

Course Section: PHYS 100 0101
 Title IDEAS IN PHYSICS
 Instructor: SINSKY, JOEL
 Enrollment: 111
 Questionnaires: 65

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1317
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	4	0	0	1	5	19	36	4.48	633/1669	4.48	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	12	47	4.74	268/1666	4.74	4.36	4.19	4.11	4.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	9	52	4.82	203/1421	4.82	4.56	4.24	4.11	4.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	34	0	1	6	6	15	4.25	801/1617	4.25	4.35	4.15	3.99	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	4	8	17	31	4.20	611/1555	4.20	3.88	4.00	3.92	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	43	0	4	1	4	8	3.94	969/1543	3.94	4.24	4.06	3.86	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	3	9	49	4.71	260/1647	4.71	4.25	4.12	4.06	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	1	0	60	4.97	285/1668	4.97	4.85	4.67	4.62	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	1	16	35	4.65	249/1605	4.65	4.04	4.07	3.96	4.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	13	47	4.73	489/1514	4.73	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	61	4.98	103/1551	4.98	4.76	4.66	4.55	4.98	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	9	50	4.79	243/1503	4.79	4.15	4.24	4.17	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	6	55	4.87	200/1506	4.87	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	3	8	51	4.77	131/1311	4.77	3.98	3.85	3.68	4.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	2	6	11	19	4.24	709/1490	4.24	3.88	4.05	3.85	4.24	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	0	2	9	27	4.66	495/1502	4.66	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.66	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	0	0	7	5	23	4.46	742/1489	4.46	4.25	4.29	4.07	4.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	27	25	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	61	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.00	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	63	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.37	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	63	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.36	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	63	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.30	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	63	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.03	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	62	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	63	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	63	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	63	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	63	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	62	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 55	****	4.50	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	62	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	63	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	63	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	63	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: PHYS 100 0101
 Title IDEAS IN PHYSICS
 Instructor: SINSKY, JOEL
 Enrollment: 111
 Questionnaires: 65

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1317
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	29	Required for Majors	42	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	7	C	4	General	10	Under-grad	65	Non-major	65
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	9	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	2				
				?	2						

Course Section: PHYS 111 0101
 Title BASIC PHYSICS I
 Instructor: CUI, LILI
 Enrollment: 211
 Questionnaires: 110

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1318
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	8	0	2	5	9	29	57	4.31	840/1669	4.31	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	1	4	11	33	53	4.30	814/1666	4.30	4.36	4.19	4.11	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	4	12	32	54	4.33	746/1421	4.33	4.56	4.24	4.11	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	29	1	5	8	31	27	4.08	981/1617	4.08	4.35	4.15	3.99	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	8	7	6	21	26	34	3.79	1037/1555	3.79	3.88	4.00	3.92	3.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	35	0	5	8	25	29	4.16	759/1543	4.16	4.24	4.06	3.86	4.16	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	1	1	10	34	56	4.40	651/1647	4.40	4.25	4.12	4.06	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	1	0	0	0	8	93	4.92	570/1668	4.92	4.85	4.67	4.62	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	0	4	3	18	35	30	3.93	1039/1605	3.93	4.04	4.07	3.96	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	3	23	74	4.68	553/1514	4.68	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	5	8	88	4.82	732/1551	4.82	4.76	4.66	4.55	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	4	4	13	34	46	4.13	996/1503	4.13	4.15	4.24	4.17	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	9	7	22	60	4.26	909/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	1	4	6	18	70	4.54	250/1311	4.54	3.98	3.85	3.68	4.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	85	0	4	3	3	6	9	3.52	****/1490	****	3.88	4.05	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	85	0	1	2	6	6	10	3.88	****/1502	****	4.32	4.26	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	86	0	2	1	2	6	13	4.13	****/1489	****	4.25	4.29	4.07	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	86	13	1	0	1	7	2	3.82	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	44	0	6	3	13	26	18	3.71	175/ 226	3.71	4.00	4.20	3.98	3.71	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	2	3	8	26	27	4.11	139/ 233	4.11	4.37	4.19	4.09	4.11	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	3	3	12	20	28	4.02	186/ 225	4.02	4.36	4.50	4.42	4.02	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	0	12	2	5	19	29	3.76	187/ 223	3.76	4.30	4.35	4.19	3.76	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	44	0	2	5	13	21	25	3.94	131/ 206	3.94	4.03	4.15	4.01	3.94	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	108	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	108	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	108	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	108	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	108	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	109	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	109	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	109	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	108	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.50	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	108	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	108	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	109	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	108	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: PHYS 111 0101
 Title BASIC PHYSICS I
 Instructor: CUI, LILI
 Enrollment: 211
 Questionnaires: 110

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1318
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	44	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	B	29						
56-83	21	2.00-2.99	8	C	10	General	1	Under-grad	110	Non-major	110
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	16	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	18	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	76				
				?	4						

