

Course-Section: PHYS 101 0101  
 Title IDEAS IN MODERN PHYSIC  
 Instructor: SINSKY, JOEL  
 Enrollment: 117  
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1141  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	0	5	12	30	4.53	522/1481	4.53	4.14	4.29	4.14	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	5	9	34	4.60	399/1481	4.60	4.01	4.23	4.18	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	1	4	9	34	4.58	423/1249	4.58	4.01	4.27	4.14	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	27	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	385/1424	4.55	3.98	4.21	4.06	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	8	1	2	12	8	15	3.89	808/1396	3.89	3.81	3.98	3.89	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	34	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	858/1342	3.93	4.07	4.07	3.88	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	1	0	0	4	10	34	4.63	321/1459	4.63	3.76	4.16	4.17	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	1	0	9	37	4.74	888/1480	4.74	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	1	1	14	29	4.50	334/1450	4.50	3.89	4.09	3.97	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	8	37	4.74	433/1409	4.74	4.16	4.42	4.36	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	2	0	46	4.92	450/1407	4.92	4.46	4.69	4.57	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	2	10	35	4.70	322/1399	4.70	3.90	4.26	4.23	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	6	39	4.77	299/1400	4.77	3.95	4.27	4.19	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	5	12	31	4.54	238/1179	4.54	3.39	3.96	3.85	4.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	3	6	14	4.33	507/1262	4.33	3.60	4.05	3.77	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	347/1259	4.76	3.76	4.29	4.06	4.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	467/1256	4.65	3.92	4.30	4.08	4.65	
4. Were special techniques successful	28	13	1	0	2	2	8	4.23	****/ 788	****	3.09	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	3.89	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 249	****	4.20	4.11	3.95	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.45	4.20	4.20	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	51	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	51	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: PHYS 101 0101  
 Title IDEAS IN MODERN PHYSIC  
 Instructor: SINSKY, JOEL  
 Enrollment: 117  
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1141  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	30	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	3	B	22						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	7	C	3	General	5	Under-grad	54	Non-major	54
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 105 0101  
 Title IDEAS IN ASTRONOMY  
 Instructor: TURNER, JANE  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1142  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	3	3	20	12	4.08	1024/1481	4.08	4.14	4.29	4.14	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	4	4	16	13	4.03	991/1481	4.03	4.01	4.23	4.18	4.03	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	5	6	10	17	4.03	885/1249	4.03	4.01	4.27	4.14	4.03	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	26	0	2	3	1	4	3.70	1213/1424	3.70	3.98	4.21	4.06	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	21	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	791/1396	3.92	3.81	3.98	3.89	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	7	16	12	3.95	832/1342	3.95	4.07	4.07	3.88	3.95	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	5	11	17	4.08	919/1459	4.08	3.76	4.16	4.17	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	3	31	4.91	631/1480	4.91	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	3	0	0	9	14	5	3.86	1014/1450	3.86	3.89	4.09	3.97	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	8	27	4.68	544/1409	4.68	4.16	4.42	4.36	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	4	30	4.78	785/1407	4.78	4.46	4.69	4.57	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	0	1	13	21	4.38	713/1399	4.38	3.90	4.26	4.23	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	12	18	4.19	921/1400	4.19	3.95	4.27	4.19	4.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	2	4	13	17	4.25	442/1179	4.25	3.39	3.96	3.85	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	5	5	12	7	3	2.94	1167/1262	2.94	3.60	4.05	3.77	2.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	8	4	12	1	6	2.77	1205/1259	2.77	3.76	4.29	4.06	2.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	4	13	5	6	3.23	1148/1256	3.23	3.92	4.30	4.08	3.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	26	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 788	****	3.09	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 17	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 19		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 5	C 5	General 9	Under-grad 38 Non-major 38
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 9	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 5	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0101  
 Title BASIC PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: DYMSKI, TERRANC (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 105  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1143  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies						Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	3	5	7	10	12	3.62	1315/1481	3.62	4.14	4.29	4.14	3.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	6	4	5	8	14	3.54	1306/1481	3.54	4.01	4.23	4.18	3.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	3	4	8	17	3.78	1031/1249	3.78	4.01	4.27	4.14	3.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	3	4	6	7	10	3.57	1255/1424	3.57	3.98	4.21	4.06	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	2	5	10	3	6	3.23	1206/1396	3.23	3.81	3.98	3.89	3.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	1	4	7	4	3	3.21	1217/1342	3.21	4.07	4.07	3.88	3.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	4	27	4.49	490/1459	4.49	3.76	4.16	4.17	4.49	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	31	6	4.16	1281/1480	4.16	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.16	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	4	4	9	12	5	3.29	1296/1450	3.65	3.89	4.09	3.97	3.