

Course-Section: MATH 100 1  
 Title Intro To Contemp Math  
 Instructor: Kogan,Jacob  
 Enrollment: 54  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 948  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	6	9	2	0	2.67	1495/1509	3.06	4.13	4.31	4.18	2.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	4	8	2	3	3.11	1455/1509	3.19	4.18	4.26	4.25	3.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	4	5	4	5	3.56	1151/1287	3.69	4.28	4.30	4.24	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	3	6	2	1	3.08	1413/1459	3.20	4.15	4.22	4.11	3.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	3	3	3	0	3.00	1333/1406	2.95	3.84	4.09	4.02	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1296/1384	3.13	4.00	4.11	3.98	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	2	10	2	3.50	1303/1489	3.54	4.28	4.17	4.20	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	10	7	4.41	1156/1506	4.66	4.85	4.67	4.66	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	4	8	2	0	2.73	1429/1463	2.92	3.92	4.09	4.02	2.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	8	4	2	3.47	1375/1438	3.52	4.40	4.46	4.44	3.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	9	5	4.19	1314/1421	4.37	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.19
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	3	5	2	2	2.80	1386/1411	2.93	4.09	4.31	4.27	2.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	5	2	3	4	3.27	1319/1405	3.43	4.18	4.32	4.27	3.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/1236	****	3.74	4.00	3.87	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	1	6	1	0	2.45	1243/1260	2.70	3.65	4.14	3.95	2.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	7	2	2	3.42	1151/1255	3.43	3.78	4.33	4.15	3.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	7	1	3	3.64	1114/1258	3.66	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.64
4. Were special techniques successful	8	7	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 873	****	3.52	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	A	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	9	General	14	Under-grad	18	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	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				
				?	2						

Course-Section: MATH 100 2  
 Title Intro To Contemp Math  
 Instructor: Seidman,Thomas  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 949  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	8	8	3	3.45	1412/1509	3.06	4.13	4.31	4.18	3.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	11	4	3	3.27	1430/1509	3.19	4.18	4.26	4.25	3.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	6	7	3.82	1069/1287	3.69	4.28	4.30	4.24	3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	10	5	2	3.32	1375/1459	3.20	4.15	4.22	4.11	3.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	1	10	3	2	2.90	1362/1406	2.95	3.84	4.09	4.02	2.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	4	5	5	2	3.06	1317/1384	3.13	4.00	4.11	3.98	3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	7	4	6	3.57	1275/1489	3.54	4.28	4.17	4.20	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	20	4.90	583/1506	4.66	4.85	4.67	4.66	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	2	5	3	0	3.10	1381/1463	2.92	3.92	4.09	4.02	3.10

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	2	6	5	5	3.58	1361/1438	3.52	4.40	4.46	4.44	3.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	1123/1421	4.37	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	5	5	2	3	3.06	1356/1411	2.93	4.09	4.31	4.27	3.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	4	5	5	3.59	1245/1405	3.43	4.18	4.32	4.27	3.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	12	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	****/1236	****	3.74	4.00	3.87	****

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	4	2	4	3	3	2.94	1188/1260	2.70	3.65	4.14	3.95	2.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	2	6	3	4	3.44	1145/1255	3.43	3.78	4.33	4.15	3.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	6	2	6	3.69	1094/1258	3.66	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.69
4. Were special techniques successful	7	12	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 873	****	3.52	4.03	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 10	Graduate	0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	5	4	8	3.64	1354/1509	3.91	4.13	4.31	4.18	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	5	11	4.09	1020/1509	4.16	4.18	4.26	4.25	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	4	14	4.36	678/1287	4.22	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	3	1	0	4	6	3.64	1249/1459	3.98	4.15	4.22	4.11	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	15	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/1406	3.70	3.84	4.09	4.02	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	16	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/1384	3.76	4.00	4.11	3.98	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	728/1489	4.13	4.28	4.17	4.20	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1506	4.93	4.85	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	3	4	8	4	3.55	1224/1463	3.76	3.92	4.09	4.02	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	2	7	11	4.23	1094/1438	4.29	4.40	4.46	4.44	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	3	3	15	4.41	1217/1421	4.61	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	3	2	12	3.95	1098/1411	4.24	4.09	4.31	4.27	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	2	14	4.18	947/1405	4.31	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	984/1236	3.33	3.74	4.00	3.87	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	982/1260	3.65	3.65	4.14	3.95	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1127/1255	3.68	3.78	4.33	4.15	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	1102/1258	3.69	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.67
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	3.33	3.61	4.22	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	3.11	3.11	4.26	4.28	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 9	General 9	Under-grad 22	Non-major 22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: MATH 106 2  
 Title Algebra & Element Func  
 Instructor: Sharma, Neeraj  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 951  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	7	11	11	4.07	1072/1509	3.91	4.13	4.31	4.18	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	8	17	4.33	774/1509	4.16	4.18	4.26	4.25	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	10	15	4.23	795/1287	4.22	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	3	7	12	4.21	826/1459	3.98	4.15	4.22	4.11	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	16	3	2	6	1	2	2.79	1370/1406	3.70	3.84	4.09	4.02	2.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	22	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	1132/1384	3.76	4.00	4.11	3.98	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	3	23	4.63	308/1489	4.13	4.28	4.17	4.20	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	233/1506	4.93	4.85	4.67	4.66	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	2	19	2	3.88	1006/1463	3.76	3.92	4.09	4.02	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	7	17	4.54	762/1438	4.29	4.40	4.46	4.44	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	898/1421	4.61	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	6	18	4.52	604/1411	4.24	4.09	4.31	4.27	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	7	17	4.44	708/1405	4.31	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	14	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	847/1236	3.33	3.74	4.00	3.87	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1260	3.65	3.65	4.14	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/1255	3.68	3.78	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/1258	3.69	3.84	4.38	4.18	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	12	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	7	4	4	3.44	1414/1509	3.91	4.13	4.31	4.18	3.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	4	6	3.83	1208/1509	4.16	4.18	4.26	4.25	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	2	7	3.56	1151/1287	4.22	4.28	4.30	4.24	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	6	4	3	3.64	1249/1459	3.98	4.15	4.22	4.11	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	5	2	3	3.55	1162/1406	3.70	3.84	4.09	4.02	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	1	4	2	1	3.38	1247/1384	3.76	4.00	4.11	3.98	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	2	12	4.28	738/1489	4.13	4.28	4.17	4.20	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1506	4.93	4.85	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	2	3	7	0	3.23	1344/1463	3.76	3.92	4.09	4.02	3.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	3	4	1	7	3.63	1353/1438	4.29	4.40	4.46	4.44	3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	1178/1421	4.61	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	3	5	6	3.76	1201/1411	4.24	4.09	4.31	4.27	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	5	3	7	4.00	1047/1405	4.31	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	1	3	5	1	3.36	1045/1236	3.33	3.74	4.00	3.87	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	605/1260	3.65	3.65	4.14	3.95	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	828/1255	3.68	3.78	4.33	4.15	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	932/1258	3.69	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	8	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 873	3.38	3.52	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	3.17	3.17	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 198	3.33	3.61	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	2
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	1
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1
			Required for Majors	4	Graduate
			General	9	Under-grad
			Electives	0	18
			Other	0	Non-major
				0	18

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	0	9	6	15	3.91	1214/1509	3.91	4.13	4.31	4.18	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	9	7	14	3.91	1164/1509	4.16	4.18	4.26	4.25	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	7	5	15	3.79	1081/1287	4.22	4.28	4.30	4.24	3.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	1	2	5	3	10	3.90	1088/1459	3.98	4.15	4.22	4.11	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	14	1	2	5	2	8	3.78	1030/1406	3.70	3.84	4.09	4.02	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	773/1384	3.76	4.00	4.11	3.98	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	5	8	3	15	3.81	1169/1489	4.13	4.28	4.17	4.20	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	0	0	29	4.90	583/1506	4.93	4.85	4.67	4.66	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	4	2	5	8	8	3.52	1237/1463	3.76	3.92	4.09	4.02	3.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	2	2	5	18	4.32	1011/1438	4.29	4.40	4.46	4.44	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	2	1	5	20	4.54	1138/1421	4.61	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	1	5	5	15	4.07	1015/1411	4.24	4.09	4.31	4.27	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	4	2	3	17	4.04	1033/1405	4.31	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	18	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	****/1236	3.33	3.74	4.00	3.87	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	3	0	4	3	6	3.56	1024/1260	3.65	3.65	4.14	3.95	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	2	2	1	4	7	3.75	1054/1255	3.68	3.78	4.33	4.15	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	2	1	0	5	8	4.00	932/1258	3.69	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	18	9	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	****/ 873	3.38	3.52	4.03	3.89	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	3.11	3.11	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	3.78	3.78	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 4	A 5	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 6	General 14	Under-grad 33 Non-major 33
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 2	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 2		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	4	10	8	3.88	1228/1509	3.91	4.13	4.31	4.18	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	5	6	10	4.04	1056/1509	4.16	4.18	4.26	4.25	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	0	13	9	4.12	869/1287	4.22	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	3	1	7	6	3.78	1182/1459	3.98	4.15	4.22	4.11	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	1	1	1	3	7	4.08	761/1406	3.70	3.84	4.09	4.02	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	1	3	4	7	3.76	1043/1384	3.76	4.00	4.11	3.98	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	3	2	7	9	3.67	1236/1489	4.13	4.28	4.17	4.20	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	233/1506	4.93	4.85	4.67	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	4	0	2	2	8	4	3.88	1006/1463	3.76	3.92	4.09	4.02	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	1	9	10	4.18	1122/1438	4.29	4.40	4.46	4.44	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	933/1421	4.61	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	2	3	5	10	4.00	1051/1411	4.24	4.09	4.31	4.27	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	1	6	13	4.27	881/1405	4.31	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	11	2	2	1	1	3	3.11	1113/1236	3.33	3.74	4.00	3.87	3.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	4	2	2	3	7	3.39	1094/1260	3.65	3.65	4.14	3.95	3.39
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	7	0	4	2	5	2.89	1225/1255	3.68	3.78	4.33	4.15	2.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	2	2	2	7	3.35	1180/1258	3.69	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.35
4. Were special techniques successful	7	10	2	1	1	0	4	3.38	745/ 873	3.38	3.52	4.03	3.89	3.38
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	6	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/ 184	3.17	3.17	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	2	0	3	1	3	3.33	190/ 198	3.33	3.61	4.22	4.14	3.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	5	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	4	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	5	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	3	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	2	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	3	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	2	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	2	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	1	3	0	3	3.11	45/ 49	3.11	3.11	4.26	4.28	3.11
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	34/ 41	3.78	3.78	4.14	4.13	3.78
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	3	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	4	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	4	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: MATH 106 5  
 Title Algebra & Element Func  
 Instructor: Baradwaj,Rajala  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 954  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	3	A	6	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	6	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
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	2				
				?	0						