Course Section: PHYS 112 0101
 Title: BASIC PHYSICS II
 Instructor: CUI, LILI (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 89
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1319
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	0	0	5	11	22	4.45	676/1669	4.45	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	10	23	4.45	634/1666	4.45	4.36	4.19	4.11	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	31	4.84	197/1421	4.84	4.56	4.24	4.11	4.84	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	2	10	18	4.53	465/1617	4.53	4.35	4.15	3.99	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	5	3	4	12	12	3.64	1155/1555	3.64	3.88	4.00	3.92	3.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	1	3	5	16	4.44	465/1543	4.44	4.24	4.06	3.86	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	14	20	4.42	617/1647	4.42	4.25	4.12	4.06	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	35	4.95	428/1668	4.95	4.85	4.67	4.62	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	4	16	13	4.27	666/1605	3.69	4.04	4.07	3.96	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	34	4.87	257/1514	4.03	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.03	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	33	4.86	622/1551	4.52	4.76	4.66	4.55	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	16	18	4.38	753/1503	3.64	4.15	4.24	4.17	3.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	12	21	4.38	799/1506	3.40	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	0	5	31	4.76	142/1311	4.76	3.98	3.85	3.68	4.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	667/1490	4.29	3.88	4.05	3.85	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	1013/1502	4.00	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	903/1489	4.29	4.25	4.29	4.07	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	25	7	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	2	6	3	7	10	3.61	186/ 226	3.61	4.00	4.20	3.98	3.61	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	5	8	14	4.21	118/ 233	4.21	4.37	4.19	4.09	4.21	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	2	4	7	15	4.25	156/ 225	4.25	4.36	4.50	4.42	4.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	3	3	4	18	4.32	139/ 223	4.32	4.30	4.35	4.19	4.32	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	1	4	2	21	4.54	72/ 206	4.54	4.03	4.15	4.01	4.54	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.50	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: PHYS 112 0101
 Title BASIC PHYSICS II
 Instructor: CUI, LILI (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 89
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1319
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	27	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	38	Non-major	39
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	34				
				?	1						

Course Section: PHYS 112 0101
 Title BASIC PHYSICS II
 Instructor: YOU, HAO (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 89
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1320
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	0	0	5	11	22	4.45	676/1669	4.45	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	10	23	4.45	634/1666	4.45	4.36	4.19	4.11	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	31	4.84	197/1421	4.84	4.56	4.24	4.11	4.84	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	2	10	18	4.53	465/1617	4.53	4.35	4.15	3.99	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	5	3	4	12	12	3.64	1155/1555	3.64	3.88	4.00	3.92	3.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	1	3	5	16	4.44	465/1543	4.44	4.24	4.06	3.86	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	14	20	4.42	617/1647	4.42	4.25	4.12	4.06	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	35	4.95	428/1668	4.95	4.85	4.67	4.62	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	3	2	6	4	1	0	2.31	1576/1605	3.69	4.04	4.07	3.96	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	28	0	1	2	3	4	1	3.18	1440/1514	4.03	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.03	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	1371/1551	4.52	4.76	4.66	4.55	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	2	3	1	4	1	2.91	1436/1503	3.64	4.15	4.24	4.17	3.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	6	0	3	1	2	2.42	1468/1506	3.40	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	28	5	2	0	2	0	2	3.00	****/1311	4.76	3.98	3.85	3.68	4.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	667/1490	4.29	3.88	4.05	3.85	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	1013/1502	4.00	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	903/1489	4.29	4.25	4.29	4.07	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	25	7	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	2	6	3	7	10	3.61	186/ 226	3.61	4.00	4.20	3.98	3.61	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	5	8	14	4.21	118/ 233	4.21	4.37	4.19	4.09	4.21	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	2	4	7	15	4.25	156/ 225	4.25	4.36	4.50	4.42	4.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	3	3	4	18	4.32	139/ 223	4.32	4.30	4.35	4.19	4.32	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	1	4	2	21	4.54	72/ 206	4.54	4.03	4.15	4.01	4.54	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.50	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: PHYS 112 0101
 Title BASIC PHYSICS II
 Instructor: YOU, HAO (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 89
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1320
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	27	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	38	Non-major	39
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	34				
				?	1						

Course Section: PHYS 112 0101
 Title: BASIC PHYSICS II
 Instructor: LINK, DANIEL (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 89
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1321
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	0	0	5	11	22	4.45	676/1669	4.45	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	10	23	4.45	634/1666	4.45	4.36	4.19	4.11	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	31	4.84	197/1421	4.84	4.56	4.24	4.11	4.84	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	2	10	18	4.53	465/1617	4.53	4.35	4.15	3.99	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	5	3	4	12	12	3.64	1155/1555	3.64	3.88	4.00	3.92	3.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	1	3	5	16	4.44	465/1543	4.44	4.24	4.06	3.86	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	14	20	4.42	617/1647	4.42	4.25	4.12	4.06	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	35	4.95	428/1668	4.95	4.85	4.67	4.62	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	373/1605	3.69	4.04	4.07	3.96	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	30	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	****/1514	4.03	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.03	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	31	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	****/1551	4.52	4.76	4.66	4.55	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	30	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	****/1503	3.64	4.15	4.24	4.17	3.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	32	0	2	2	1	0	2	2.71	****/1506	3.40	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	32	4	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/1311	4.76	3.98	3.85	3.68	4.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	667/1490	4.29	3.88	4.05	3.85	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	1013/1502	4.00	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	903/1489	4.29	4.25	4.29	4.07	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	25	7	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	2	6	3	7	10	3.61	186/ 226	3.61	4.00	4.20	3.98	3.61	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	5	8	14	4.21	118/ 233	4.21	4.37	4.19	4.09	4.21	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	2	4	7	15	4.25	156/ 225	4.25	4.36	4.50	4.42	4.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	3	3	4	18	4.32	139/ 223	4.32	4.30	4.35	4.19	4.32	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	1	4	2	21	4.54	72/ 206	4.54	4.03	4.15	4.01	4.54	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.50	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: PHYS 112 0101
 Title BASIC PHYSICS II
 Instructor: LINK, DANIEL (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 89
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1321
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	27	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	38	Non-major	39
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	34				
				?	1						

Course Section: PHYS 121 0101
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ERIC (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 238
 Questionnaires: 95