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	3	4	14	15	4.05	1137/1409	4.05	4.16	4.42	4.36	4.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	5	10	20	4.36	1205/1407	4.36	4.46	4.69	4.57	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	4	11	7	11	3.53	1233/1399	3.53	3.90	4.26	4.23	3.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	2	8	6	15	3.67	1183/1400	3.67	3.95	4.27	4.19	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	26	2	2	1	2	2	3.00	****/1179	****	3.39	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	3	2	3	2	2	2.83	1186/1262	2.83	3.60	4.05	3.77	2.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	2	2	2	1	5	3.42	1123/1259	3.42	3.76	4.29	4.06	3.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	3	2	1	2	4	3.17	1156/1256	3.17	3.92	4.30	4.08	3.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	27	8	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 788	****	3.09	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	3	2	9	9	4	3.33	226/ 246	3.33	3.89	4.20	3.93	3.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	3	0	10	14	4.30	121/ 249	4.30	4.20	4.11	3.95	4.30	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	7	20	4.74	65/ 242	4.74	4.18	4.40	4.33	4.74	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	39/ 240	4.89	4.45	4.20	4.20	4.89	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	1	2	5	19	4.56	61/ 217	4.56	4.13	4.04	4.02	4.56	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors	4
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 15		Graduate 0
56-83	9	2.00-2.99 5	C 10	General	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 12	D 0		Under-grad 38
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	30
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0101  
 Title BASIC PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: ON, JASON P (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 105  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1144  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	3	5	7	10	12	3.62	1315/1481	3.62	4.14	4.29	4.14	3.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	6	4	5	8	14	3.54	1306/1481	3.54	4.01	4.23	4.18	3.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	3	4	8	17	3.78	1031/1249	3.78	4.01	4.27	4.14	3.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	3	4	6	7	10	3.57	1255/1424	3.57	3.98	4.21	4.06	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	2	5	10	3	6	3.23	1206/1396	3.23	3.81	3.98	3.89	3.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	1	4	7	4	3	3.21	1217/1342	3.21	4.07	4.07	3.88	3.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	4	27	4.49	490/1459	4.49	3.76	4.16	4.17	4.49	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	31	6	4.16	1281/1480	4.16	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.16	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	30	2	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/1450	3.65	3.89	4.09	3.97	3.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	33	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1409	4.05	4.16	4.42	4.36	4.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	33	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1407	4.36	4.46	4.69	4.57	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	33	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1399	3.53	3.90	4.26	4.23	3.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1400	3.67	3.95	4.27	4.19	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	33	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1179	****	3.39	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	3	2	3	2	2	2.83	1186/1262	2.83	3.60	4.05	3.77	2.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	2	2	2	1	5	3.42	1123/1259	3.42	3.76	4.29	4.06	3.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	3	2	1	2	4	3.17	1156/1256	3.17	3.92	4.30	4.08	3.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	27	8	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 788	****	3.09	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	3	2	9	9	4	3.33	226/ 246	3.33	3.89	4.20	3.93	3.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	3	0	10	14	4.30	121/ 249	4.30	4.20	4.11	3.95	4.30	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	7	20	4.74	65/ 242	4.74	4.18	4.40	4.33	4.74	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	39/ 240	4.89	4.45	4.20	4.20	4.89	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	1	2	5	19	4.56	61/ 217	4.56	4.13	4.04	4.02	4.56	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B 15			
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	5	C 10	General 1	Under-grad 38	Non-major 38
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	12	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 30		
				? 0			

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	7	13	16	11	9	3.04	1448/1481	3.04	4.14	4.29	4.14	3.04	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	5	10	19	11	10	3.20	1394/1481	3.20	4.01	4.23	4.18	3.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	8	7	13	12	16	3.38	1141/1249	3.38	4.01	4.27	4.14	3.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	24	4	5	9	4	9	3.29	1325/1424	3.29	3.98	4.21	4.06	3.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	18	4	14	6	6	2.54	1364/1396	2.54	3.81	3.98	3.89	2.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	23	7	4	10	8	3	2.88	1307/1342	2.88	4.07	4.07	3.88	2.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	5	8	13	29	4.20	827/1459	4.20	3.76	4.16	4.17	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	1	4	45	3	3.94	1391/1480	3.94	4.64	4.68	4.64	3.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	6	10	17	5	4	2.79	1401/1450	2.79	3.89	4.09	3.97	2.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	7	15	16	17	3.68	1267/1409	3.68	4.16	4.42	4.36	3.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	8	14	19	16	3.75	1344/1407	3.75	4.46	4.69	4.57	3.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	10	11	18	10	7	2.88	1350/1399	2.88	3.90	4.26	4.23	2.