Seidman,Thomas</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1284/1361	3.33	3.66	4.39	4.39	3.33

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 1 Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 8 Non-major 3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 1		

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 381 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Lin. Meth/Oper Research</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Guler,Osman</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	626/1644	4.56	4.14	4.32	4.31	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	897/1644	4.33	4.20	4.28	4.25	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	308/1419	4.78	4.29	4.35	4.31	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	410/1596	4.63	4.12	4.24	4.25	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	300/1535	4.67	3.91	4.15	4.14	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	538/1510	4.40	4.10	4.13	4.16	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	102/1620	4.89	4.28	4.20	4.18	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.89	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1240/1596	3.75	3.96	4.12	4.09	3.75
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1254/1534	4.11	4.38	4.48	4.44	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1339/1539	4.44	4.70	4.76	4.74	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	1348/1531	3.67	4.06	4.33	4.30	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	2	3	3.44	1400/1530	3.44	4.13	4.35	4.32	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	1202/1409	3.43	3.87	4.08	4.09	3.43
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1366	****	3.58	4.18	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1364	****	3.53	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1361	****	3.66	4.39	4.39	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 381 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Lin. Meth/Oper Research</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Guler,Osman</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1019	****	3.85	4.09	4.04	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 385 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro To Math Modeling</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kang,Weining</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>22</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	1	7	6	5	3.52	1514/1644	3.52	4.14	4.32	4.31	3.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	3	8	7	3.81	1360/1644	3.81	4.20	4.28	4.25	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	7	8	3.95	1126/1419	3.95	4.29	4.35	4.31	3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	2	0	3	2	6	3.77	1298/1596	3.77	4.12	4.24	4.25	3.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	4	1	6	2	3	2.94	1490/1535	2.94	3.91	4.15	4.14	2.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	1	1	6	4	3.85	1080/1510	3.85	4.10	4.13	4.16	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	3	4	11	4.00	1134/1620	4.00	4.28	4.20	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	316/1642	4.95	4.89	4.68	4.65	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	5	8	3	3.71	1278/1596	3.71	3.96	4.12	4.09	3.71
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	6	10	4.19	1200/1534	4.19	4.38	4.48	4.44	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	1353/1539	4.43	4.70	4.76	4.74	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	6	4	8	3.76	1309/1531	3.76	4.06	4.33	4.30	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	5	1	11	3.86	1257/1530	3.86	4.13	4.35	4.32	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	5	4	4	3.71	1057/1409	3.71	3.87	4.08	4.09	3.71
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1366	****	3.58	4.18	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1364	****	3.53	4.33	4.37	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 385 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro To Math Modeling</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kang,Weining</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>22</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1361	****	3.66	4.39	4.39	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		Major 16
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 22
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		Non-major 6
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 6	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 2		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 390 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Special Topics In Mathem</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Meskin,Stephen</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	2	5	1	3	2.93	1622/1644	2.93	4.14	4.32	4.31	2.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	5	5	1	0	2.29	1636/1644	2.29	4.20	4.28	4.25	2.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	4	4	1	1	2.46	1412/1419	2.46	4.29	4.35	4.31	2.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	3	2	4	1	0	2.30	1585/1596	2.30	4.12	4.24	4.25	2.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	5	0	4	3.15	1448/1535	3.15	3.91	4.15	4.14	3.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	4	1	5	1	0	2.27	1501/1510	2.27	4.10	4.13	4.16	2.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	3	3	3	0	0	2.00	1607/1620	2.00	4.28	4.20	4.18	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	505/1642	4.92	4.89	4.68	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	5	2	3	1	0	2.00	1587/1596	2.00	3.96	4.12	4.09	2.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	5	2	3	0	2.38	1525/1534	2.38	4.38	4.48	4.44	2.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	3	6	3	3.64	1518/1539	3.64	4.70	4.76	4.74	3.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	6	2	2	2	0	2.00	1525/1531	2.00	4.06	4.33	4.30	2.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	7	1	4	0	0	1.75	1527/1530	1.75	4.13	4.35	4.32	1.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	3	3	4	0	0	2.10	1397/1409	2.10	3.87	4.08	4.09	2.10
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	0	3	0	0	2.00	1353/1366	2.00	3.58	4.18	4.22	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	2	2	0	1	2.67	1336/1364	2.67	3.53	4.33	4.37	2.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	2	2	0	0	2.00	1355/1361	2.00	3.66	4.39	4.39	2.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	3	1	1	0	0	1.60	1017/1019	1.60	3.85	4.09	4.04	1.60