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1322
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	7	0	0	1	16	28	43	4.28	876/1669	4.28	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	2	10	33	44	4.34	777/1666	4.34	4.36	4.19	4.11	4.34	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	3	10	22	53	4.42	657/1421	4.42	4.56	4.24	4.11	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	40	1	5	4	14	23	4.13	946/1617	4.13	4.35	4.15	3.99	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	5	3	6	20	25	30	3.87	971/1555	3.87	3.88	4.00	3.92	3.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	57	0	2	7	7	15	4.13	807/1543	4.13	4.24	4.06	3.86	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	1	1	10	28	47	4.37	713/1647	4.37	4.25	4.12	4.06	4.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	5	0	0	0	0	82	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	2	0	2	14	43	20	4.03	904/1605	3.92	4.04	4.07	3.96	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	3	23	60	4.63	631/1514	4.63	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	2	15	71	4.78	825/1551	4.78	4.76	4.66	4.55	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	1	7	28	51	4.44	653/1503	4.44	4.15	4.24	4.17	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	2	0	2	7	21	56	4.52	623/1506	4.52	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	9	3	6	9	32	29	3.99	609/1311	3.99	3.98	3.85	3.68	3.99	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	8	7	14	18	34	3.78	1022/1490	3.78	3.88	4.05	3.85	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	5	5	12	16	43	4.07	986/1502	4.07	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.07	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	3	5	15	19	32	3.97	1064/1489	3.97	4.25	4.29	4.07	3.97	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	20	3	4	12	11	29	4.00	479/1006	4.00	3.84	4.00	3.81	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	89	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 226	****	4.00	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	91	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.37	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	90	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.36	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	91	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.30	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	91	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.03	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	91	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	94	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	92	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 55	****	4.50	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	92	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	92	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	92	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	92	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27 13	0.00-0.99 4	A 20	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55 21	1.00-1.99 0	B 31			
56-83 10	2.00-2.99 3	C 22	General 1	Under-grad 95	Non-major 91
84-150 2	3.00-3.49 8	D 3			
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00 23	F 2	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
		P 0			

I	0	Other	72
?	2		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	7	0	0	1	16	28	43	4.28	876/1669	4.28	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	2	10	33	44	4.34	777/1666	4.34	4.36	4.19	4.11	4.34	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	3	10	22	53	4.42	657/1421	4.42	4.56	4.24	4.11	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	40	1	5	4	14	23	4.13	946/1617	4.13	4.35	4.15	3.99	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	5	3	6	20	25	30	3.87	971/1555	3.87	3.88	4.00	3.92	3.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	57	0	2	7	7	15	4.13	807/1543	4.13	4.24	4.06	3.86	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	1	1	10	28	47	4.37	713/1647	4.37	4.25	4.12	4.06	4.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	5	0	0	0	0	82	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	69	11	2	2	4	6	1	3.13	****/1605	3.92	4.04	4.07	3.96	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	86	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	****/1514	4.63	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	84	0	1	0	3	0	7	4.09	****/1551	4.78	4.76	4.66	4.55	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	86	0	0	2	1	2	4	3.89	****/1503	4.44	4.15	4.24	4.17	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	86	0	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	****/1506	4.52	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	85	6	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1311	3.99	3.98	3.85	3.68	3.99	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	8	7	14	18	34	3.78	1022/1490	3.78	3.88	4.05	3.85	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	5	5	12	16	43	4.07	986/1502	4.07	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.07	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	3	5	15	19	32	3.97	1064/1489	3.97	4.25	4.29	4.07	3.97	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	20	3	4	12	11	29	4.00	479/1006	4.00	3.84	4.00	3.81	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	89	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 226	****	4.00	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	91	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.37	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	90	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.36	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	91	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.30	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	91	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.03	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	91	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	94	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	92	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 55	****	4.50	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	92	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	92	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	92	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	92	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	4	A	20
28-55	21	1.00-1.99	0	B	31
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	3	C	22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	8	D	3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	23	F	2
				P	0
				Required for Majors	5
				General	1
				Electives	1
				Graduate	0
				Under-grad	95
				Major	4
				Non-major	91
#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					

I	0	Other	72
?	2		

Course Section: PHYS 121 0101
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I
 Instructor: BOLE, TIM (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 238
 Questionnaires: 95

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1324
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	7	0	0	1	16	28	43	4.28	876/1669	4.28	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	2	10	33	44	4.34	777/1666	4.34	4.36	4.19	4.11	4.34	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	3	10	22	53	4.42	657/1421	4.42	4.56	4.24	4.11	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	40	1	5	4	14	23	4.13	946/1617	4.13	4.35	4.15	3.99	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	5	3	6	20	25	30	3.87	971/1555	3.87	3.88	4.00	3.92	3.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	57	0	2	7	7	15	4.13	807/1543	4.13	4.24	4.06	3.86	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	1	1	10	28	47	4.37	713/1647	4.37	4.25	4.12	4.06	4.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	5	0	0	0	0	82	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	63	8	1	0	8	9	6	3.79	1179/1605	3.92	4.04	4.07	3.96	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	78	0	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	****/1514	4.63	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	76	0	1	0	3	1	14	4.42	****/1551	4.78	4.76	4.66	4.55	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	79	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	****/1503	4.44	4.15	4.24	4.17	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	79	0	1	0	3	3	9	4.19	****/1506	4.52	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	79	8	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	****/1311	3.99	3.98	3.85	3.68	3.99	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	8	7	14	18	34	3.78	1022/1490	3.78	3.88	4.05	3.85	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	5	5	12	16	43	4.07	986/1502	4.07	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.07	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	3	5	15	19	32	3.97	1064/1489	3.97	4.25	4.29	4.07	3.97	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	20	3	4	12	11	29	4.00	479/1006	4.00	3.84	4.00	3.81	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	89	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 226	****	4.00	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	91	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.37	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	90	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.36	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	91	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.30	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	91	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.03	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	91	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	94	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	92	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 55	****	4.50	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	92	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	92	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	92	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	92	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	4	A	20	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	21	1.00-1.99	0	B	31						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	3	C	22	General	1	Under-grad	95	Non-major	91
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	8	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	23	F	2	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						