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	5	7	4	5	3.22	1453/1509	3.91	4.13	4.31	4.18	3.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	5	5	3	8	3.43	1394/1509	4.16	4.18	4.26	4.25	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	5	10	3.91	1010/1287	4.22	4.28	4.30	4.24	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	2	2	3	7	3	3.41	1339/1459	3.98	4.15	4.22	4.11	3.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	4	2	1	1	2	2.50	1392/1406	3.70	3.84	4.09	4.02	2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	3	2	2	0	1	2.25	1381/1384	3.76	4.00	4.11	3.98	2.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	5	3	5	8	3.52	1295/1489	4.13	4.28	4.17	4.20	3.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	292/1506	4.93	4.85	4.67	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	2	6	9	1	3.37	1306/1463	3.76	3.92	4.09	4.02	3.37
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	3	3	5	5	3.75	1315/1438	4.29	4.40	4.46	4.44	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	1289/1421	4.61	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	2	1	2	6	4	3.60	1256/1411	4.24	4.09	4.31	4.27	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	2	3	1	7	3.60	1241/1405	4.31	4.18	4.32	4.27	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	8	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/1236	3.33	3.74	4.00	3.87	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	3	0	0	3	0	2.50	1241/1260	3.65	3.65	4.14	3.95	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1192/1255	3.68	3.78	4.33	4.15	3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	2	1	0	1	2	3.00	1222/1258	3.69	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	17	4	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 873	3.38	3.52	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	176/ 184	3.17	3.17	4.16	4.06	3.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 198	3.33	3.61	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 49	3.11	3.11	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 41	3.78	3.78	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	2	A	4	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	9	General	6	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 106 7  
 Title Algebra & Element Func  
 Instructor: Riley, Samantha  
 Enrollment: 48  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 956  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	9	8	4.26	872/1509	3.91	4.13	4.31	4.18	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	4	11	4.37	742/1509	4.16	4.18	4.26	4.25	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	453/1287	4.22	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	2	0	5	6	4.15	868/1459	3.98	4.15	4.22	4.11	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	813/1406	3.70	3.84	4.09	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	14	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1384	3.76	4.00	4.11	3.98	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	4	4	8	3.89	1113/1489	4.13	4.28	4.17	4.20	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	602/1506	4.93	4.85	4.67	4.66	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	4	9	3	3.94	944/1463	3.76	3.92	4.09	4.02	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	950/1438	4.29	4.40	4.46	4.44	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	933/1421	4.61	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	520/1411	4.24	4.09	4.31	4.27	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	526/1405	4.31	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	4	0	1	0	0	1.40	1233/1236	3.33	3.74	4.00	3.87	1.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	896/1260	3.65	3.65	4.14	3.95	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1023/1255	3.68	3.78	4.33	4.15	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1102/1258	3.69	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 873	3.38	3.52	4.03	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	8	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	7	14	4.30	842/1509	3.91	4.13	4.31	4.18	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	20	4.70	311/1509	4.16	4.18	4.26	4.25	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	272/1287	4.22	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	647/1459	3.98	4.15	4.22	4.11	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	527/1406	3.70	3.84	4.09	4.02	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	313/1384	3.76	4.00	4.11	3.98	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	9	15	4.50	458/1489	4.13	4.28	4.17	4.20	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	622/1506	4.93	4.85	4.67	4.66	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	11	11	4.38	500/1463	3.76	3.92	4.09	4.02	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	247/1438	4.29	4.40	4.46	4.44	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	22	4.77	863/1421	4.61	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	201/1411	4.24	4.09	4.31	4.27	4.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	251/1405	4.31	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	354/1236	3.33	3.74	4.00	3.87	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	746/1260	3.65	3.65	4.14	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	992/1255	3.68	3.78	4.33	4.15	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	1054/1258	3.69	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	16	7	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	****/ 873	3.38	3.52	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 198	3.33	3.61	4.22	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 49	3.11	3.11	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 41	3.78	3.78	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	3	A	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	14
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1
			Required for Majors	6	Graduate
			General	11	Under-grad
			Electives	1	Non-major
			Other	3	27
			#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	3	12	4.47	635/1509	3.91	4.13	4.31	4.18	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	311/1509	4.16	4.18	4.26	4.25	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	315/1287	4.22	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	209/1459	3.98	4.15	4.22	4.11	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	261/1406	3.70	3.84	4.09	4.02	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	225/1384	3.76	4.00	4.11	3.98	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	422/1489	4.13	4.28	4.17	4.20	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	762/1506	4.93	4.85	4.67	4.66	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	0	0	5	4	4.10	799/1463	3.76	3.92	4.09	4.02	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	480/1438	4.29	4.40	4.46	4.44	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	639/1421	4.61	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	180/1411	4.24	4.09	4.31	4.27	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	285/1405	4.31	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	853/1236	3.33	3.74	4.00	3.87	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	746/1260	3.65	3.65	4.14	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	2	0	2	6	4.20	822/1255	3.68	3.78	4.33	4.15	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	932/1258	3.69	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 873	3.38	3.52	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	3.17	3.17	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	3.33	3.61	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	3.11	3.11	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	3.78	3.78	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: MATH 106 9  
 Title Algebra & Element Func  
 Instructor: Riley, Samantha  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 958  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 106Y 1  
 Title Algebra And Elem. Func  
 Instructor: Sharma, Neeraj  
 Enrollment: 56  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 959  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	942/1509	4.20	4.13	4.31	4.18	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	636/1509	4.44	4.18	4.26	4.25	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	638/1287	4.40	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	647/1459	4.38	4.15	4.22	4.11	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1396/1406	2.33	3.84	4.09	4.02	2.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1322/1384	3.00	4.00	4.11	3.98	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	458/1489	4.50	4.28	4.17	4.20	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	658/1463	4.22	3.92	4.09	4.02	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	219/1438	4.90	4.40	4.46	4.44	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	979/1421	4.70	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	416/1411	4.67	4.09	4.31	4.27	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	285/1405	4.80	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	598/1236	4.13	3.74	4.00	3.87	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1162/1260	3.00	3.65	4.14	3.95	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	443/1255	4.67	3.78	4.33	4.15	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	507/1258	4.67	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	3.52	4.03	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	A	2	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 115 1  
 Title Finite Mathematics  
 Instructor: Lo, James T  
 Enrollment: 57  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 960  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	6	13	8	7	3.21	1453/1509	3.21	4.13	4.31	4.18	3.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	3	7	13	11	3.63	1318/1509	3.63	4.18	4.26	4.25	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	7	10	18	4.08	894/1287	4.08	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	1	1	7	9	7	3.80	1167/1459	3.80	4.15	4.22	4.11	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	4	0	7	7	8	3.58	1151/1406	3.58	3.84	4.09	4.02	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	2	1	2	12	5	3.77	1036/1384	3.77	4.00	4.11	3.98	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	8	13	16	4.22	802/1489	4.22	4.28	4.17	4.20	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	36	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	6	1	11	14	2	3.15	1370/1463	3.15	3.92	4.09	4.02	3.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	3	3	7	10	13	3.75	1315/1438	3.75	4.40	4.46	4.44	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	3	12	21	4.43	1200/1421	4.43	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	5	8	9	12	3.59	1258/1411	3.59	4.09	4.31	4.27	3.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	8	14	10	3.68	1216/1405	3.68	4.18	4.32	4.27	3.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	22	1	3	6	4	1	3.07	1122/1236	3.07	3.74	4.00	3.87	3.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	5	2	4	9	5	3.28	1113/1260	3.28	3.65	4.14	3.95	3.28
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	3	2	5	8	7	3.56	1113/1255	3.56	3.78	4.33	4.15	3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	1	6	8	8	3.76	1067/1258	3.76	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.76
4. Were special techniques successful	12	22	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 873	****	3.52	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	6	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	****/ 184	****	3.17	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	3	1	2	2	3	3.09	192/ 198	3.09	3.61	4.22	4.14	3.09
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	7	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	5	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	6	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	4	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	3	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	****/ 49	****	3.11	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	2	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.78	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	2	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	2	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: MATH 115 1  
 Title Finite Mathematics  
 Instructor: Lo, James T  
 Enrollment: 57  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 960  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	A	11	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	22	Under-grad	37	Non-major	38
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	23	4.69	386/1509	4.69	4.13	4.31	4.18	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	22	4.62	401/1509	4.62	4.18	4.26	4.25	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	20	4.52	509/1287	4.52	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.15	4.22	4.11	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	0	3	8	8	3.95	873/1406	3.95	3.84	4.09	4.02	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	182/1384	4.71	4.00	4.11	3.98	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	24	4.72	216/1489	4.72	4.28	4.17	4.20	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	325/1463	4.50	3.92	4.09	4.02	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	21	4.75	447/1438	4.75	4.40	4.46	4.44	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	742/1421	4.82	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	4	20	4.57	532/1411	4.57	4.09	4.31	4.27	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	5	20	4.63	513/1405	4.63	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	10	3	0	0	2	9	4.00	664/1236	4.00	3.74	4.00	3.87	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1260	****	3.65	4.14	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/1255	****	3.78	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/1258	****	3.84	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	24	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 873	****	3.52	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	3.17	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	3.61	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.11	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.78	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: MATH 131 1  
 Title Math For Elem Tchrs I  
 Instructor: Tighe, Bonny J  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 961  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	6	General	5	Under-grad	28	Non-major	29
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	2						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	4	10	19	34	4.10	1044/1509	4.03	4.13	4.31	4.18	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	2	10	17	37	4.25	859/1509	4.19	4.18	4.26	4.25	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	7	22	35	4.26	771/1287	4.14	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.26	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	3	4	8	16	16	3.81	1167/1459	3.84	4.15	4.22	4.11	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	29	3	4	13	12	9	3.49	1189/1406	3.49	3.84	4.09	4.02	3.49
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	37	6	2	3	10	11	3.56	1163/1384	3.71	4.00	4.11	3.98	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	7	22	37	4.32	696/1489	4.28	4.28	4.17	4.20	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	67	5.00	1/1506	4.93	4.85	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	2	1	9	30	12	3.91	983/1463	3.82	3.92	4.09	4.02	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	3	14	46	4.63	646/1438	4.51	4.40	4.46	4.44	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	1	7	56	4.82	768/1421	4.68	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	4	11	22	26	4.02	1045/1411	4.04	4.09	4.31	4.27	4.02
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	2	1	2	4	14	43	4.50	634/1405	4.35	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	26	5	4	8	8	13	3.53	974/1236	3.41	3.74	4.00	3.87	3.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	13	9	18	15	13	3.09	1150/1260	3.20	3.65	4.14	3.95	3.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	13	10	16	13	16	3.13	1196/1255	3.15	3.78	4.33	4.15	3.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	12	13	18	12	13	3.01	1221/1258	3.19	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.01
4. Were special techniques successful	3	51	6	3	3	1	3	2.50	****/ 873	2.71	3.52	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	11	3	4	2	1	3	2.77	****/ 184	****	3.17	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	4	0	6	3	6	3.37	189/ 198	3.37	3.61	4.22	4.14	3.37
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	11	2	2	1	1	2	2.88	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	9	2	0	3	3	2	3.30	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	12	2	2	1	1	1	2.57	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	56	8	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	59	7	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	59	9	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	59	3	2	1	3	2	0	2.63	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	59	5	2	0	1	0	3	3.33	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	58	0	5	1	5	0	1	2.25	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	58	0	2	1	3	2	4	3.42	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	58	5	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	57	5	3	0	2	1	2	2.88	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	58	7	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	57	0	2	1	5	3	2	3.15	****/ 49	****	3.11	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	2	2	0	3	2	5	3.67	****/ 41	****	3.78	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56	3	3	1	1	1	5	3.36	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	2	1	5	3	3	3.29	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	3	0	4	2	5	3.43	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: MATH 150 1  
 Title Precalculus Mathematic  
 Instructor: Baradwaj,Rajala  
 Enrollment: 288  
 Questionnaires: 70