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 390 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Special Topics In Mathem</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Meskin,Stephen</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/209	****	3.64	4.19	4.18	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/48	****	3.05	4.16	4.95	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/45	****	3.70	4.19	4.95	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/51	****	3.76	4.03	4.75	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 404 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Part Diff Eq I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Peercy,Bradford</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>24</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	3	1	4	14	4.17	1062/1644	4.54	4.14	4.32	4.47	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	13	7	4.17	1071/1644	4.39	4.20	4.28	4.35	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	674/1419	4.69	4.29	4.35	4.48	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	528/1596	4.35	4.12	4.24	4.34	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	5	5	4	3.93	1048/1535	4.15	3.91	4.15	4.26	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	1	0	2	1	9	4.31	668/1510	4.40	4.10	4.13	4.29	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	7	13	4.39	698/1620	4.35	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	869/1642	4.89	4.89	4.68	4.67	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	12	6	4.09	911/1596	4.05	3.96	4.12	4.20	4.09
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	11	8	4.23	1178/1534	4.51	4.38	4.48	4.54	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	932/1539	4.89	4.70	4.76	4.81	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	4	8	8	4.00	1163/1531	4.05	4.06	4.33	4.38	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	5	12	4.14	1092/1530	4.27	4.13	4.35	4.41	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	2	1	4	10	3.95	883/1409	3.90	3.87	4.08	4.15	3.95
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1366	2.40	3.58	4.18	4.37	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1364	2.80	3.53	4.33	4.52	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 404 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Part Diff Eq I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Peercy,Bradford</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>24</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1361	3.40	3.66	4.39	4.59	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 2 Major 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 22 Non-major 17
84-150	13	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives 7	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 1		

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 404 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Part Diff Eq I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Bell,Jonathan</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>10</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	175/1644	4.54	4.14	4.32	4.47	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	508/1644	4.39	4.20	4.28	4.35	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	170/1419	4.69	4.29	4.35	4.48	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	1008/1596	4.35	4.12	4.24	4.34	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	612/1535	4.15	3.91	4.15	4.26	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	429/1510	4.40	4.10	4.13	4.29	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	820/1620	4.35	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1642	4.89	4.89	4.68	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	7	1	4.00	971/1596	4.05	3.96	4.12	4.20	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	439/1534	4.51	4.38	4.48	4.54	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1539	4.89	4.70	4.76	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1119/1531	4.05	4.06	4.33	4.38	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	882/1530	4.27	4.13	4.35	4.41	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	957/1409	3.90	3.87	4.08	4.15	3.86
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	1341/1366	2.40	3.58	4.18	4.37	2.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	2	0	1	1	2.80	1327/1364	2.80	3.53	4.33	4.52	2.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1270/1361	3.40	3.66	4.39	4.59	3.40

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 404 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Part Diff Eq I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Bell,Jonathan</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>10</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1019	****	3.85	4.09	4.32	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 1	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 0	D 1		Non-major 8
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 2		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 407 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Modern Algebra &amp; No.Theo</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Armstrong,Thoma</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	1218/1644	4.00	4.14	4.32	4.47	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	3	5	3.71	1405/1644	3.71	4.20	4.28	4.35	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	1090/1419	4.00	4.29	4.35	4.48	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	985/1596	4.18	4.12	4.24	4.34	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	0	8	4.50	442/1535	4.50	3.91	4.15	4.26	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	359/1510	4.57	4.10	4.13	4.29	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	752/1620	4.36	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	505/1642	4.92	4.89	4.68	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	6	4	1	3.33	1458/1596	3.33	3.96	4.12	4.20	3.33
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	1047/1534	4.38	4.38	4.48	4.54	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	1200/1539	4.62	4.70	4.76	4.81	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	7	1	5	3.85	1274/1531	3.85	4.06	4.33	4.38	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	3	2	4	3.42	1409/1530	3.42	4.13	4.35	4.41	3.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1211/1409	3.40	3.87	4.08	4.15	3.40
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1366	****	3.58	4.18	4.37	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1364	****	3.53	4.33	4.52	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1361	****	3.66	4.39	4.59	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 407 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Modern Algebra &amp; No.Theo</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Armstrong,Thoma</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1019	****	3.85	4.09	4.32	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	1	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 410 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro to Complex Analyti</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Draganescu,Andr</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	536/1644	4.63	4.14	4.32	4.47	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	843/1644	4.38	4.20	4.28	4.35	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	435/1419	4.69	4.29	4.35	4.48	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	515/1596	4.55	4.12	4.24	4.34	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	693/1535	4.31	3.91	4.15	4.26	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	101/1510	4.89	4.10	4.13	4.29	4.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1620	5.00	4.28	4.20	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.89	4.68	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	667/1596	4.29	3.96	4.12	4.20	4.29
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	643/1534	4.69	4.38	4.48	4.54	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	426/1539	4.94	4.70	4.76	4.81	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	813/1531	4.44	4.06	4.33	4.38	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	843/1530	4.44	4.13	4.35	4.41	4.44