I	0	Other	72
?	2		

Course Section: PHYS 121H 0101
 Title INTRO PHYSICS I-HONORS
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ERIC (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1325
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	914/1669	4.25	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	243/1666	4.75	4.36	4.19	4.11	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	170/1421	4.88	4.56	4.24	4.11	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.35	4.15	3.99	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	0	0	4	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.88	4.00	3.92	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	3	1	0	0	2.25	1530/1543	2.25	4.24	4.06	3.86	2.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.25	4.12	4.06	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	807/1668	4.86	4.85	4.67	4.62	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	918/1605	3.70	4.04	4.07	3.96	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	647/1514	4.53	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	1193/1551	4.75	4.76	4.66	4.55	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	1066/1503	3.33	4.15	4.24	4.17	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	0	5	3.88	1189/1506	3.58	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	764/1311	3.80	3.98	3.85	3.68	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1265/1490	3.25	3.88	4.05	3.85	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	522/1502	4.63	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	434/1489	4.75	4.25	4.29	4.07	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	235/1006	4.50	3.84	4.00	3.81	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	4.00	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.37	4.19	4.09	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.30	4.35	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PHYS 121H 0101
 Title INTRO PHYSICS I-HONORS
 Instructor: TAKACS, LASZLO (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1326
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	914/1669	4.25	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	243/1666	4.75	4.36	4.19	4.11	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	170/1421	4.88	4.56	4.24	4.11	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.35	4.15	3.99	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	0	0	4	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.88	4.00	3.92	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	3	1	0	0	2.25	1530/1543	2.25	4.24	4.06	3.86	2.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.25	4.12	4.06	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	807/1668	4.86	4.85	4.67	4.62	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1400/1605	3.70	4.04	4.07	3.96	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	923/1514	4.53	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	4.75	4.76	4.66	4.55	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	4	1	0	1	2.67	1458/1503	3.33	4.15	4.24	4.17	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1371/1506	3.58	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1311	3.80	3.98	3.85	3.68	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1265/1490	3.25	3.88	4.05	3.85	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	522/1502	4.63	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	434/1489	4.75	4.25	4.29	4.07	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	235/1006	4.50	3.84	4.00	3.81	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	4.00	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.37	4.19	4.09	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.30	4.35	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PHYS 122 0101
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ERIC (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 217
 Questionnaires: 94

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1327
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	0	4	12	22	55	4.38	769/1669	4.38	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	10	26	55	4.43	648/1666	4.43	4.36	4.19	4.11	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	9	25	57	4.46	607/1421	4.46	4.56	4.24	4.11	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	29	2	6	12	10	32	4.03	1011/1617	4.03	4.35	4.15	3.99	4.03	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	7	7	4	12	30	29	3.85	980/1555	3.85	3.88	4.00	3.92	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	38	2	4	11	16	19	3.88	1035/1543	3.88	4.24	4.06	3.86	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	7	24	60	4.55	424/1647	4.55	4.25	4.12	4.06	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	1	0	0	0	87	4.95	357/1668	4.95	4.85	4.67	4.62	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	0	1	8	36	31	4.28	666/1605	3.90	4.04	4.07	3.96	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	7	19	65	4.64	631/1514	4.64	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	4	14	72	4.71	954/1551	4.71	4.76	4.66	4.55	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	3	8	23	56	4.47	621/1503	4.47	4.15	4.24	4.17	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	7	20	60	4.55	594/1506	4.55	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	3	6	3	14	22	35	3.96	631/1311	3.96	3.98	3.85	3.68	3.96	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	13	5	15	19	22	3.43	1196/1490	3.43	3.88	4.05	3.85	3.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	10	8	19	17	20	3.39	1340/1502	3.39	4.32	4.26	4.06	3.39	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	13	5	11	20	19	3.40	1321/1489	3.40	4.25	4.29	4.07	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	25	34	1	3	8	7	16	3.97	517/1006	3.97	3.84	4.00	3.81	3.97	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	93	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	4.50	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	93	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	93	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	93	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	93	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	39	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	22	1.00-1.99	0	B	37						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	10	C	9	General	1	Under-grad	94	Non-major	90
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	23	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	26	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	84				
				?	3						

Course Section: PHYS 122 0101
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I
 Instructor: BUNCH, ANDREW (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 217
 Questionnaires: 94