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 962  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	20	0.00-0.99	4	A	19	Required for Majors	42	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	B	28						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	12	General	10	Under-grad	69	Non-major	68
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	5	16	14	26	4.00	1114/1509	4.03	4.13	4.31	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	10	22	26	4.16	952/1509	4.19	4.18	4.26	4.25	4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	9	11	23	18	3.82	1069/1287	4.14	4.28	4.30	4.24	3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	18	1	6	10	15	10	3.64	1249/1459	3.84	4.15	4.22	4.11	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	28	4	5	8	9	7	3.30	1267/1406	3.49	3.84	4.09	4.02	3.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	37	0	3	7	7	6	3.70	1089/1384	3.71	4.00	4.11	3.98	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	5	7	21	26	4.10	917/1489	4.28	4.28	4.17	4.20	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	57	4.92	524/1506	4.93	4.85	4.67	4.66	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	3	12	28	8	3.80	1060/1463	3.82	3.92	4.09	4.02	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	4	13	40	4.54	750/1438	4.51	4.40	4.46	4.44	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	6	12	40	4.54	1130/1421	4.68	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	8	16	30	4.21	929/1411	4.04	4.09	4.31	4.27	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	2	8	8	37	4.28	881/1405	4.35	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	37	6	0	5	4	4	3.00	1131/1236	3.41	3.74	4.00	3.87	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	7	13	13	19	3.60	1014/1260	3.20	3.65	4.14	3.95	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	7	12	7	13	18	3.40	1154/1255	3.15	3.78	4.33	4.15	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	5	5	18	9	17	3.52	1141/1258	3.19	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.52
4. Were special techniques successful	5	36	5	3	5	4	3	2.85	838/ 873	2.71	3.52	4.03	3.89	2.85
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	8	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	****/ 184	****	3.17	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	2	5	1	2	2	2.75	****/ 198	3.37	3.61	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	7	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	5	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	6	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	57	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	57	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	3	1	0	1	1	2.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	58	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	57	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	57	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	4	0	1	0	0	1.40	****/ 49	****	3.11	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	57	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.78	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56	2	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	1	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: MATH 150 11  
 Title Precalculus Mathematic  
 Instructor: Sharma, Neeraj  
 Enrollment: 262  
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 963  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	34	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	B	20						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	18	General	19	Under-grad	61	Non-major	59
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	4	15	27	31	3.99	1134/1509	4.03	4.13	4.31	4.18	3.99
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	15	20	40	4.16	952/1509	4.19	4.18	4.26	4.25	4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	5	28	43	43	4.35	688/1287	4.14	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	29	0	3	9	20	19	4.08	931/1459	3.84	4.15	4.22	4.11	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	25	3	5	11	18	14	3.69	1093/1406	3.49	3.84	4.09	4.02	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	44	1	1	12	7	13	3.88	954/1384	3.71	4.00	4.11	3.98	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	2	4	24	46	4.41	583/1489	4.28	4.28	4.17	4.20	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	1	0	1	3	72	4.88	622/1506	4.93	4.85	4.67	4.66	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	2	4	15	27	14	3.76	1101/1463	3.82	3.92	4.09	4.02	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	3	8	20	44	4.36	981/1438	4.51	4.40	4.46	4.44	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	6	9	61	4.69	991/1421	4.68	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	2	6	16	22	27	3.90	1145/1411	4.04	4.09	4.31	4.27	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	4	7	18	45	4.27	881/1405	4.35	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	13	3	8	17	11	23	3.69	888/1236	3.41	3.74	4.00	3.87	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	13	9	24	16	7	2.93	1192/1260	3.20	3.65	4.14	3.95	2.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	14	14	17	11	13	2.93	1219/1255	3.15	3.78	4.33	4.15	2.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	16	6	19	11	15	3.04	1220/1258	3.19	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.04
4. Were special techniques successful	12	46	5	5	10	1	2	2.57	851/ 873	2.71	3.52	4.03	3.89	2.57
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	62	7	0	2	4	2	4	3.67	****/ 184	****	3.17	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	64	0	1	2	7	3	4	3.41	****/ 198	3.37	3.61	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	67	7	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	68	5	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	69	5	1	1	3	0	2	3.14	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	71	5	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	72	4	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	72	6	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	72	4	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	72	5	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	72	0	0	1	5	1	2	3.44	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	73	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	73	4	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	73	4	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	71	5	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	70	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	****/ 49	****	3.11	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	70	1	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	****/ 41	****	3.78	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	70	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	71	1	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	70	2	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: MATH 150 6  
 Title Precalculus Mathematic  
 Instructor: Baradwaj,Rajala  
 Enrollment: 284  
 Questionnaires: 81

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 964  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	19	0.00-0.99	6	A	18	Required for Majors	53	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	2	B	30						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	16	General	12	Under-grad	81	Non-major	81
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	D	4						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	3						



Course-Section: MATH 151 1  
 Title Calc & Analy Geomtry I  
 Instructor: Gloor, Philip J.  
 Enrollment: 150  
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 965  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	3	17	16	4.02	1100/1509	4.06	4.13	4.31	4.18	4.02
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	16	21	4.37	742/1509	4.22	4.18	4.26	4.25	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	8	13	17	4.05	907/1287	4.25	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	1	2	13	13	4.20	834/1459	3.97	4.15	4.22	4.11	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	5	7	8	16	3.82	1001/1406	3.74	3.84	4.09	4.02	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	2	3	3	5	13	3.92	912/1384	3.82	4.00	4.11	3.98	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	7	17	15	4.10	923/1489	4.39	4.28	4.17	4.20	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	40	4.98	175/1506	4.89	4.85	4.67	4.66	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	5	16	13	4.14	750/1463	4.07	3.92	4.09	4.02	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	9	29	4.65	603/1438	4.48	4.40	4.46	4.44	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	38	4.95	322/1421	4.68	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	4	13	21	4.36	789/1411	4.11	4.09	4.31	4.27	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	12	23	4.40	758/1405	4.27	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	25	0	3	2	1	7	3.92	752/1236	3.76	3.74	4.00	3.87	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	4	13	19	4.26	613/1260	3.86	3.65	4.14	3.95	4.26
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	5	16	6	11	3.61	1104/1255	3.64	3.78	4.33	4.15	3.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	3	12	6	17	3.97	956/1258	3.80	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.97
4. Were special techniques successful	3	27	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	372/ 873	3.92	3.52	4.03	3.89	4.18

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 31	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 18			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 5	General 1	Under-grad 41	Non-major 41
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 1	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 2			

Course-Section: MATH 151 10  
 Title Calc & Analy Geomtry I  
 Instructor: Tighe, Bonny J  
 Enrollment: 122  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 966  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	6	24	4.56	540/1509	4.06	4.13	4.31	4.18	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	31	4.88	133/1509	4.22	4.18	4.26	4.25	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	29	4.82	191/1287	4.25	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	454/1459	3.97	4.15	4.22	4.11	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	1	4	6	10	4.19	656/1406	3.74	3.84	4.09	4.02	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	0	4	9	4	4.00	807/1384	3.82	4.00	4.11	3.98	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	8	24	4.62	330/1489	4.39	4.28	4.17	4.20	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1506	4.89	4.85	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	164/1463	4.07	3.92	4.09	4.02	4.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	30	4.91	219/1438	4.48	4.40	4.46	4.44	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	376/1421	4.68	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	7	24	4.72	351/1411	4.11	4.09	4.31	4.27	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	28	4.84	239/1405	4.27	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	19	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	630/1236	3.76	3.74	4.00	3.87	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	7	5	13	3.93	844/1260	3.86	3.65	4.14	3.95	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	4	7	16	4.32	732/1255	3.64	3.78	4.33	4.15	4.32
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	0	5	7	13	3.96	964/1258	3.80	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.96
4. Were special techniques successful	6	18	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	261/ 873	3.92	3.52	4.03	3.89	4.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 184	****	3.17	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	3.61	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.11	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.78	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: MATH 151 10  
 Title Calc & Analy Geomtry I  
 Instructor: Tighe, Bonny J  
 Enrollment: 122  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 966  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	2	A	14	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	34	Non-major	33
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Course-Section: MATH 151 13  
 Title Calc & Analy Geomtry I  
 Instructor: Tighe, Bonny J  
 Enrollment: 120  
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 967  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	11	26	4.54	563/1509	4.06	4.13	4.31	4.18	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	30	4.56	471/1509	4.22	4.18	4.26	4.25	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	34	4.71	315/1287	4.25	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	0	4	7	21	4.42	586/1459	3.97	4.15	4.22	4.11	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	5	2	3	3	18	3.87	956/1406	3.74	3.84	4.09	4.02	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	2	4	4	17	4.33	531/1384	3.82	4.00	4.11	3.98	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	6	29	4.54	422/1489	4.39	4.28	4.17	4.20	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	2	37	4.85	682/1506	4.89	4.85	4.67	4.66	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	0	0	0	8	21	4.72	170/1463	4.07	3.92	4.09	4.02	4.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	32	4.77	430/1438	4.48	4.40	4.46	4.44	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	37	4.88	614/1421	4.68	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	2	5	30	4.55	556/1411	4.11	4.09	4.31	4.27	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	1	35	4.72	381/1405	4.27	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	18	1	1	2	2	13	4.32	441/1236	3.76	3.74	4.00	3.87	4.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	3	4	6	19	3.92	856/1260	3.86	3.65	4.14	3.95	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	6	2	4	9	15	3.69	1074/1255	3.64	3.78	4.33	4.15	3.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	3	6	5	20	4.06	916/1258	3.80	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.06
4. Were special techniques successful	5	20	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	209/ 873	3.92	3.52	4.03	3.89	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A 15	Required for Majors 22	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 8	General 5	Under-grad 41	Non-major 41
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D 2			
Grad.	0	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			

Course-Section: MATH 151 16  
 Title Calc & Analy Geomtry I  
 Instructor: Bell,Jonathan  
 Enrollment: 116  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 968  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	4	4	1	2	2.92	1482/1509	4.06	4.13	4.31	4.18	2.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	4	2	2	2.92	1481/1509	4.22	4.18	4.26	4.25	2.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	2	4	2	3.27	1217/1287	4.25	4.28	4.30	4.24	3.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	3	1	2	3	3.56	1292/1459	3.97	4.15	4.22	4.11	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	5	1	2	3.33	1258/1406	3.74	3.84	4.09	4.02	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	1132/1384	3.82	4.00	4.11	3.98	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	986/1489	4.39	4.28	4.17	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	965/1506	4.89	4.85	4.67	4.66	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	6	1	0	2.78	1425/1463	4.07	3.92	4.09	4.02	2.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	6	1	2	3.18	1396/1438	4.48	4.40	4.46	4.44	3.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	1285/1421	4.68	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	2	4	1	1	2.55	1394/1411	4.11	4.09	4.31	4.27	2.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	2	2	3.00	1348/1405	4.27	4.18	4.32	4.27	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	4	1	1	2	1	2.44	1203/1236	3.76	3.74	4.00	3.87	2.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	2	7	4.00	746/1260	3.86	3.65	4.14	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	3	3	2	2	2.92	1221/1255	3.64	3.78	4.33	4.15	2.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	2	4	3	1	2.92	1236/1258	3.80	3.84	4.38	4.18	2.92
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	850/ 873	3.92	3.52	4.03	3.89	2.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	3.17	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 198	****	3.61	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 49	****	3.11	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	3.78	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: MATH 151 16  
 Title Calc & Analy Geomtry I  
 Instructor: Bell,Jonathan  
 Enrollment: 116  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 968  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	1	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				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	10	14	15	3.95	1164/1509	4.06	4.13	4.31	4.18	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	13	20	4.17	952/1509	4.22	4.18	4.26	4.25	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	12	21	4.19	826/1287	4.25	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	21	3	5	4	2	7	3.24	1390/1459	3.97	4.15	4.22	4.11	3.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	21	4	3	2	6	6	3.33	1258/1406	3.74	3.84	4.09	4.02	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	28	1	1	3	6	3	3.64	1120/1384	3.82	4.00	4.11	3.98	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	10	26	4.51	446/1489	4.39	4.28	4.17	4.20	4.51
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	33	4.80	782/1506	4.89	4.85	4.67	4.66	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	3	3	14	9	4.00	853/1463	4.07	3.92	4.09	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	4	10	24	4.29	1039/1438	4.48	4.40	4.46	4.44	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	7	9	25	4.44	1200/1421	4.68	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	3	6	10	19	4.03	1040/1411	4.11	4.09	4.31	4.27	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	6	10	21	4.10	1005/1405	4.27	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	26	4	2	1	0	7	3.29	1072/1236	3.76	3.74	4.00	3.87	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	10	3	11	6	9	3.03	1159/1260	3.86	3.65	4.14	3.95	3.03
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	9	5	6	8	11	3.18	1191/1255	3.64	3.78	4.33	4.15	3.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	8	0	10	7	13	3.45	1159/1258	3.80	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.45
4. Were special techniques successful	4	37	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 873	3.92	3.52	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 198	****	3.61	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.11	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	3.78	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: MATH 151 19  
 Title Calc & Analy Geomtry I  
 Instructor: Slowikowski,Wil  
 Enrollment: 136  
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 969  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	30	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	16	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	9	C	8	General	2	Under-grad	42	Non-major	42
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	3						