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 410 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro to Complex Analyysi</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Draganescu,Andr</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Lecture</b>														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	296/1409	4.60	3.87	4.08	4.15	4.60

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 16
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Non-major 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 8	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 421 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introduction To Topology</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Armstrong,Thoma</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>7</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1349/1644	3.86	4.14	4.32	4.47	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1405/1644	3.71	4.20	4.28	4.35	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1090/1419	4.00	4.29	4.35	4.48	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	567/1596	4.50	4.12	4.24	4.34	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	442/1535	4.50	3.91	4.15	4.26	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	629/1510	4.33	4.10	4.13	4.29	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	1499/1620	3.29	4.28	4.20	4.25	3.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.89	4.68	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1302/1596	3.67	3.96	4.12	4.20	3.67
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1296/1534	4.00	4.38	4.48	4.54	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1430/1539	4.29	4.70	4.76	4.81	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1331/1531	3.71	4.06	4.33	4.38	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1358/1530	3.57	4.13	4.35	4.41	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	551/1409	4.33	3.87	4.08	4.15	4.33
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1353/1366	2.00	3.58	4.18	4.37	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1336/1364	2.67	3.53	4.33	4.52	2.67

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 421 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introduction To Topology</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Armstrong,Thoma</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>7</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1333/1361	2.67	3.66	4.39	4.59	2.67

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Non-major 5
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 3	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 1		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 430 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Matrix Analysis</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kogan,Jacob</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>4</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1603/1644	3.00	4.14	4.32	4.47	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	1637/1644	2.25	4.20	4.28	4.35	2.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	1418/1419	2.00	4.29	4.35	4.48	2.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1540/1596	3.00	4.12	4.24	4.34	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	737/1535	4.25	3.91	4.15	4.26	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1261/1510	3.50	4.10	4.13	4.29	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1328/1620	3.75	4.28	4.20	4.25	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.89	4.68	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1458/1596	3.33	3.96	4.12	4.20	3.33
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1491/1534	3.25	4.38	4.48	4.54	3.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	990/1539	4.75	4.70	4.76	4.81	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1473/1531	3.00	4.06	4.33	4.38	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	1518/1530	2.25	4.13	4.35	4.41	2.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	3.87	4.08	4.15	5.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1279/1366	3.00	3.58	4.18	4.37	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	649/1364	4.50	3.53	4.33	4.52	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	703/1361	4.50	3.66	4.39	4.59	4.50

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 430 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Matrix Analysis</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kogan, Jacob</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>4</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1019	5.00	3.85	4.09	4.32	5.00