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1328
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	0	4	12	22	55	4.38	769/1669	4.38	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	10	26	55	4.43	648/1666	4.43	4.36	4.19	4.11	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	9	25	57	4.46	607/1421	4.46	4.56	4.24	4.11	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	29	2	6	12	10	32	4.03	1011/1617	4.03	4.35	4.15	3.99	4.03	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	7	7	4	12	30	29	3.85	980/1555	3.85	3.88	4.00	3.92	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	38	2	4	11	16	19	3.88	1035/1543	3.88	4.24	4.06	3.86	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	7	24	60	4.55	424/1647	4.55	4.25	4.12	4.06	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	1	0	0	0	87	4.95	357/1668	4.95	4.85	4.67	4.62	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	61	8	0	1	13	8	3	3.52	1348/1605	3.90	4.04	4.07	3.96	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	79	0	1	1	7	1	5	3.53	****/1514	4.64	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	80	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	****/1551	4.71	4.76	4.66	4.55	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	80	0	1	2	1	3	7	3.93	****/1503	4.47	4.15	4.24	4.17	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	81	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	****/1506	4.55	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	81	8	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/1311	3.96	3.98	3.85	3.68	3.96	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	13	5	15	19	22	3.43	1196/1490	3.43	3.88	4.05	3.85	3.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	10	8	19	17	20	3.39	1340/1502	3.39	4.32	4.26	4.06	3.39	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	13	5	11	20	19	3.40	1321/1489	3.40	4.25	4.29	4.07	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	25	34	1	3	8	7	16	3.97	517/1006	3.97	3.84	4.00	3.81	3.97	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	93	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	55	****	4.50	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	93	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	93	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	46	****	5.00	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	93	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	93	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 39	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	22	1.00-1.99	B 37						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	C 9	General	1	Under-grad	94	Non-major	90
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	D 1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	84				
			? 3						

Course Section: PHYS 122L 0101
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS L
 Instructor: RENO, ROBERT C
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1329
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	6	7	7	3.95	1230/1669	3.95	4.48	4.23	4.02	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	10	9	4.40	691/1666	4.40	4.36	4.19	4.11	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1421	****	4.56	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.35	4.15	3.99	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	4	2	6	4	2	2.89	1472/1555	2.89	3.88	4.00	3.92	2.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	10	7	4.20	723/1543	4.20	4.24	4.06	3.86	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	458/1647	4.52	4.25	4.12	4.06	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	14	1	3.84	1140/1605	3.84	4.04	4.07	3.96	3.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	4	12	4.40	955/1514	4.40	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	1111/1551	4.60	4.76	4.66	4.55	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	6	1	12	4.20	932/1503	4.20	4.15	4.24	4.17	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	4	4	8	3.75	1243/1506	3.75	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	2	4	2	3	3.55	919/1311	3.55	3.98	3.85	3.68	3.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	1391/1490	2.83	3.88	4.05	3.85	2.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1357/1502	3.33	4.32	4.26	4.06	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1379/1489	3.17	4.25	4.29	4.07	3.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	62/ 226	4.61	4.00	4.20	3.98	4.61	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	66/ 233	4.67	4.37	4.19	4.09	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	68/ 225	4.83	4.36	4.50	4.42	4.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	1	16	4.78	65/ 223	4.78	4.30	4.35	4.19	4.78	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	76/ 206	4.50	4.03	4.15	4.01	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course Section: PHYS 224 0101
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I
 Instructor: GEORGE, IAN
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1330
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	0	1	7	13	4.57	511/1669	4.57	4.48	4.23	4.34	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	715/1666	4.38	4.36	4.19	4.29	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	453/1421	4.62	4.56	4.24	4.35	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	3	8	3	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.35	4.15	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	5	2	12	4.25	558/1555	4.25	3.88	4.00	3.96	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	552/1543	4.36	4.24	4.06	4.10	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	9	6	3.95	1102/1647	3.95	4.25	4.12	4.19	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	19	2	4.10	1482/1668	4.10	4.85	4.67	4.59	4.10	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	10	6	4.11	851/1605	4.11	4.04	4.07	4.15	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	9	9	4.24	1094/1514	4.24	4.57	4.39	4.39	4.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	1028/1551	4.67	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	7	9	4.14	978/1503	4.14	4.15	4.24	4.29	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	789/1506	4.38	4.22	4.26	4.33	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	0	4	5	6	3.94	665/1311	3.94	3.98	3.85	3.96	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1490	****	3.88	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1502	****	4.32	4.26	4.31	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1489	****	4.25	4.29	4.36	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	3.99	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	21
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course Section: PHYS 303 0101
 Title THERMAL/STATISTICAL PH
 Instructor: WORCHESKY, TERR
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1331
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	0	2	5	15	4.59	489/1669	4.59	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	11	4.41	691/1666	4.41	4.36	4.19	4.20	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	475/1421	4.59	4.56	4.24	4.25	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	612/1617	4.43	4.35	4.15	4.22	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	4	6	9	4.05	747/1555	4.05	3.88	4.00	4.03	4.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	250/1543	4.67	4.24	4.06	4.14	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	10	10	4.36	713/1647	4.36	4.25	4.12	4.14	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	320/1605	4.58	4.04	4.07	4.09	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	189/1514	4.91	4.57	4.39	4.46	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	512/1551	4.91	4.76	4.66	4.70	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	637/1503	4.45	4.15	4.24	4.28	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	14	4.41	770/1506	4.41	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	19	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1311	****	3.98	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1202/1490	3.43	3.88	4.05	4.11	3.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	729/1502	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.28	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	903/1489	4.29	4.25	4.29	4.35	4.29	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 12		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	1
84-150	5	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	21
			? 0		