Course-Section: MATH 151 22  
 Title Calc & Analy Geomtry I  
 Instructor: Slowikowski,Wil  
 Enrollment: 124  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 970  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	4	5	13	13	4.00	1114/1509	4.06	4.13	4.31	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	11	17	4.20	922/1509	4.22	4.18	4.26	4.25	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	12	19	4.37	668/1287	4.25	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	1	2	5	4	7	3.74	1202/1459	3.97	4.15	4.22	4.11	3.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	4	4	5	6	3.68	1093/1406	3.74	3.84	4.09	4.02	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	1	4	2	3	5	3.47	1209/1384	3.82	4.00	4.11	3.98	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	6	26	4.66	287/1489	4.39	4.28	4.17	4.20	4.66
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	33	4.94	350/1506	4.89	4.85	4.67	4.66	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	4	15	7	4.04	836/1463	4.07	3.92	4.09	4.02	4.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	8	24	4.60	675/1438	4.48	4.40	4.46	4.44	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	4	7	22	4.40	1217/1421	4.68	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	4	17	11	4.00	1051/1411	4.11	4.09	4.31	4.27	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	7	9	18	4.23	919/1405	4.27	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	20	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	664/1236	3.76	3.74	4.00	3.87	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	6	23	4.48	433/1260	3.86	3.65	4.14	3.95	4.48
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	2	2	8	20	4.33	723/1255	3.64	3.78	4.33	4.15	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	7	24	4.67	507/1258	3.80	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	19	0	1	5	5	3	3.71	630/ 873	3.92	3.52	4.03	3.89	3.71
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 184	****	3.17	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	3.61	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	3.11	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	3.78	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: MATH 151 22  
 Title Calc & Analy Geomtry I  
 Instructor: Slowikowski,Wil  
 Enrollment: 124  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 970  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	21	0.00-0.99	1	A	18	Required for Majors	33	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	35	Non-major	35
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 151 25  
 Title Calc & Analy Geomtry I  
 Instructor: Gassman, Amanda  
 Enrollment: 142  
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 971  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	1	1	13	22	4.51	586/1509	4.06	4.13	4.31	4.18	4.51
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	11	22	4.46	621/1509	4.22	4.18	4.26	4.25	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	2	4	8	23	4.41	638/1287	4.25	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	11	0	1	3	9	13	4.31	715/1459	3.97	4.15	4.22	4.11	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	12	1	0	3	8	11	4.22	635/1406	3.74	3.84	4.09	4.02	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	16	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	269/1384	3.82	4.00	4.11	3.98	4.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	2	7	26	4.69	254/1489	4.39	4.28	4.17	4.20	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	1	1	33	4.91	524/1506	4.89	4.85	4.67	4.66	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	1	0	3	7	15	4.35	534/1463	4.07	3.92	4.09	4.02	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	1	32	4.86	291/1438	4.48	4.40	4.46	4.44	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	2	32	4.89	588/1421	4.68	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	8	25	4.66	429/1411	4.11	4.09	4.31	4.27	4.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	8	26	4.71	393/1405	4.27	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	16	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	421/1236	3.76	3.74	4.00	3.87	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	2	2	4	16	4.28	597/1260	3.86	3.65	4.14	3.95	4.28
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	2	6	4	13	4.00	904/1255	3.64	3.78	4.33	4.15	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	4	6	14	4.32	777/1258	3.80	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.32
4. Were special techniques successful	15	15	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	417/ 873	3.92	3.52	4.03	3.89	4.10
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 184	****	3.17	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	****/ 198	****	3.61	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 49	****	3.11	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 41	****	3.78	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: MATH 151 25  
 Title Calc & Analy Geomtry I  
 Instructor: Gassman, Amanda  
 Enrollment: 142  
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 971  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	40	Non-major	40
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	13	13	17	4.09	1051/1509	4.06	4.13	4.31	4.18	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	19	21	4.37	731/1509	4.22	4.18	4.26	4.25	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	14	22	4.33	718/1287	4.25	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	20	1	1	4	7	10	4.04	951/1459	3.97	4.15	4.22	4.11	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	23	1	0	4	12	2	3.74	1060/1406	3.74	3.84	4.09	4.02	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	25	0	3	5	7	1	3.38	1247/1384	3.82	4.00	4.11	3.98	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	1	5	12	20	4.18	844/1489	4.39	4.28	4.17	4.20	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	38	4.93	466/1506	4.89	4.85	4.67	4.66	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	1	6	11	12	4.13	762/1463	4.07	3.92	4.09	4.02	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	8	30	4.66	603/1438	4.48	4.40	4.46	4.44	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	5	34	4.78	828/1421	4.68	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	3	16	19	4.22	920/1411	4.11	4.09	4.31	4.27	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	14	23	4.43	733/1405	4.27	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	27	1	1	4	5	4	3.67	904/1236	3.76	3.74	4.00	3.87	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	12	8	8	5	5	2.55	1239/1260	3.86	3.65	4.14	3.95	2.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	8	11	11	3	5	2.63	1236/1255	3.64	3.78	4.33	4.15	2.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	5	6	14	4	8	3.11	1217/1258	3.80	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.11
4. Were special techniques successful	5	33	2	1	0	0	2	2.80	****/ 873	3.92	3.52	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 184	****	3.17	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 198	****	3.61	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	39	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	39	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 49	****	3.11	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 41	****	3.78	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	17	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors	34
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 5	C 12	General	Major 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		Under-grad 43
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives	Non-major 43
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant



Course-Section: MATH 151 7  
 Title Calc & Analy Geomtry I  
 Instructor: Slowikowski,Wil  
 Enrollment: 138  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 973  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	12	17	11	3.93	1194/1509	4.06	4.13	4.31	4.18	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	9	17	14	4.07	1034/1509	4.22	4.18	4.26	4.25	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	9	17	14	4.07	894/1287	4.25	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	19	0	1	8	9	4	3.73	1207/1459	3.97	4.15	4.22	4.11	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	16	4	3	2	8	8	3.52	1170/1406	3.74	3.84	4.09	4.02	3.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	29	0	2	4	4	1	3.36	1251/1384	3.82	4.00	4.11	3.98	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	6	11	20	4.20	823/1489	4.39	4.28	4.17	4.20	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	40	5.00	1/1506	4.89	4.85	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	2	11	17	6	3.75	1101/1463	4.07	3.92	4.09	4.02	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	5	10	25	4.44	891/1438	4.48	4.40	4.46	4.44	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	8	29	4.63	1060/1421	4.68	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	3	10	11	15	3.90	1145/1411	4.11	4.09	4.31	4.27	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	3	8	12	16	3.97	1072/1405	4.27	4.18	4.32	4.27	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	30	1	3	1	2	3	3.30	****/1236	3.76	3.74	4.00	3.87	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	6	8	22	4.32	574/1260	3.86	3.65	4.14	3.95	4.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	2	5	16	14	4.05	889/1255	3.64	3.78	4.33	4.15	4.05
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	4	2	8	7	16	3.78	1060/1258	3.80	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	5	28	1	2	2	2	3	3.40	****/ 873	3.92	3.52	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 198	****	3.61	4.22	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	3.11	4.26	4.28	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: MATH 151 7  
 Title Calc & Analy Geomtry I  
 Instructor: Slowikowski,Wil  
 Enrollment: 138  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 973  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	3	A	13	Required for Majors	29	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	9	General	4	Under-grad	43	Non-major	43
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	11	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	2						



Course-Section: MATH 151H 1  
 Title Calc/Analy Geom I-Hono  
 Instructor: Rathinam,Muruha  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 974  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	3	6	3.87	1243/1509	3.87	4.13	4.31	4.18	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	4	3.80	1228/1509	3.80	4.18	4.26	4.25	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	638/1287	4.40	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	979/1459	4.00	4.15	4.22	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	1366/1406	2.83	3.84	4.09	4.02	2.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	3	0	2	2	3.43	1226/1384	3.43	4.00	4.11	3.98	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	513/1489	4.47	4.28	4.17	4.20	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	3	4.20	1300/1506	4.20	4.85	4.67	4.66	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	8	3	4.00	853/1463	4.00	3.92	4.09	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	930/1438	4.40	4.40	4.46	4.44	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	1289/1421	4.27	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	8	4	3.93	1116/1411	3.93	4.09	4.31	4.27	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	4	8	4.13	980/1405	4.13	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	100/1236	4.80	3.74	4.00	3.87	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	308/1260	4.67	3.65	4.14	3.95	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	611/1255	4.47	3.78	4.33	4.15	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	598/1258	4.53	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	0	12	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.52	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 184	****	3.17	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	3.61	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.11	4.26	4.28	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 15 Non-major 12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MATH 152 1  
 Title Calc & Analy Geometry  
 Instructor: Tighe, Bonny J  
 Enrollment: 122  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 975  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	2	8	26	4.44	686/1509	4.60	4.13	4.31	4.18	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	5	31	4.64	378/1509	4.53	4.18	4.26	4.25	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	8	28	4.66	370/1287	4.44	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.66
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	454/1459	4.44	4.15	4.22	4.11	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	3	2	4	7	12	3.82	994/1406	4.04	3.84	4.09	4.02	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	22	0	0	4	2	11	4.41	430/1384	4.19	4.00	4.11	3.98	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	4	5	29	4.66	287/1489	4.60	4.28	4.17	4.20	4.66
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	1	37	4.87	642/1506	4.90	4.85	4.67	4.66	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	2	8	20	4.41	467/1463	4.19	3.92	4.09	4.02	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	1	8	28	4.56	725/1438	4.76	4.40	4.46	4.44	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	1	4	32	4.67	1014/1421	4.70	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	2	5	29	4.51	604/1411	4.45	4.09	4.31	4.27	4.51
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	5	30	4.56	577/1405	4.54	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	30	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	****/1236	3.99	3.74	4.00	3.87	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	6	7	18	4.21	653/1260	4.12	3.65	4.14	3.95	4.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	7	8	16	4.12	862/1255	3.91	3.78	4.33	4.15	4.12
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	2	4	5	20	4.18	856/1258	4.03	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	6	20	0	0	8	3	2	3.54	694/ 873	3.54	3.52	4.03	3.89	3.54

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 28	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 39	Non-major 35
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 1			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 1			