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 1	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 4 Non-major 1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 441 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro to Numerical Analy</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Suri,Manil</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	650/1644	4.53	4.14	4.32	4.47	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	595/1644	4.53	4.20	4.28	4.35	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	689/1419	4.47	4.29	4.35	4.48	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	627/1596	4.46	4.12	4.24	4.34	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	3	6	2	3.67	1235/1535	3.67	3.91	4.15	4.26	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	349/1510	4.58	4.10	4.13	4.29	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	685/1620	4.40	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.89	4.68	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	246/1596	4.67	3.96	4.12	4.20	4.67
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	198/1534	4.93	4.38	4.48	4.54	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.70	4.76	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	406/1531	4.71	4.06	4.33	4.38	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	502/1530	4.71	4.13	4.35	4.41	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1409	****	3.87	4.08	4.15	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1366	****	3.58	4.18	4.37	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1364	****	3.53	4.33	4.52	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 441 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro to Numerical Analy</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Suri,Manil</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1361	****	3.66	4.39	4.59	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 15
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 2
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 4	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 2		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 481 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Mathematical Modeling</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Rostamian,Roube</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	814/1644	4.40	4.14	4.32	4.47	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	3	8	4.13	1116/1644	4.13	4.20	4.28	4.35	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1419	****	4.29	4.35	4.48	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	5	1	6	3.92	1197/1596	3.92	4.12	4.24	4.34	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	1396/1535	3.33	3.91	4.15	4.26	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	472/1510	4.46	4.10	4.13	4.29	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	4	3	4	3.40	1473/1620	3.40	4.28	4.20	4.25	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	840/1642	4.80	4.89	4.68	4.67	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	4	6	2	3.50	1388/1596	3.50	3.96	4.12	4.20	3.50
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	946/1534	4.47	4.38	4.48	4.54	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	1028/1539	4.73	4.70	4.76	4.81	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	1094/1531	4.13	4.06	4.33	4.38	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	996/1530	4.27	4.13	4.35	4.41	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	777/1409	4.08	3.87	4.08	4.15	4.08
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1366	****	3.58	4.18	4.37	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1364	****	3.53	4.33	4.52	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1361	****	3.66	4.39	4.59	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 481 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Mathematical Modeling</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Rostamian,Roube</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1019	****	3.85	4.09	4.32	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 1 Major 13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 3	General 1	Under-grad 14 Non-major 2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 487 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Continuous Dynamical Sys</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Shen,Jinglai</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>4</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	975/1644	4.25	4.14	4.32	4.47	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1644	5.00	4.20	4.28	4.35	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1419	5.00	4.29	4.35	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1596	5.00	4.12	4.24	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1176/1535	3.75	3.91	4.15	4.26	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	629/1510	4.33	4.10	4.13	4.29	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1620	5.00	4.28	4.20	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.89	4.68	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	705/1596	4.25	3.96	4.12	4.20	4.25
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	525/1534	4.75	4.38	4.48	4.54	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.70	4.76	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	348/1531	4.75	4.06	4.33	4.38	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	437/1530	4.75	4.13	4.35	4.41	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1316/1409	3.00	3.87	4.08	4.15	3.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1279/1366	3.00	3.58	4.18	4.37	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1354/1364	2.00	3.53	4.33	4.52	2.00

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 487 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Continuous Dynamical Sys</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Shen,Jinglai</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>4</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1308/1361	3.00	3.66	4.39	4.59	3.00

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Major 4
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Non-major 0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 2	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 600 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Real Analysis</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Rathinam,Muruha</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>8</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	208/1644	4.88	4.14	4.32	4.42	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	481/1644	4.63	4.20	4.28	4.32	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	632/1419	4.50	4.29	4.35	4.45	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	476/1596	4.57	4.12	4.24	4.32	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1535	****	3.91	4.15	4.25	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	629/1510	4.33	4.10	4.13	4.24	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	375/1620	4.63	4.28	4.20	4.29	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	694/1642	4.88	4.89	4.68	4.82	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	877/1596	4.13	3.96	4.12	4.20	4.13
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1002/1534	4.43	4.38	4.48	4.52	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.70	4.76	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	826/1531	4.43	4.06	4.33	4.34	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	279/1530	4.86	4.13	4.35	4.38	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1409	****	3.87	4.08	4.04	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1366	5.00	3.58	4.18	4.26	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1364	5.00	3.53	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1034/1361	4.00	3.66	4.39	4.49	4.00