Course Section: PHYS 316 0101
 Title EXTRAGALACTIC ASTRO/CO
 Instructor: BECKMANN, VOLKE
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1332
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	0	1	4	4	4.33	816/1669	4.33	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1028/1666	4.11	4.36	4.19	4.20	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.56	4.24	4.25	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.35	4.15	4.22	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	665/1555	4.14	3.88	4.00	4.03	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1035/1543	3.89	4.24	4.06	4.14	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	896/1647	4.22	4.25	4.12	4.14	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	4	3	1	3.44	1382/1605	3.44	4.04	4.07	4.09	3.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	892/1514	4.44	4.57	4.39	4.46	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1152/1551	4.56	4.76	4.66	4.70	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	4	2	1	3.11	1415/1503	3.11	4.15	4.24	4.28	3.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	3	2	3.56	1309/1506	3.56	4.22	4.26	4.30	3.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.98	3.85	3.97	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1490	****	3.88	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1502	****	4.32	4.26	4.28	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1489	****	4.25	4.29	4.35	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PHYS 330L 0101
 Title OPTICS LABORATORY
 Instructor: PITTMAN, TODD B
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1333
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	0	1	3	17	4.76	256/1669	4.76	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	425/1666	4.62	4.36	4.19	4.20	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	19	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.56	4.24	4.25	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	1	15	4.63	358/1617	4.63	4.35	4.15	4.22	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	2	10	4	3.94	872/1555	3.94	3.88	4.00	4.03	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	2	14	4.45	465/1543	4.45	4.24	4.06	4.14	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	5	3	10	3.86	1205/1647	3.86	4.25	4.12	4.14	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	268/1605	4.63	4.04	4.07	4.09	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	584/1514	4.67	4.57	4.39	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	256/1551	4.95	4.76	4.66	4.70	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	277/1503	4.75	4.15	4.24	4.28	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	4	12	4.29	884/1506	4.29	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	333/1311	4.40	3.98	3.85	3.97	4.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	3	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	27/ 226	4.88	4.00	4.20	4.17	4.88	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	38/ 233	4.85	4.37	4.19	4.13	4.85	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	54/ 225	4.90	4.36	4.50	4.45	4.90	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	42/ 223	4.90	4.30	4.35	4.27	4.90	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	2	2	2	5	9	3.85	144/ 206	3.85	4.03	4.15	4.08	3.85	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	0						