Course-Section: MATH 152 4  
 Title Calc & Analy Geometry  
 Instructor: Song,Yoon J  
 Enrollment: 124  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 976  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	23	4.66	422/1509	4.60	4.13	4.31	4.18	4.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	16	4.34	763/1509	4.53	4.18	4.26	4.25	4.34
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	8	18	4.54	491/1287	4.44	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	2	0	0	8	6	4.00	979/1459	4.44	4.15	4.22	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	1	4	7	5	3.94	885/1406	4.04	3.84	4.09	4.02	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	1009/1384	4.19	4.00	4.11	3.98	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	11	16	4.54	422/1489	4.60	4.28	4.17	4.20	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	682/1506	4.90	4.85	4.67	4.66	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	6	11	9	4.12	786/1463	4.19	3.92	4.09	4.02	4.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	334/1438	4.76	4.40	4.46	4.44	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	8	19	4.64	1037/1421	4.70	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	12	13	4.36	789/1411	4.45	4.09	4.31	4.27	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	22	4.59	558/1405	4.54	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	15	0	3	4	3	4	3.57	950/1236	3.99	3.74	4.00	3.87	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	3	9	9	4.04	732/1260	4.12	3.65	4.14	3.95	4.04
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	0	6	10	6	3.75	1054/1255	3.91	3.78	4.33	4.15	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	0	3	11	7	3.91	1004/1258	4.03	3.84	4.38	4.18	3.91
4. Were special techniques successful	6	20	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 873	3.54	3.52	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	3.61	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.11	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	3.78	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: MATH 152 4  
 Title Calc & Analy Geometry  
 Instructor: Song, Yoon J  
 Enrollment: 124  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 976  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	1	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	26
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Course-Section: MATH 152 7  
 Title Calc & Analy Geometry  
 Instructor: Song,Yoon J  
 Enrollment: 114  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 977  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	18	4.72	351/1509	4.60	4.13	4.31	4.18	4.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	10	15	4.60	424/1509	4.53	4.18	4.26	4.25	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	11	10	4.12	869/1287	4.44	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	136/1459	4.44	4.15	4.22	4.11	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	0	1	5	10	4.35	486/1406	4.04	3.84	4.09	4.02	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	531/1384	4.19	4.00	4.11	3.98	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	341/1489	4.60	4.28	4.17	4.20	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	233/1506	4.90	4.85	4.67	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	2	11	6	4.05	826/1463	4.19	3.92	4.09	4.02	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	247/1438	4.76	4.40	4.46	4.44	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	794/1421	4.70	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	7	15	4.48	641/1411	4.45	4.09	4.31	4.27	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	16	4.48	658/1405	4.54	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	354/1236	3.99	3.74	4.00	3.87	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	5	8	7	4.10	712/1260	4.12	3.65	4.14	3.95	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	0	4	3	10	3.85	1014/1255	3.91	3.78	4.33	4.15	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	2	4	4	8	4.00	932/1258	4.03	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	13	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 873	3.54	3.52	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 184	****	3.17	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 198	****	3.61	4.22	4.14	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	3	A	6	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	2	Under-grad	25	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	1	6	6	6	3.50	1399/1509	4.12	4.13	4.31	4.18	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	4	8	5	3.50	1372/1509	4.37	4.18	4.26	4.25	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	4	5	7	3.55	1154/1287	4.29	4.28	4.30	4.24	3.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	2	3	2	6	2	3.20	1396/1459	4.02	4.15	4.22	4.11	3.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	4	1	4	7	3.42	1225/1406	3.82	3.84	4.09	4.02	3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	2	2	3	6	3.79	1030/1384	4.24	4.00	4.11	3.98	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	1	6	11	4.00	986/1489	4.37	4.28	4.17	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	1	0	11	9	4.33	1205/1506	4.78	4.85	4.67	4.66	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	2	4	5	4	3.73	1117/1463	4.35	3.92	4.09	4.02	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	3	5	9	3.95	1235/1438	4.53	4.40	4.46	4.44	3.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	0	4	14	4.58	1107/1421	4.81	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	1	5	4	8	3.75	1204/1411	4.43	4.09	4.31	4.27	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	5	3	8	3.70	1206/1405	4.41	4.18	4.32	4.27	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	12	2	5	0	0	0	1.71	1229/1236	3.03	3.74	4.00	3.87	1.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	9	1	0	4	2	2.31	1249/1260	3.54	3.65	4.14	3.95	2.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	5	7	3	0	1	2.06	1253/1255	3.47	3.78	4.33	4.15	2.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	7	3	2	1	3	2.38	1249/1258	3.66	3.84	4.38	4.18	2.38
4. Were special techniques successful	6	13	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 873	3.83	3.52	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	3.17	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	3	0	0	1	0	1.75	****/ 198	4.67	3.61	4.22	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 49	****	3.11	4.26	4.28	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A	4	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				



Course-Section: MATH 155 2  
 Title Elementary Calculus  
 Instructor: Kelly,Brian  
 Enrollment: 55  
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 979  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	4	3	11	18	4.19	942/1509	4.12	4.13	4.31	4.18	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	8	26	4.69	333/1509	4.37	4.18	4.26	4.25	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	9	23	4.50	519/1287	4.29	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	3	10	15	4.27	759/1459	4.02	4.15	4.22	4.11	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	2	3	2	4	13	3.96	873/1406	3.82	3.84	4.09	4.02	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	4	7	13	4.38	479/1384	4.24	4.00	4.11	3.98	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	8	25	4.53	434/1489	4.37	4.28	4.17	4.20	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	5.00	1/1506	4.78	4.85	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	1	10	15	4.54	301/1463	4.35	3.92	4.09	4.02	4.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	6	27	4.69	559/1438	4.53	4.40	4.46	4.44	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	2	32	4.86	665/1421	4.81	4.66	4.73	4.66	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	4	28	4.71	351/1411	4.43	4.09	4.31	4.27	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	4	27	4.66	473/1405	4.41	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	6	1	0	2	7	3.19	1093/1236	3.03	3.74	4.00	3.87	3.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	1	5	4	14	4.04	735/1260	3.54	3.65	4.14	3.95	4.04
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	3	8	14	4.44	629/1255	3.47	3.78	4.33	4.15	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	1	4	19	4.60	549/1258	3.66	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	11	13	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	570/ 873	3.83	3.52	4.03	3.89	3.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 184	****	3.17	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	2	0	0	0	5	3.86	****/ 198	4.67	3.61	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 49	****	3.11	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 41	****	3.78	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****



Course-Section: MATH 155 2  
 Title Elementary Calculus  
 Instructor: Kelly, Brian  
 Enrollment: 55  
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 979  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	31	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	8	C	8	General	3	Under-grad	35	Non-major	36
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	3						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	1	19	4.65	422/1509	4.12	4.13	4.31	4.18	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	104/1509	4.37	4.18	4.26	4.25	4.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	20	4.82	199/1287	4.29	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	0	3	13	4.59	367/1459	4.02	4.15	4.22	4.11	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	2	0	1	4	8	4.07	768/1406	3.82	3.84	4.09	4.02	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	299/1384	4.24	4.00	4.11	3.98	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	2	1	17	4.57	376/1489	4.37	4.28	4.17	4.20	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1506	4.78	4.85	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	144/1463	4.35	3.92	4.09	4.02	4.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	110/1438	4.53	4.40	4.46	4.44	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1421	4.81	4.66	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	222/1411	4.43	4.09	4.31	4.27	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	217/1405	4.41	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	1	1	0	1	7	4.20	536/1236	3.03	3.74	4.00	3.87	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	1	2	13	4.26	613/1260	3.54	3.65	4.14	3.95	4.26
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	0	4	1	11	3.89	996/1255	3.47	3.78	4.33	4.15	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	1	3	2	11	4.00	932/1258	3.66	3.84	4.38	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	15	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 873	3.83	3.52	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 184	****	3.17	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	41/ 198	4.67	3.61	4.22	4.14	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 49	****	3.11	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 41	****	3.78	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: MATH 155 3  
 Title Elementary Calculus  
 Instructor: Kapoor, Jagmohan  
 Enrollment: 46  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 980  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	5	11	13	4.00	1114/1509	4.00	4.13	4.31	4.34	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	1	4	23	4.41	699/1509	4.41	4.18	4.26	4.32	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	1	25	4.61	414/1287	4.61	4.28	4.30	4.35	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	1	3	3	13	4.40	619/1459	4.40	4.15	4.22	4.30	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	2	0	1	4	10	4.18	674/1406	4.18	3.84	4.09	4.09	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	243/1384	4.65	4.00	4.11	4.09	4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	4	22	4.44	555/1489	4.44	4.28	4.17	4.19	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	24	4.75	845/1506	4.75	4.85	4.67	4.61	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	2	0	6	8	9	3.88	998/1463	3.88	3.92	4.09	4.08	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	4	21	4.59	700/1438	4.59	4.40	4.46	4.48	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	2	6	19	4.41	1211/1421	4.41	4.66	4.73	4.76	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	2	6	18	4.43	713/1411	4.43	4.09	4.31	4.37	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	1	4	20	4.31	848/1405	4.31	4.18	4.32	4.39	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	20	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	274/1236	4.50	3.74	4.00	4.11	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	5	1	1	1	8	3.38	1096/1260	3.38	3.65	4.14	4.19	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	3	3	1	2	7	3.44	1145/1255	3.44	3.78	4.33	4.37	3.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	4	3	4	1	4	2.88	1239/1258	2.88	3.84	4.38	4.44	2.88
4. Were special techniques successful	17	11	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 873	****	3.52	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 198	****	3.61	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	2.88	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.11	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.78	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 26
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 12	
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 7	General 1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D 1	Under-grad 32
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 32
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Other 0

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MATH 221 1  
 Title Intro To Linear Algebr  
 Instructor: Lo,James T  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 982  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	10	9	8	3.76	1304/1509	4.08	4.13	4.31	4.34	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	8	8	13	4.17	942/1509	4.15	4.18	4.26	4.32	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	7	15	4.32	718/1287	4.35	4.28	4.30	4.35	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	877/1459	4.28	4.15	4.22	4.30	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	2	3	9	7	4.00	813/1406	4.29	3.84	4.09	4.09	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	807/1384	4.15	4.00	4.11	4.09	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	8	17	4.45	541/1489	4.51	4.28	4.17	4.19	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	233/1506	4.92	4.85	4.67	4.61	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	0	1	5	11	3	3.80	1060/1463	3.75	3.92	4.09	4.08	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	5	7	16	4.31	1021/1438	4.39	4.40	4.46	4.48	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	742/1421	4.70	4.66	4.73	4.76	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	5	14	8	3.97	1088/1411	3.83	4.09	4.31	4.37	3.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	4	8	10	3.85	1159/1405	3.91	4.18	4.32	4.39	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	20	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	853/1236	3.51	3.74	4.00	4.11	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	****/1260	3.45	3.65	4.14	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	****/1255	3.96	3.78	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	****/1258	4.30	3.84	4.38	4.44	****
4. Were special techniques successful	22	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.52	4.03	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 27	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 14					
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major 25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	D 2					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	0			
				? 1					

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	7	16	4.37	756/1509	4.08	4.13	4.31	4.34	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	16	4.44	636/1509	4.15	4.18	4.26	4.32	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	18	4.56	472/1287	4.35	4.28	4.30	4.35	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	503/1459	4.28	4.15	4.22	4.30	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	332/1406	4.29	3.84	4.09	4.09	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	4	4	12	4.24	639/1384	4.15	4.00	4.11	4.09	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	276/1489	4.51	4.28	4.17	4.19	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	25	4.85	682/1506	4.92	4.85	4.67	4.61	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	6	11	7	3.96	905/1463	3.75	3.92	4.09	4.08	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	10	13	4.33	1001/1438	4.39	4.40	4.46	4.48	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	25	4.89	588/1421	4.70	4.66	4.73	4.76	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	4	7	14	4.19	943/1411	3.83	4.09	4.31	4.37	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	0	5	19	4.41	758/1405	3.91	4.18	4.32	4.39	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	2	2	1	0	7	3.67	904/1236	3.51	3.74	4.00	4.11	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1021/1260	3.45	3.65	4.14	4.19	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	851/1255	3.96	3.78	4.33	4.37	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	299/1258	4.30	3.84	4.38	4.44	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	20	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 873	****	3.52	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	3.61	4.22	4.51	****
Seminar														
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	17	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 221 3  
 Title Intro To Linear Algebr  
 Instructor: Guler,Osman  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 984  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	3	6	3.87	1243/1509	4.08	4.13	4.31	4.34	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	3	3	5	3.60	1331/1509	4.15	4.18	4.26	4.32	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	6	4.00	924/1287	4.35	4.28	4.30	4.35	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	979/1459	4.28	4.15	4.22	4.30	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	587/1406	4.29	3.84	4.09	4.09	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1159/1384	4.15	4.00	4.11	4.09	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	7	6	4.20	823/1489	4.51	4.28	4.17	4.19	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	408/1506	4.92	4.85	4.67	4.61	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	4	4	3	1	3.08	1383/1463	3.75	3.92	4.09	4.08	3.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	1141/1438	4.39	4.40	4.46	4.48	4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	1138/1421	4.70	4.66	4.73	4.76	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	4	2	3	2	2.92	1375/1411	3.83	4.09	4.31	4.37	2.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	4	2	4	3.29	1315/1405	3.91	4.18	4.32	4.39	3.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	3	1	0	3	3	3.20	1088/1236	3.51	3.74	4.00	4.11	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1260	3.45	3.65	4.14	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1255	3.96	3.78	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1258	4.30	3.84	4.38	4.44	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 873	****	3.52	4.03	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	0	2	5	16	4.32	811/1509	4.08	4.13	4.31	4.34	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	2	5	15	4.38	731/1509	4.15	4.18	4.26	4.32	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	8	16	4.52	500/1287	4.35	4.28	4.30	4.35	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	1	0	1	2	12	4.50	454/1459	4.28	4.15	4.22	4.30	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	3	3	14	4.43	423/1406	4.29	3.84	4.09	4.09	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	14	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	107/1384	4.15	4.00	4.11	4.09	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	224/1489	4.51	4.28	4.17	4.19	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	524/1506	4.92	4.85	4.67	4.61	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	4	5	10	4.15	738/1463	3.75	3.92	4.09	4.08	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	1	19	4.77	413/1438	4.39	4.40	4.46	4.48	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	4	2	16	4.55	1130/1421	4.70	4.66	4.73	4.76	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	4	5	12	4.23	911/1411	3.83	4.09	4.31	4.37	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	1	2	1	15	4.09	1005/1405	3.91	4.18	4.32	4.39	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	11	2	1	0	0	4	3.43	1021/1236	3.51	3.74	4.00	4.11	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	1	1	2	3	3.33	1102/1260	3.45	3.65	4.14	4.19	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	1047/1255	3.96	3.78	4.33	4.37	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	2	0	1	0	5	3.75	1070/1258	4.30	3.84	4.38	4.44	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	18	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 873	****	3.52	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	3.17	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/ 198	****	3.61	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.11	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	3.78	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****