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 600 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Real Analysis</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Rathinam,Muruha</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>8</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1019	****	3.85	4.09	4.12	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 3	A 4	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Non-major 4
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 603 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Matrix Analysis</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Shen,Jinglai</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>8</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	688/1644	4.50	4.14	4.32	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	481/1644	4.63	4.20	4.28	4.32	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	516/1419	4.63	4.29	4.35	4.45	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	437/1596	4.60	4.12	4.24	4.32	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	442/1535	4.50	3.91	4.15	4.25	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1510	5.00	4.10	4.13	4.24	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	109/1620	4.88	4.28	4.20	4.29	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.89	4.68	4.82	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	515/1596	4.40	3.96	4.12	4.20	4.40
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1534	5.00	4.38	4.48	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.70	4.76	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1531	5.00	4.06	4.33	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	502/1530	4.71	4.13	4.35	4.38	4.71
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1366	****	3.58	4.18	4.26	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1364	****	3.53	4.33	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1361	****	3.66	4.39	4.49	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 603 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Matrix Analysis</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Shen,Jinglai</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>8</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1019	****	3.85	4.09	4.12	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	6	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	5	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 611 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Applied Analysis</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gowda,Muddappa</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1644	5.00	4.14	4.32	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	114/1644	4.93	4.20	4.28	4.32	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	136/1419	4.93	4.29	4.35	4.45	4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1596	5.00	4.12	4.24	4.32	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	781/1535	4.20	3.91	4.15	4.25	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1510	5.00	4.10	4.13	4.24	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	124/1620	4.86	4.28	4.20	4.29	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.89	4.68	4.82	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	95/1596	4.91	3.96	4.12	4.20	4.91
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1534	5.00	4.38	4.48	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.70	4.76	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1531	5.00	4.06	4.33	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1530	5.00	4.13	4.35	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1409	5.00	3.87	4.08	4.04	5.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1366	****	3.58	4.18	4.26	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1364	****	3.53	4.33	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1361	****	3.66	4.39	4.49	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 611 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Applied Analysis</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gowda,Muddappa</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1019	****	3.85	4.09	4.12	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		Major 13
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Non-major 1
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 2	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 614 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Partial Differentl Eq</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Bell,Jonathan</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>7</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	889/1644	4.33	4.14	4.32	4.42	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1343/1644	3.83	4.20	4.28	4.32	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	632/1419	4.50	4.29	4.35	4.45	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	207/1596	4.80	4.12	4.24	4.32	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1235/1535	3.67	3.91	4.15	4.25	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	196/1510	4.75	4.10	4.13	4.24	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	331/1620	4.67	4.28	4.20	4.29	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.89	4.68	4.82	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	971/1596	4.00	3.96	4.12	4.20	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	381/1534	4.83	4.38	4.48	4.52	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.70	4.76	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1163/1531	4.00	4.06	4.33	4.34	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	1071/1530	4.17	4.13	4.35	4.38	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1409	****	3.87	4.08	4.04	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1329/1366	2.67	3.58	4.18	4.26	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1258/1364	3.33	3.53	4.33	4.46	3.33

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 614 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Partial Differentl Eq</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Bell,Jonathan</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>7</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	549/1361	4.67	3.66	4.39	4.49	4.67

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1 A 4	Required for Majors	4 Graduate 2 Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0 C 0	General	0 Under-grad 5 Non-major 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0 D 0		
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	2 F 0	Electives	0 **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 2		

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 620 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Numerical Analysis</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gobbert,Matthia</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>8</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	943/1644	4.29	4.14	4.32	4.42	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	360/1644	4.71	4.20	4.28	4.32	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	217/1419	4.86	4.29	4.35	4.45	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	567/1596	4.50	4.12	4.24	4.32	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	737/1535	4.25	3.91	4.15	4.25	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	429/1510	4.50	4.10	4.13	4.24	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	274/1620	4.71	4.28	4.20	4.29	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.89	4.68	4.82	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	382/1596	4.50	3.96	4.12	4.20	4.50
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	807/1534	4.79	4.38	4.48	4.52	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	1353/1539	4.71	4.70	4.76	4.79	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	612/1531	4.50	4.06	4.33	4.34	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	677/1530	4.57	4.13	4.35	4.38	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	486/1409	3.87	3.87	4.08	4.04	3.87
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	492/1366	4.50	3.58	4.18	4.26	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1364	5.00	3.53	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1361	5.00	3.66	4.39	4.49	5.00

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 620 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Numerical Analysis</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gobbert,Matthia</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>8</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1019	5.00	3.85	4.09	4.12	5.00

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 2	A 6	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Non-major 2
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 620 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Numerical Analysis</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Meister,Andreas</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>8</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	943/1644	4.29	4.14	4.32	4.42	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	360/1644	4.71	4.20	4.28	4.32	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	217/1419	4.86	4.29	4.35	4.45	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	567/1596	4.50	4.12	4.24	4.32	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	737/1535	4.25	3.91	4.15	4.25	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	429/1510	4.50	4.10	4.13	4.24	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	274/1620	4.71	4.28	4.20	4.29	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.89	4.68	4.82	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	382/1596	4.50	3.96	4.12	4.20	4.50
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1534	4.79	4.38	4.48	4.52	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1539	4.71	4.70	4.76	4.79	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	826/1531	4.50	4.06	4.33	4.34	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	677/1530	4.57	4.13	4.35	4.38	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1243/1409	3.87	3.87	4.08	4.04	3.87
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	492/1366	4.50	3.58	4.18	4.26	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1364	5.00	3.53	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1361	5.00	3.66	4.39	4.49	5.00

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 620 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Numerical Analysis</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Meister,Andreas</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>8</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1019	5.00	3.85	4.09	4.12	5.00