Course Section: PHYS 331L 0101
 Title MODERN PHYSICS LAB
 Instructor: WU, EN-SHINN
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1334
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	2	6	1	3.70	1391/1669	3.70	4.48	4.23	4.28	3.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	4	0	3.00	1578/1666	3.00	4.36	4.19	4.20	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.56	4.24	4.25	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1334/1617	3.60	4.35	4.15	4.22	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1272/1555	3.44	3.88	4.00	4.03	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1215/1543	3.63	4.24	4.06	4.14	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	3	1	1	2.60	1582/1647	2.60	4.25	4.12	4.14	2.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	901/1668	4.80	4.85	4.67	4.68	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1274/1605	3.67	4.04	4.07	4.09	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1324/1514	3.75	4.57	4.39	4.46	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1489/1551	3.50	4.76	4.66	4.70	3.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1423/1503	3.00	4.15	4.24	4.28	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1447/1506	2.60	4.22	4.26	4.30	2.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1311	****	3.98	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1490	****	3.88	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1502	****	4.32	4.26	4.28	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1489	****	4.25	4.29	4.35	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	4	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	140/ 226	4.00	4.00	4.20	4.17	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	117/ 233	4.22	4.37	4.19	4.13	4.22	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	187/ 225	4.00	4.36	4.50	4.45	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	193/ 223	3.67	4.30	4.35	4.27	3.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	3	1	4	1	0	2.33	203/ 206	2.33	4.03	4.15	4.08	2.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PHYS 407 0101
 Title ELECTROMAGNETIC THEORY
 Instructor: SPARLING, LYNN
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1335
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	1	4	9	4.40	734/1669	4.40	4.48	4.23	4.39	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	868/1666	4.27	4.36	4.19	4.22	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	607/1421	4.47	4.56	4.24	4.38	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	370/1617	4.63	4.35	4.15	4.22	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	665/1555	4.14	3.88	4.00	4.08	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	453/1543	4.45	4.24	4.06	4.18	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	759/1647	4.33	4.25	4.12	4.14	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	864/1605	4.08	4.04	4.07	4.16	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	3	7	2	3.64	1357/1514	3.64	4.57	4.39	4.45	3.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	1223/1551	4.47	4.76	4.66	4.73	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	2	8	2	3.71	1255/1503	3.71	4.15	4.24	4.27	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	2	7	3.80	1225/1506	3.80	4.22	4.26	4.29	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1311	****	3.98	3.85	3.88	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1490	****	3.88	4.05	4.26	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1502	****	4.32	4.26	4.46	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1489	****	4.25	4.29	4.52	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PHYS 601 0101
 Title QUANTUM MECHANICS
 Instructor: FRANSON, JAMES
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1336
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	0	0	2	6	4.75	269/1669	4.75	4.48	4.23	4.35	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	293/1666	4.71	4.36	4.19	4.19	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	331/1421	4.71	4.56	4.24	4.33	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	219/1617	4.75	4.35	4.15	4.24	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	461/1555	4.38	3.88	4.00	4.07	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.24	4.06	4.27	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.25	4.12	4.15	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	810/1605	4.14	4.04	4.07	4.13	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1514	4.88	4.57	4.39	4.37	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	594/1551	4.88	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.15	4.24	4.22	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	521/1506	4.63	4.22	4.26	4.24	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	731/1311	3.86	3.98	3.85	3.89	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	445/1490	4.50	3.88	4.05	4.18	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.32	4.26	4.46	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.25	4.29	4.44	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	841/1006	3.33	3.84	4.00	4.11	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.00	4.20	4.47	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	83/ 233	4.50	4.37	4.19	4.41	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.36	4.50	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.30	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.03	4.15	4.39	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.23	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.93	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	5.00	4.22	4.53	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.06	4.57	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.39	4.90	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.55	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	31/ 55	4.50	4.50	4.34	4.45	4.50	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.31	4.40	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 46	5.00	5.00	4.45	4.61	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.60	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: PHYS 601 0101
 Title: QUANTUM MECHANICS
 Instructor: FRANSON, JAMES
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1336
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	Major	5
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	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course Section: PHYS 605 0101
 Title MATHEMATICAL PHYSICS
 Instructor: ROUS, PHILIP
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1337
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	0	1	3	9	4.62	463/1669	4.62	4.48	4.23	4.35	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	516/1666	4.54	4.36	4.19	4.19	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	267/1421	4.77	4.56	4.24	4.33	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	288/1617	4.70	4.35	4.15	4.24	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	225/1555	4.67	3.88	4.00	4.07	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	130/1543	4.83	4.24	4.06	4.27	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	145/1647	4.85	4.25	4.12	4.15	4.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	6	2	4	3.69	1623/1668	3.69	4.85	4.67	4.83	3.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	298/1605	4.60	4.04	4.07	4.13	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.57	4.39	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	409/1551	4.92	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.15	4.24	4.22	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	340/1506	4.77	4.22	4.26	4.24	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.98	3.85	3.89	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	749/1490	4.18	3.88	4.05	4.18	4.18	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	427/1502	4.73	4.32	4.26	4.46	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	1	1	9	4.42	788/1489	4.42	4.25	4.29	4.44	4.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	873/1006	3.25	3.84	4.00	4.11	3.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.00	4.20	4.47	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.37	4.19	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.30	4.35	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.39	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	4.57	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.31	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.55	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	4.50	4.34	4.45	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.40	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.60	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: PHYS 605 0101
 Title MATHEMATICAL PHYSICS
 Instructor: ROUS, PHILIP
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1337
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	6	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	7	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course Section: PHYS 606 0101
 Title CLASSICAL MECHANICS
 Instructor: KRAMER, IVAN
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1338
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	0	1	1	4	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.48	4.23	4.35	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.36	4.19	4.19	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	197/1421	4.83	4.56	4.24	4.33	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	219/1617	4.75	4.35	4.15	4.24	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	262/1555	4.60	3.88	4.00	4.07	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	516/1543	4.40	4.24	4.06	4.27	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.25	4.12	4.15	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	789/1605	4.17	4.04	4.07	4.13	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.57	4.39	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.15	4.24	4.22	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	471/1506	4.67	4.22	4.26	4.24	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1115/1311	3.00	3.98	3.85	3.89	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	849/1490	4.00	3.88	4.05	4.18	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	393/1502	4.75	4.32	4.26	4.46	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.25	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	967/1006	2.50	3.84	4.00	4.11	2.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 226	****	4.00	4.20	4.47	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PHYS 609 0101
 Title MODERN OPTICS
 Instructor: SHIH, YANHUA
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1339
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	0	0	2	4	4.67	389/1669	4.67	4.48	4.23	4.35	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	984/1666	4.17	4.36	4.19	4.19	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	197/1421	4.83	4.56	4.24	4.33	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	161/1617	4.80	4.35	4.15	4.24	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	996/1555	3.83	3.88	4.00	4.07	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	298/1543	4.60	4.24	4.06	4.27	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	759/1647	4.33	4.25	4.12	4.15	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1068/1668	4.67	4.85	4.67	4.83	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.04	4.07	4.13	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	308/1514	4.83	4.57	4.39	4.37	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	959/1503	4.17	4.15	4.24	4.22	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	471/1506	4.67	4.22	4.26	4.24	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	1057/1311	3.25	3.98	3.85	3.89	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	192/1490	4.83	3.88	4.05	4.18	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.32	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.25	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	407/1006	4.20	3.84	4.00	4.11	4.20	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.37	4.19	4.41	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.36	4.50	4.65	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PHYS 614 0101
 Title INTRO SURFACE PHYS
 Instructor: GOUGOUSI, THEOD
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1340
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	0	0	1	6	4.86	167/1669	4.86	4.48	4.23	4.35	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.36	4.19	4.19	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.56	4.24	4.33	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	265/1617	4.71	4.35	4.15	4.24	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1555	5.00	3.88	4.00	4.07	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.24	4.06	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1647	5.00	4.25	4.12	4.15	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	239/1605	4.67	4.04	4.07	4.13	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.57	4.39	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.15	4.24	4.22	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.22	4.26	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1311	5.00	3.98	3.85	3.89	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1490	5.00	3.88	4.05	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	393/1502	4.75	4.32	4.26	4.46	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.25	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PHYS 621 0101