Course-Section: MATH 221 4  
 Title Intro To Linear Algebr  
 Instructor: Shen,Jinglai  
 Enrollment: 59  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 985  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	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	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 225 1  
 Title Intro Differentl Equat  
 Instructor: Draganescu,Andr  
 Enrollment: 51  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 986  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	25	4.73	339/1509	4.56	4.13	4.31	4.34	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	11	20	4.55	495/1509	4.36	4.18	4.26	4.32	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	6	25	4.81	208/1287	4.64	4.28	4.30	4.35	4.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	400/1459	4.38	4.15	4.22	4.30	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	1	6	16	4.54	306/1406	4.04	3.84	4.09	4.09	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	103/1384	4.51	4.00	4.11	4.09	4.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	26	4.76	192/1489	4.34	4.28	4.17	4.19	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	12	13	4.46	381/1463	3.94	3.92	4.09	4.08	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	28	4.88	262/1438	4.57	4.40	4.46	4.48	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	27	4.81	768/1421	4.50	4.66	4.73	4.76	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	12	18	4.55	568/1411	4.05	4.09	4.31	4.37	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	4	23	4.61	526/1405	4.20	4.18	4.32	4.39	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	18	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	354/1236	4.20	3.74	4.00	4.11	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1260	****	3.65	4.14	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/1255	****	3.78	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/1258	****	3.84	4.38	4.44	****
4. Were special techniques successful	29	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 873	****	3.52	4.03	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors 25	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	10	2.00-2.99 3	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 33 Non-major 32
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
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 5	
			? 1		

Course-Section: MATH 225 3  
 Title Intro Differentl Equat  
 Instructor: Gobbert,Matthia  
 Enrollment: 48  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 987  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	9	16	4.39	734/1509	4.56	4.13	4.31	4.34	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	11	11	4.18	942/1509	4.36	4.18	4.26	4.32	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	0	5	20	4.46	566/1287	4.64	4.28	4.30	4.35	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	834/1459	4.38	4.15	4.22	4.30	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	1	2	2	5	3	3.54	1166/1406	4.04	3.84	4.09	4.09	3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	3	5	10	4.21	659/1384	4.51	4.00	4.11	4.09	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	3	9	11	3.93	1082/1489	4.34	4.28	4.17	4.19	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	2	8	9	2	3.41	1295/1463	3.94	3.92	4.09	4.08	3.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	6	8	13	4.26	1071/1438	4.57	4.40	4.46	4.48	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	2	2	8	14	4.19	1314/1421	4.50	4.66	4.73	4.76	4.19
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	3	11	4	8	3.56	1266/1411	4.05	4.09	4.31	4.37	3.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	5	9	9	3.78	1185/1405	4.20	4.18	4.32	4.39	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	0	5	8	8	4.00	664/1236	4.20	3.74	4.00	4.11	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	****/1260	****	3.65	4.14	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	3	0	0	1	2	2.83	****/1255	****	3.78	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/1258	****	3.84	4.38	4.44	****
4. Were special techniques successful	22	2	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 873	****	3.52	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	3.61	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 24	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B 7					
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 4	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major 25
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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			
				? 1					

Course-Section: MATH 251 1  
 Title Multivariable Calculus  
 Instructor: Kang, Weining  
 Enrollment: 64  
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 988  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	6	20	30	4.34	789/1509	4.35	4.13	4.31	4.34	4.34
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	16	36	4.50	543/1509	4.31	4.18	4.26	4.32	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	12	40	4.55	472/1287	4.26	4.28	4.30	4.35	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	1	6	11	27	4.42	586/1459	4.29	4.15	4.22	4.30	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	15	2	1	8	16	15	3.98	849/1406	4.06	3.84	4.09	4.09	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	1	9	13	22	4.17	693/1384	4.21	4.00	4.11	4.09	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	3	14	36	4.42	569/1489	4.19	4.28	4.17	4.19	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	55	4.98	117/1506	4.72	4.85	4.67	4.61	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	3	0	0	4	25	20	4.33	556/1463	4.19	3.92	4.09	4.08	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	10	44	4.69	559/1438	4.63	4.40	4.46	4.48	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	14	40	4.62	1060/1421	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.76	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	7	15	35	4.45	689/1411	4.31	4.09	4.31	4.37	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	6	15	34	4.38	788/1405	4.39	4.18	4.32	4.39	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	26	1	4	6	8	12	3.84	809/1236	3.78	3.74	4.00	4.11	3.84
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	46	0	4	0	4	2	2	2.83	****/1260	4.26	3.65	4.14	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	46	0	1	2	5	1	3	3.25	****/1255	3.96	3.78	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	46	0	2	2	4	1	3	3.08	****/1258	4.13	3.84	4.38	4.44	****
4. Were special techniques successful	47	6	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	****/ 873	****	3.52	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	54	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	3.17	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 198	****	3.61	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	****	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	57	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	57	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	57	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.11	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 41	****	3.78	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	54	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: MATH 251 1  
 Title: Multivariable Calculus  
 Instructor: Kang, Weining  
 Enrollment: 64  
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 988  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	49	Graduate	1	Major	3
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B	28						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	11	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	57	Non-major	55
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	10	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 251 2  
 Title Multivariable Calculus  
 Instructor: Zweck,John W  
 Enrollment: 48  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 989  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	30	4.76	291/1509	4.35	4.13	4.31	4.34	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	11	26	4.66	367/1509	4.31	4.18	4.26	4.32	4.66
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	12	23	4.53	500/1287	4.26	4.28	4.30	4.35	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	5	8	17	4.40	619/1459	4.29	4.15	4.22	4.30	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	1	1	5	9	9	3.96	861/1406	4.06	3.84	4.09	4.09	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	1	0	2	11	9	4.17	693/1384	4.21	4.00	4.11	4.09	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	6	2	11	19	4.13	885/1489	4.19	4.28	4.17	4.19	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	37	4.97	175/1506	4.72	4.85	4.67	4.61	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	3	0	0	2	13	16	4.45	396/1463	4.19	3.92	4.09	4.08	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	32	4.82	348/1438	4.63	4.40	4.46	4.48	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	36	4.95	322/1421	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.76	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	13	23	4.55	556/1411	4.31	4.09	4.31	4.37	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	33	4.84	239/1405	4.39	4.18	4.32	4.39	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	18	3	2	2	3	10	3.75	853/1236	3.78	3.74	4.00	4.11	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	3	4	14	4.26	613/1260	4.26	3.65	4.14	4.19	4.26
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	2	4	7	9	3.91	983/1255	3.96	3.78	4.33	4.37	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	4	6	12	4.26	813/1258	4.13	3.84	4.38	4.44	4.26
4. Were special techniques successful	15	14	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	****/ 873	****	3.52	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 198	****	3.61	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 49	****	3.11	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/ 41	****	3.78	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: MATH 251 2  
 Title Multivariable Calculus  
 Instructor: Zweck, John W  
 Enrollment: 48  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 989  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	30	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	38	Non-major	28
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 251 3  
 Title Multivariable Calculus  
 Instructor: Song,Yoon J  
 Enrollment: 59  
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 990  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	4	5	10	29	4.20	942/1509	4.35	4.13	4.31	4.34	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	20	24	4.30	807/1509	4.31	4.18	4.26	4.32	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	6	14	24	4.10	882/1287	4.26	4.28	4.30	4.35	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	24	0	1	4	6	15	4.35	676/1459	4.29	4.15	4.22	4.30	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	24	0	0	5	5	15	4.40	446/1406	4.06	3.84	4.09	4.09	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	1	4	10	23	4.45	403/1384	4.21	4.00	4.11	4.09	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	7	14	26	4.35	652/1489	4.19	4.28	4.17	4.19	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	7	41	4.85	682/1506	4.72	4.85	4.67	4.61	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	8	18	18	4.16	738/1463	4.19	3.92	4.09	4.08	4.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	7	41	4.76	430/1438	4.63	4.40	4.46	4.48	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	5	16	29	4.48	1173/1421	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.76	4.48
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	6	16	26	4.32	820/1411	4.31	4.09	4.31	4.37	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	5	8	32	4.40	768/1405	4.39	4.18	4.32	4.39	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	32	3	0	1	3	8	3.87	794/1236	3.78	3.74	4.00	4.11	3.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1260	4.26	3.65	4.14	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1255	3.96	3.78	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1258	4.13	3.84	4.38	4.44	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.11	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.78	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	39	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6	C	11	General	0	Under-grad	50	Non-major	46
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	18	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	5						



Course-Section: MATH 251 4  
 Title: Multivariable Calculus  
 Instructor: Chin, Sang H.  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 991  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	6	5	22	4.11	1044/1509	4.35	4.13	4.31	4.34	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	7	13	12	3.76	1252/1509	4.31	4.18	4.26	4.32	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	3	5	10	10	3.86	1042/1287	4.26	4.28	4.30	4.35	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	8	11	11	4.00	979/1459	4.29	4.15	4.22	4.30	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	1	1	7	6	10	3.92	909/1406	4.06	3.84	4.09	4.09	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	2	4	8	9	4.04	784/1384	4.21	4.00	4.11	4.09	4.04
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	9	9	15	3.84	1148/1489	4.19	4.28	4.17	4.19	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	3	27	6	4.08	1353/1506	4.72	4.85	4.67	4.61	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	1	9	11	9	3.84	1036/1463	4.19	3.92	4.09	4.08	3.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	4	13	19	4.24	1086/1438	4.63	4.40	4.46	4.48	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	32	4.82	768/1421	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.76	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	2	6	10	16	3.92	1135/1411	4.31	4.09	4.31	4.37	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	3	3	9	19	3.95	1098/1405	4.39	4.18	4.32	4.39	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	18	3	2	1	3	8	3.65	914/1236	3.78	3.74	4.00	4.11	3.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	****/1260	4.26	3.65	4.14	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	904/1255	3.96	3.78	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	932/1258	4.13	3.84	4.38	4.44	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	28	5	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/ 873	****	3.52	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	3.17	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 198	****	3.61	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	36	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.11	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.78	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: MATH 251 4  
 Title Multivariable Calculus  
 Instructor: Chin, Sang H.  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 991  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	32	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	7	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	38	Non-major	31
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	9	D	1						
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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 251H 1  
 Title: Multivariable Calculus  
 Instructor: Hoffman, Kathlee  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 992  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	374/1509	4.70	4.13	4.31	4.34	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1013/1509	4.10	4.18	4.26	4.32	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	826/1287	4.20	4.28	4.30	4.35	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1238/1459	3.67	4.15	4.22	4.30	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	446/1406	4.40	3.84	4.09	4.09	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	3	0	3	3.71	1076/1384	3.71	4.00	4.11	4.09	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	917/1489	4.10	4.28	4.17	4.19	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1101/1463	3.75	3.92	4.09	4.08	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	588/1438	4.67	4.40	4.46	4.48	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	846/1421	4.78	4.66	4.73	4.76	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1235/1411	3.67	4.09	4.31	4.37	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1141/1405	3.89	4.18	4.32	4.39	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1260	****	3.65	4.14	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1255	****	3.78	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1258	****	3.84	4.38	4.44	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	64/1509	4.62	4.13	4.31	4.32	4.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	167/1509	4.28	4.18	4.26	4.25	4.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	143/1287	4.59	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	67/1459	4.82	4.15	4.22	4.26	4.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	6	6	8	4.00	813/1406	3.98	3.84	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	278/1384	4.27	4.00	4.11	4.15	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	224/1489	4.40	4.28	4.17	4.14	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1506	4.85	4.85	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	81/1463	4.15	3.92	4.09	4.08	4.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1438	4.52	4.40	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1421	4.96	4.66	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1411	4.31	4.09	4.31	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	69/1405	4.60	4.18	4.32	4.32	4.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	16	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	421/1236	4.33	3.74	4.00	4.07	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1260	4.13	3.65	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/1255	4.35	3.78	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1258	4.00	3.84	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	3.47	3.52	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	3.17	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	3.61	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.11	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 1	A 7	Required for Majors	22	Graduate 1	Major 17
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 13				
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 3	C 3	General	0	Under-grad 24	Non-major 8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 1	D 0				
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0				
			I 0	Other	2		
			? 1				