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 2	A 6	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Non-major 2
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 627 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intr Parallel Comp</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gobbert,Matthia</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	846/1644	4.38	4.14	4.32	4.42	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	843/1644	4.38	4.20	4.28	4.32	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	1030/1596	4.14	4.12	4.24	4.32	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1176/1535	3.75	3.91	4.15	4.25	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	727/1510	4.25	4.10	4.13	4.24	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	527/1620	4.50	4.28	4.20	4.29	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.89	4.68	4.82	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	971/1596	4.00	3.96	4.12	4.20	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	343/1534	4.86	4.38	4.48	4.52	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	1066/1539	4.71	4.70	4.76	4.79	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	990/1531	4.25	4.06	4.33	4.34	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	1085/1530	4.14	4.13	4.35	4.38	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	957/1409	3.86	3.87	4.08	4.04	3.86
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/1366	****	3.58	4.18	4.26	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1364	****	3.53	4.33	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1351/1361	2.33	3.66	4.39	4.49	2.33

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 627 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intr Parallel Comp</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gobbert,Matthia</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1019	****	3.85	4.09	4.12	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	5				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 650 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Foundtns Of Optimization</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Guler,Osman</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	751/1644	4.45	4.14	4.32	4.42	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	1306/1644	3.91	4.20	4.28	4.32	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	380/1419	4.73	4.29	4.35	4.45	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	759/1596	4.38	4.12	4.24	4.32	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	737/1535	4.25	3.91	4.15	4.25	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	516/1510	4.43	4.10	4.13	4.24	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	685/1620	4.40	4.28	4.20	4.29	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.89	4.68	4.82	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	6	3	0	3.33	1458/1596	3.33	3.96	4.12	4.20	3.33
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	772/1534	4.60	4.38	4.48	4.52	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.70	4.76	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	4	3	1	3.30	1429/1531	3.30	4.06	4.33	4.34	3.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	1311/1530	3.70	4.13	4.35	4.38	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1409	****	3.87	4.08	4.04	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	492/1366	4.50	3.58	4.18	4.26	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	877/1364	4.25	3.53	4.33	4.46	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1034/1361	4.00	3.66	4.39	4.49	4.00

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 650 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Foundtns Of Optimization</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Guler,Osman</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1019	****	3.85	4.09	4.12	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Non-major 4
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 2	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 700 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Top:Appl/Numer Analysis</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Meister,Andreas</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>5</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	288/1644	4.80	4.14	4.32	4.42	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	508/1644	4.60	4.20	4.28	4.32	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	462/1419	4.67	4.29	4.35	4.45	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	963/1596	4.20	4.12	4.24	4.32	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	225/1535	4.75	3.91	4.15	4.25	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	149/1510	4.80	4.10	4.13	4.24	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	161/1620	4.80	4.28	4.20	4.29	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	840/1642	4.80	4.89	4.68	4.82	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	515/1596	4.40	3.96	4.12	4.20	4.40
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1534	5.00	4.38	4.48	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.70	4.76	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	275/1531	4.80	4.06	4.33	4.34	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1530	5.00	4.13	4.35	4.38	5.00

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 700 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Top:Appl/Numer Analysis</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Meister,Andreas</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>5</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Lecture</b>														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	151/1409	4.80	3.87	4.08	4.04	4.80

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Non-major 0
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 4	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 710 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Spec Topics In Appl Math</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Seidman,Thomas</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>5</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	814/1644	4.40	4.14	4.32	4.42	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1360/1644	3.80	4.20	4.28	4.32	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	462/1419	4.67	4.29	4.35	4.45	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	1429/1596	3.50	4.12	4.24	4.32	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	361/1535	4.60	3.91	4.15	4.25	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	196/1510	4.75	4.10	4.13	4.24	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1607/1620	2.00	4.28	4.20	4.29	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.89	4.68	4.82	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1203/1596	3.80	3.96	4.12	4.20	3.80
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1518/1534	2.75	4.38	4.48	4.52	2.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.70	4.76	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1348/1531	3.67	4.06	4.33	4.34	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1295/1530	3.75	4.13	4.35	4.38	3.75
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1366	****	3.58	4.18	4.26	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1364	****	3.53	4.33	4.46	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MATH 710 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Spec Topics In Appl Math</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Seidman,Thomas</b>

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>5</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1361	****	3.66	4.39	4.49	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 3 Major 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 2 Non-major 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		