 Title: ATMOS PHYSICS I
 Instructor: SPARLING, LYNN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1341
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	207/1669	4.80	4.48	4.23	4.35	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.36	4.19	4.19	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	466/1421	4.60	4.56	4.24	4.33	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	641/1617	4.40	4.35	4.15	4.24	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.88	4.00	4.07	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	516/1543	4.40	4.24	4.06	4.27	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1250/1647	3.80	4.25	4.12	4.15	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	901/1668	4.80	4.85	4.67	4.83	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1357/1605	3.50	4.04	4.07	4.13	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	955/1514	4.45	4.57	4.39	4.37	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1066/1503	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.22	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	770/1506	4.70	4.22	4.26	4.24	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	483/1311	4.35	3.98	3.85	3.89	4.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	622/1490	4.33	3.88	4.05	4.18	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	818/1502	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.46	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	532/1489	4.67	4.25	4.29	4.44	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	4.11	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.37	4.19	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.30	4.35	4.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	4.57	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.31	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.55	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.50	4.34	4.45	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.61	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PHYS 621 0101
 Title: ATMOS PHYSICS I
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1342
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	207/1669	4.80	4.48	4.23	4.35	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.36	4.19	4.19	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	466/1421	4.60	4.56	4.24	4.33	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	641/1617	4.40	4.35	4.15	4.24	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.88	4.00	4.07	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	516/1543	4.40	4.24	4.06	4.27	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1250/1647	3.80	4.25	4.12	4.15	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	901/1668	4.80	4.85	4.67	4.83	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1605	3.50	4.04	4.07	4.13	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	799/1514	4.45	4.57	4.39	4.37	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	556/1503	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.22	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	4.70	4.22	4.26	4.24	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	264/1311	4.35	3.98	3.85	3.89	4.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	622/1490	4.33	3.88	4.05	4.18	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	818/1502	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.46	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	532/1489	4.67	4.25	4.29	4.44	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	4.11	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.37	4.19	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.30	4.35	4.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	4.57	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.31	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.55	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.50	4.34	4.45	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.61	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PHYS 632 0101
 Title THE PHYSICS OF ASTROP
 Instructor: HENRIKSEN, MARK
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1343
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	0	0	3	1	4.25	914/1669	4.25	4.48	4.23	4.35	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1334/1666	3.75	4.36	4.19	4.19	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	814/1421	4.25	4.56	4.24	4.33	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.35	4.15	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	558/1555	4.25	3.88	4.00	4.07	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	580/1543	4.33	4.24	4.06	4.27	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1275/1647	3.75	4.25	4.12	4.15	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.04	4.07	4.13	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1199/1514	4.00	4.57	4.39	4.37	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	880/1551	4.75	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	879/1503	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.22	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	4.22	4.26	4.24	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1227/1311	2.50	3.98	3.85	3.89	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	3.88	4.05	4.18	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	818/1502	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.46	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1038/1489	4.00	4.25	4.29	4.44	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	923/1006	3.00	3.84	4.00	4.11	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: PHYS 690 0101
 Title PROF SKILLS PHYS
 Instructor: HAYDEN, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1344
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	0	1	2	5	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.48	4.23	4.35	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	412/1666	4.63	4.36	4.19	4.19	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	280/1421	4.75	4.56	4.24	4.33	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	128/1617	4.88	4.35	4.15	4.24	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	340/1555	4.50	3.88	4.00	4.07	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.24	4.06	4.27	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1647	5.00	4.25	4.12	4.15	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	759/1605	4.20	4.04	4.07	4.13	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.57	4.39	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.15	4.24	4.22	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	353/1506	4.75	4.22	4.26	4.24	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1311	5.00	3.98	3.85	3.89	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	535/1490	4.43	3.88	4.05	4.18	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.32	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.25	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	479/1006	4.00	3.84	4.00	4.11	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.38	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.23	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.93	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	4.57	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.31	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.55	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PHYS 707 0101
 Title ADV ELECTROMAGNETIC TH
 Instructor: RUBIN, MORTON H
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1345
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.48	4.23	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	881/1666	4.25	4.36	4.19	4.19	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.56	4.24	4.33	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.35	4.15	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1359/1555	3.25	3.88	4.00	4.07	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.24	4.06	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.25	4.12	4.15	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.04	4.07	4.13	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.57	4.39	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	880/1551	4.75	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	879/1503	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.22	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	642/1506	4.50	4.22	4.26	4.24	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1227/1311	2.50	3.98	3.85	3.89	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1154/1490	3.50	3.88	4.05	4.18	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	393/1502	4.75	4.32	4.26	4.46	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1279/1489	3.50	4.25	4.29	4.44	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	235/1006	4.50	3.84	4.00	4.11	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: PHYS 721 0101
 Title: ATMOS RADIATION
 Instructor: ORAIOPOULOS, LA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1346
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.48	4.23	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	549/1666	4.50	4.36	4.19	4.19	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1222/1421	3.50	4.56	4.24	4.33	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.35	4.15	4.24	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1427/1555	3.00	3.88	4.00	4.07	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.24	4.06	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1526/1647	3.00	4.25	4.12	4.15	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1190/1668	4.50	4.85	4.67	4.83	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	918/1605	4.25	4.04	4.07	4.13	4.25	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.57	4.39	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1066/1503	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.22	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	642/1506	4.50	4.22	4.26	4.24	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PHYS 721 0101
 Title: ATMOS RADIATION
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1347
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.48	4.23	4.35	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	549/1666	4.50	4.36	4.19	4.19	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1222/1421	3.50	4.56	4.24	4.33	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.35	4.15	4.24	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1427/1555	3.00	3.88	4.00	4.07	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.24	4.06	4.27	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1526/1647	3.00	4.25	4.12	4.15	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1190/1668	4.50	4.85	4.67	4.83	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1605	4.25	4.04	4.07	4.13	4.25

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.57	4.39	4.37	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.76	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	556/1503	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.22	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	642/1506	4.50	4.22	4.26	4.24	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: PHYS 732 0101
 Title COMP FLUID DYNAM
 Instructor: JIANG, WEIYAN
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1348
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	3	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	988/1669	4.20	4.48	4.23	4.35	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1432/1666	3.60	4.36	4.19	4.19	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1372/1617	3.50	4.35	4.15	4.24	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1505/1555	2.67	3.88	4.00	4.07	2.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	895/1543	4.00	4.24	4.06	4.27	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	367/1647	4.60	4.25	4.12	4.15	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1312/1605	3.60	4.04	4.07	4.13	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	955/1514	4.40	4.57	4.39	4.37	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	1270/1551	4.40	4.76	4.66	4.72	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1366/1503	3.40	4.15	4.24	4.22	3.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1225/1506	3.80	4.22	4.26	4.24	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1311	****	3.98	3.85	3.89	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	3.88	4.05	4.18	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.32	4.26	4.46	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1361/1489	3.25	4.25	4.29	4.44	3.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	4.11	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/233	****	4.37	4.19	4.41	****	

Frequency Distribution

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