Course-Section: MATH 301 2  
 Title Intro Math Analysis I  
 Instructor: Seidman,Thomas  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 994  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	3	4	4.00	1114/1509	4.62	4.13	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1391/1509	4.28	4.18	4.26	4.25	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	0	7	4.33	708/1287	4.59	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	227/1459	4.82	4.15	4.22	4.26	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	0	1	3	3.43	1225/1406	3.98	3.84	4.09	4.12	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1296/1384	4.27	4.00	4.11	4.15	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	1236/1489	4.40	4.28	4.17	4.14	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	4.85	4.85	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	2	3	0	3.00	1392/1463	4.15	3.92	4.09	4.08	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	1	3	3	3.56	1364/1438	4.52	4.40	4.46	4.43	3.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	588/1421	4.96	4.66	4.73	4.73	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	2	2	2	3.11	1352/1411	4.31	4.09	4.31	4.29	3.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	994/1405	4.60	4.18	4.32	4.32	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1236	4.33	3.74	4.00	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	415/1260	4.13	3.65	4.14	4.22	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	822/1255	4.35	3.78	4.33	4.37	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	620/1258	4.00	3.84	4.38	4.42	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	850/ 873	3.47	3.52	4.03	4.08	2.60

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 301 3  
 Title Intro Math Analysis I  
 Instructor: Shen,Jinglai  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 995  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	159/1509	4.62	4.13	4.31	4.32	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	495/1509	4.28	4.18	4.26	4.25	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	481/1287	4.59	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	146/1459	4.82	4.15	4.22	4.26	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	332/1406	3.98	3.84	4.09	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1384	4.27	4.00	4.11	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	151/1489	4.40	4.28	4.17	4.14	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	1038/1506	4.85	4.85	4.67	4.67	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	286/1463	4.15	3.92	4.09	4.08	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1438	4.52	4.40	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1421	4.96	4.66	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	232/1411	4.31	4.09	4.31	4.29	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	381/1405	4.60	4.18	4.32	4.32	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1236	4.33	3.74	4.00	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	936/1260	4.13	3.65	4.14	4.22	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	575/1255	4.35	3.78	4.33	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1143/1258	4.00	3.84	4.38	4.42	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	292/ 873	3.47	3.52	4.03	4.08	4.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 302 1  
 Title Intro Math Analysis II  
 Instructor: Potra, Florian A  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 996  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank							
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	2	10	4.11	1032/1509	4.11	4.13	4.31	4.32	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	4	9	4.06	1049/1509	4.06	4.18	4.26	4.25	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	2	12	4.33	708/1287	4.33	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	0	2	3	8	4.00	979/1459	4.00	4.15	4.22	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	4	10	4.24	611/1406	4.24	3.84	4.09	4.12	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	3	3	6	3.86	978/1384	3.86	4.00	4.11	4.15	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	2	3	1	9	3.76	1193/1489	3.76	4.28	4.17	4.14	3.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	622/1506	4.89	4.85	4.67	4.67	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	4	6	3	3.79	1076/1463	3.79	3.92	4.09	4.08	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	5	5	7	4.00	1203/1438	4.00	4.40	4.46	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	588/1421	4.89	4.66	4.73	4.73	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	3	5	6	3.71	1222/1411	3.71	4.09	4.31	4.29	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	5	3	7	3.61	1237/1405	3.61	4.18	4.32	4.32	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	13	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1236	****	3.74	4.00	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	746/1260	4.00	3.65	4.14	4.22	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	868/1255	4.11	3.78	4.33	4.37	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	2	0	6	4.11	895/1258	4.11	3.84	4.38	4.42	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 873	****	3.52	4.03	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 1		

Course-Section: MATH 381 1  
 Title Lin. Meth/Oper Researc  
 Instructor: Guler,Osman  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 997  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	0	5	2	3.50	1399/1509	3.50	4.13	4.31	4.32	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	3	1	3.30	1426/1509	3.30	4.18	4.26	4.25	3.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	1108/1287	3.70	4.28	4.30	4.33	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1103/1459	3.89	4.15	4.22	4.26	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	949/1406	3.89	3.84	4.09	4.12	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	1107/1384	3.67	4.00	4.11	4.15	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	917/1489	4.10	4.28	4.17	4.14	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1166/1506	4.40	4.85	4.67	4.67	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	4	4	1	0	2.50	1442/1463	2.50	3.92	4.09	4.08	2.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	3.50	1371/1438	3.50	4.40	4.46	4.43	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1162/1421	4.50	4.66	4.73	4.73	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	4	2	0	2.70	1392/1411	2.70	4.09	4.31	4.29	2.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	4	2	0	2.70	1379/1405	2.70	4.18	4.32	4.32	2.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	3	3	0	3.00	1131/1236	3.00	3.74	4.00	4.07	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1162/1260	3.00	3.65	4.14	4.22	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1180/1255	3.25	3.78	4.33	4.37	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1244/1258	2.75	3.84	4.38	4.42	2.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors		4	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General		1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives		5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	2							



Course-Section: MATH 404 1  
 Title Intro Part Diff Eq I  
 Instructor: Bell,Jonathan  
 Enrollment: 49  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 998  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	10	17	4.27	862/1509	4.27	4.13	4.31	4.39	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	11	16	4.21	901/1509	4.21	4.18	4.26	4.26	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	7	19	4.30	739/1287	4.30	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	1	5	6	13	4.12	902/1459	4.12	4.15	4.22	4.32	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	7	2	8	5	7	3.10	1319/1406	3.10	3.84	4.09	4.11	3.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	1	3	8	11	4.13	734/1384	4.13	4.00	4.11	4.23	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	7	7	18	4.34	663/1489	4.34	4.28	4.17	4.18	4.34
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	233/1506	4.97	4.85	4.67	4.67	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	1	3	15	8	4.11	786/1463	4.11	3.92	4.09	4.18	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	5	25	4.74	463/1438	4.74	4.40	4.46	4.50	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	4	26	4.77	846/1421	4.77	4.66	4.73	4.76	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	0	5	5	18	4.23	902/1411	4.23	4.09	4.31	4.35	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	4	9	15	4.10	1005/1405	4.10	4.18	4.32	4.34	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	2	3	7	6	7	3.52	974/1236	3.52	3.74	4.00	4.03	3.52
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	6	0	3	3	2	2.64	1230/1260	2.64	3.65	4.14	4.25	2.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	3	2	1	4	4	3.29	1175/1255	3.29	3.78	4.33	4.46	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	2	0	3	4	5	3.71	1083/1258	3.71	3.84	4.38	4.51	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	19	8	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	****/ 873	****	3.52	4.03	4.26	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	3.17	4.16	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	3.61	4.22	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.66	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.29	****
Seminar														
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.19	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.11	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.78	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.33	****

Course-Section: MATH 404 1  
 Title Intro Part Diff Eq I  
 Instructor: Bell,Jonathan  
 Enrollment: 49  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 998  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	10	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	31
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 407 1  
 Title Modern Algebra & No.Th  
 Instructor: Toll,Charles  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 999  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	833/1509	4.31	4.13	4.31	4.39	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	605/1509	4.46	4.18	4.26	4.26	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	658/1287	4.38	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.15	4.22	4.32	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	739/1406	4.10	3.84	4.09	4.11	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	225/1384	4.67	4.00	4.11	4.23	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	513/1489	4.46	4.28	4.17	4.18	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	722/1506	4.83	4.85	4.67	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	628/1463	4.25	3.92	4.09	4.18	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.40	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	483/1421	4.92	4.66	4.73	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	617/1411	4.50	4.09	4.31	4.35	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.18	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1236	****	3.74	4.00	4.03	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	1045/1260	3.50	3.65	4.14	4.25	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	904/1255	4.00	3.78	4.33	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	770/1258	4.33	3.84	4.38	4.51	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors		5	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General		0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives		5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		1				
				?	1							

Course-Section: MATH 410 1  
 Title Intro Complex Analysis  
 Instructor: Lynn,Yen-mow  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1000  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1236/1509	3.88	4.13	4.31	4.39	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	1	3.63	1322/1509	3.63	4.18	4.26	4.26	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	779/1287	4.25	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	619/1459	4.40	4.15	4.22	4.32	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	656/1406	4.20	3.84	4.09	4.11	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	677/1384	4.20	4.00	4.11	4.23	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	192/1489	4.75	4.28	4.17	4.18	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	1454/1463	2.00	3.92	4.09	4.18	2.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	1393/1438	3.25	4.40	4.46	4.50	3.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	3	1	2	3.38	1402/1421	3.38	4.66	4.73	4.76	3.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	1302/1411	3.43	4.09	4.31	4.35	3.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	1	1	2	2.88	1371/1405	2.88	4.18	4.32	4.34	2.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1236	****	3.74	4.00	4.03	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1241/1260	2.50	3.65	4.14	4.25	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1202/1255	3.00	3.78	4.33	4.46	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1222/1258	3.00	3.84	4.38	4.51	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 873	****	3.52	4.03	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 421 1  
 Title Introduction To Topolo  
 Instructor: Armstrong,Thoma  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1001  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1114/1509	4.00	4.13	4.31	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1086/1509	4.00	4.18	4.26	4.26	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	979/1459	4.00	4.15	4.22	4.32	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.00	4.11	4.23	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1303/1489	3.50	4.28	4.17	4.18	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1241/1463	3.50	3.92	4.09	4.18	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1371/1438	3.50	4.40	4.46	4.50	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1345/1421	4.00	4.66	4.73	4.76	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1277/1411	3.50	4.09	4.31	4.35	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1265/1405	3.50	4.18	4.32	4.34	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 430 1  
 Title Matrix Analysis  
 Instructor: Kogan, Jacob  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1002  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1387/1509	3.55	4.13	4.31	4.39	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	3	2	3.27	1430/1509	3.27	4.18	4.26	4.26	3.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	2	3	3.36	1197/1287	3.36	4.28	4.30	4.38	3.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	2	2	3	3.36	1356/1459	3.36	4.15	4.22	4.32	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	587/1406	4.25	3.84	4.09	4.11	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	5	3	2	3.70	1083/1384	3.70	4.00	4.11	4.23	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	923/1489	4.09	4.28	4.17	4.18	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	1243/1506	4.27	4.85	4.67	4.67	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	4	3	2	3.36	1306/1463	3.36	3.92	4.09	4.18	3.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	1334/1438	3.70	4.40	4.46	4.50	3.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	1383/1421	3.70	4.66	4.73	4.76	3.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	2	3	1	1	2.50	1395/1411	2.50	4.09	4.31	4.35	2.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	2	3	0	2.40	1391/1405	2.40	4.18	4.32	4.34	2.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1236	****	3.74	4.00	4.03	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1260	****	3.65	4.14	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1255	****	3.78	4.33	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1258	****	3.84	4.38	4.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	3	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 441 1  
 Title Intro Numerical Analys  
 Instructor: Gobbert,Matthia  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1003  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.13	4.31	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	774/1509	4.33	4.18	4.26	4.26	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	519/1287	4.50	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	146/1459	4.80	4.15	4.22	4.32	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	2	0	2	2	0	2.67	1381/1406	2.67	3.84	4.09	4.11	2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	440/1384	4.40	4.00	4.11	4.23	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	364/1489	4.58	4.28	4.17	4.18	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	396/1463	4.45	3.92	4.09	4.18	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	319/1438	4.83	4.40	4.46	4.50	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	716/1421	4.83	4.66	4.73	4.76	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	520/1411	4.58	4.09	4.31	4.35	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	345/1405	4.75	4.18	4.32	4.34	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	616/1236	4.10	3.74	4.00	4.03	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	415/1260	4.50	3.65	4.14	4.25	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	575/1255	4.50	3.78	4.33	4.46	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1070/1258	3.75	3.84	4.38	4.51	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 873	****	3.52	4.03	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 2 Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 13 Non-major 6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 1		

Course-Section: MATH 476 1  
 Title Intro To Game Theory  
 Instructor: Armstrong,Thoma  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1004  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	4	3	4	2	3.31	1440/1509	3.31	4.13	4.31	4.39	3.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	3	1	3.15	1449/1509	3.15	4.18	4.26	4.26	3.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	1	3	3.31	1212/1287	3.31	4.28	4.30	4.38	3.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	1	4	0	3.29	1382/1459	3.29	4.15	4.22	4.32	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	4	1	2	3.50	1178/1406	3.50	3.84	4.09	4.11	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1192/1384	3.50	4.00	4.11	4.23	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	3	5	1	3.08	1399/1489	3.08	4.28	4.17	4.18	3.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	2	7	2	0	2.83	1419/1463	2.83	3.92	4.09	4.18	2.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	1203/1438	4.00	4.40	4.46	4.50	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	1228/1421	4.38	4.66	4.73	4.76	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	5	5	1	0	2.50	1395/1411	2.50	4.09	4.31	4.35	2.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	5	6	0	0	2.31	1392/1405	2.31	4.18	4.32	4.34	2.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1260	****	3.65	4.14	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	****/1255	****	3.78	4.33	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/1258	****	3.84	4.38	4.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						



Course-Section: MATH 479 1  
 Title Math Problem Solving S  
 Instructor: Armstrong,Thoma  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1005  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	458/1509	4.63	4.13	4.31	4.39	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	859/1509	4.25	4.18	4.26	4.26	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.28	4.30	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.15	4.22	4.32	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	677/1384	4.20	4.00	4.11	4.23	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1403/1489	3.00	4.28	4.17	4.18	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	726/1463	4.17	3.92	4.09	4.18	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.40	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.66	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.09	4.31	4.35	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	251/1405	4.83	4.18	4.32	4.34	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1260	****	3.65	4.14	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1255	****	3.78	4.33	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1258	****	3.84	4.38	4.51	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.71	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 481 1  
 Title Math Modeling  
 Instructor: Rostamian,Roube  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1006  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.13	4.31	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	412/1509	4.61	4.18	4.26	4.26	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	638/1287	4.40	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	389/1459	4.56	4.15	4.22	4.32	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	446/1406	4.40	3.84	4.09	4.11	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	278/1384	4.60	4.00	4.11	4.23	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	3	3	9	4.19	833/1489	4.19	4.28	4.17	4.18	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	925/1506	4.69	4.85	4.67	4.67	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	438/1463	4.43	3.92	4.09	4.18	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	775/1438	4.53	4.40	4.46	4.50	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	588/1421	4.88	4.66	4.73	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	303/1411	4.75	4.09	4.31	4.35	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	15	4.76	333/1405	4.76	4.18	4.32	4.34	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	110/1236	4.79	3.74	4.00	4.03	4.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1113/1260	3.29	3.65	4.14	4.25	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	904/1255	4.00	3.78	4.33	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	570/1258	4.57	3.84	4.38	4.51	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	11	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 873	****	3.52	4.03	4.26	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	3.17	4.16	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	3.61	4.22	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	4
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 490 1  
 Title Special Topics In Math  
 Instructor: Rathinam,Muruha  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1007  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	482/1509	4.53	4.13	4.31	4.39	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	424/1509	4.64	4.18	4.26	4.26	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	426/1287	4.53	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	454/1459	4.72	4.15	4.22	4.32	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	587/1406	4.42	3.84	4.09	4.11	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	349/1384	4.50	4.00	4.11	4.23	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	341/1489	4.42	4.28	4.17	4.18	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1168/1463	4.39	3.92	4.09	4.18	3.67

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1297/1438	4.38	4.40	4.46	4.50	3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1217/1421	4.80	4.66	4.73	4.76	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	1256/1411	4.20	4.09	4.31	4.35	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	940/1405	4.40	4.18	4.32	4.34	4.20

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 2 Major 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0 Under-grad 3 Non-major 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Other 0

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MATH 490 2  
 Title Special Topics In Math  
 Instructor: Peercy,Bradford  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1008  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1114/1509	4.53	4.13	4.31	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	774/1509	4.64	4.18	4.26	4.26	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	924/1287	4.53	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	280/1459	4.72	4.15	4.22	4.32	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	813/1406	4.42	3.84	4.09	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	807/1384	4.50	4.00	4.11	4.23	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1236/1489	4.42	4.28	4.17	4.18	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	325/1463	4.39	3.92	4.09	4.18	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1001/1438	4.38	4.40	4.46	4.50	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	4.80	4.66	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1051/1411	4.20	4.09	4.31	4.35	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1047/1405	4.40	4.18	4.32	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	176/1236	4.83	3.74	4.00	4.03	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	746/1260	4.00	3.65	4.14	4.25	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	904/1255	4.00	3.78	4.33	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	932/1258	4.00	3.84	4.38	4.51	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	801/ 873	3.00	3.52	4.03	4.26	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
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.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 490 3  
 Title Special Topics In Math  
 Instructor: Minkoff,Susan E  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1009  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4									
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.53	4.13	4.31	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.64	4.18	4.26	4.26	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	4.53	4.28	4.30	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	4.72	4.15	4.22	4.32	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	4.42	3.84	4.09	4.11	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	4.50	4.00	4.11	4.23	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.42	4.28	4.17	4.18	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	4.39	3.92	4.09	4.18	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	4.38	4.40	4.46	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.80	4.66	4.73	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	4.20	4.09	4.31	4.35	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	4.40	4.18	4.32	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	4.83	3.74	4.00	4.03	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	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 601 1  
 Title Measure Theory  
 Instructor: Gowda,Muddappa  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1010  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	563/1509	4.54	4.13	4.31	4.39	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	167/1509	4.85	4.18	4.26	4.25	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	250/1287	4.77	4.28	4.30	4.22	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	111/1459	4.88	4.15	4.22	4.16	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	720/1406	4.13	3.84	4.09	4.12	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	292/1384	4.58	4.00	4.11	4.16	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	133/1489	4.83	4.28	4.17	4.14	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1463	5.00	3.92	4.09	4.15	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.40	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.66	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	110/1411	4.92	4.09	4.31	4.33	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	137/1405	4.92	4.18	4.32	4.33	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1236	****	3.74	4.00	3.98	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1260	****	3.65	4.14	4.21	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1255	5.00	3.78	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1258	5.00	3.84	4.38	4.50	5.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	3.61	4.22	4.31	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.52	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 7	Major 12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 6	Non-major 1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 2			

Course-Section: MATH 620 1  
 Title Numerical Analysis I  
 Instructor: Draganescu, Andr  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1011  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	351/1509	4.71	4.13	4.31	4.39	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	300/1509	4.71	4.18	4.26	4.25	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	167/1287	4.86	4.28	4.30	4.22	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.15	4.22	4.16	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	287/1406	4.57	3.84	4.09	4.12	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	182/1384	4.71	4.00	4.11	4.16	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	224/1489	4.71	4.28	4.17	4.14	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	1325/1506	4.14	4.85	4.67	4.71	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	118/1463	4.80	3.92	4.09	4.15	4.80

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	447/1438	4.75	4.40	4.46	4.49	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	881/1421	4.75	4.66	4.73	4.78	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	469/1411	4.63	4.09	4.31	4.33	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	345/1405	4.75	4.18	4.32	4.33	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	489/1236	4.25	3.74	4.00	3.98	4.25

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	666/1260	4.20	3.65	4.14	4.21	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	904/1255	4.00	3.78	4.33	4.43	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	932/1258	4.00	3.84	4.38	4.50	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	3.52	4.03	4.01	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MATH 710A 1  
 Title Game Theory  
 Instructor: Armstrong, Thoma  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1012  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1399/1509	3.50	4.13	4.31	4.39	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1372/1509	3.50	4.18	4.26	4.25	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1168/1287	3.50	4.28	4.30	4.22	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1314/1459	3.50	4.15	4.22	4.16	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1322/1384	3.00	4.00	4.11	4.16	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.28	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1241/1463	3.50	3.92	4.09	4.15	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	800/1438	4.50	4.40	4.46	4.49	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.66	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1051/1411	4.00	4.09	4.31	4.33	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1265/1405	3.50	4.18	4.32	4.33	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	746/1260	4.00	3.65	4.14	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	904/1255	4.00	3.78	4.33	4.43	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	932/1258	4.00	3.84	4.38	4.50	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: MATH 710B 2  
 Title Mathematical Physiolog  
 Instructor: Peercy,Bradford  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1013  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1114/1509	4.00	4.13	4.31	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1228/1509	3.80	4.18	4.26	4.25	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1075/1287	3.80	4.28	4.30	4.22	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1167/1459	3.80	4.15	4.22	4.16	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1045/1406	3.75	3.84	4.09	4.12	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1145/1384	3.60	4.00	4.11	4.16	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	986/1489	4.00	4.28	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1166/1506	4.40	4.85	4.67	4.71	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1060/1463	3.80	3.92	4.09	4.15	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1358/1438	3.60	4.40	4.46	4.49	3.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.66	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1187/1411	3.80	4.09	4.31	4.33	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1177/1405	3.80	4.18	4.32	4.33	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	354/1236	4.40	3.74	4.00	3.98	4.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	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	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Course-Section: MATH 710D 4  
 Title Numerical Solutions of  
 Instructor: Minkoff,Susan E  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1014  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	724/1509	4.40	4.13	4.31	4.39	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	543/1509	4.50	4.18	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	359/1287	4.67	4.28	4.30	4.22	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.15	4.22	4.16	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	729/1406	4.11	3.84	4.09	4.12	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	742/1384	4.11	4.00	4.11	4.16	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	674/1489	4.33	4.28	4.17	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	628/1463	4.25	3.92	4.09	4.15	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	930/1438	4.40	4.40	4.46	4.49	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	1084/1421	4.60	4.66	4.73	4.78	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	841/1411	4.30	4.09	4.31	4.33	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.18	4.32	4.33	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	3	0	3	4	0	2.80	1174/1236	2.80	3.74	4.00	3.98	2.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	4	3	3.78	924/1260	3.78	3.65	4.14	4.21	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	443/1255	4.67	3.78	4.33	4.43	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	620/1258	4.50	3.84	4.38	4.50	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	848/ 873	2.67	3.52	4.03	4.01	2.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	3.17	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	3.61	4.22	4.31	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 8	Major 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 2	Non-major 6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 1			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 1			