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	2	14	8	12	14	7	2.85	1339/1400	2.85	3.95	4.27	4.19	2.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	36	7	1	4	4	1	2.47	1131/1179	2.47	3.39	3.96	3.85	2.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	48	0	6	1	2	0	0	1.56	****/1262	****	3.60	4.05	3.77	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	48	0	4	0	3	1	1	2.44	****/1259	****	3.76	4.29	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	48	0	6	0	1	2	0	1.89	****/1256	****	3.92	4.30	4.08	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	8	7	7	7	3	2.69	244/ 246	2.69	3.89	4.20	3.93	2.69	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	4	8	7	10	3	3.00	230/ 249	3.00	4.20	4.11	3.95	3.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	4	10	4	8	6	3.06	239/ 242	3.06	4.18	4.40	4.33	3.06	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	6	5	6	4	11	3.28	209/ 240	3.28	4.45	4.20	4.20	3.28	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	2	6	8	8	8	3.44	172/ 217	3.44	4.13	4.04	4.02	3.44	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	56	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 16	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 24			
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	6	C 11	General 0	Under-grad 57	Non-major 57
84-150	21	3.00-3.49	15	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	18	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 53		
				? 1			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	5	0	5	9	17	26	18	3.57	1334/1481	3.57	4.14	4.29	4.14	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	3	19	23	30	3.99	1023/1481	3.99	4.01	4.23	4.18	3.99	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	3	3	6	30	33	4.16	810/1249	4.16	4.01	4.27	4.14	4.16	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	25	3	5	5	19	18	3.88	1101/1424	3.88	3.98	4.21	4.06	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	1	5	6	12	29	21	3.75	918/1396	3.75	3.81	3.98	3.89	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	39	6	2	4	12	12	3.61	1065/1342	3.61	4.07	4.07	3.88	3.61	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	1	0	4	13	23	33	4.16	854/1459	4.16	3.76	4.16	4.17	4.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	2	0	0	0	2	71	4.97	211/1480	4.97	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	3	0	15	34	14	3.85	1022/1450	3.46	3.89	4.09	3.97	3.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	1	7	30	36	4.32	979/1409	3.66	4.16	4.42	4.36	3.66	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	4	24	45	4.53	1091/1407	4.01	4.46	4.69	4.57	4.01	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	3	0	11	30	30	4.14	938/1399	3.44	3.90	4.26	4.23	3.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	2	4	11	30	26	4.01	1013/1400	3.30	3.95	4.27	4.19	3.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	7	10	6	15	24	12	3.33	976/1179	3.33	3.39	3.96	3.85	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	28	4	8	14	12	2.67	1206/1262	2.67	3.60	4.05	3.77	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	15	16	15	10	10	2.76	1209/1259	2.76	3.76	4.29	4.06	2.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	17	4	17	13	12	2.98	1172/1256	2.98	3.92	4.30	4.08	2.98	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	43	8	3	6	2	4	2.61	755/ 788	2.61	3.09	4.00	3.80	2.61	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	73	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	3.89	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	76	0	4	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	4.20	4.11	3.95	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	77	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	77	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	77	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	79	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	79	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	78	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	78	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	78	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	78	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	78	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	25	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	21	1.00-1.99 1	B 26		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 6	C 21	General 0	Under-grad 80 Non-major 77
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 18	D 4		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 26	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		

I	0	Other	63
?	2		



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	5	0	5	9	17	26	18	3.57	1334/1481	3.57	4.14	4.29	4.14	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	3	19	23	30	3.99	1023/1481	3.99	4.01	4.23	4.18	3.99	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	3	3	6	30	33	4.16	810/1249	4.16	4.01	4.27	4.14	4.16	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	25	3	5	5	19	18	3.88	1101/1424	3.88	3.98	4.21	4.06	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	1	5	6	12	29	21	3.75	918/1396	3.75	3.81	3.98	3.89	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	39	6	2	4	12	12	3.61	1065/1342	3.61	4.07	4.07	3.88	3.61	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	1	0	4	13	23	33	4.16	854/1459	4.16	3.76	4.16	4.17	4.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	2	0	0	0	2	71	4.97	211/1480	4.97	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	38	8	10	10	7	6	1	2.35	1436/1450	3.46	3.89	4.09	3.97	3.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	46	0	8	9	5	7	5	2.76	1386/1409	3.66	4.16	4.42	4.36	3.66	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	47	0	5	5	8	8	7	3.21	1387/1407	4.01	4.46	4.69	4.57	4.01	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	46	0	15	6	4	6	3	2.29	1394/1399	3.44	3.90	4.26	4.23	3.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	46	6	11	6	6	3	2	2.25	1387/1400	3.30	3.95	4.27	4.19	3.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	48	26	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	****/1179	3.33	3.39	3.96	3.85	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	28	4	8	14	12	2.67	1206/1262	2.67	3.60	4.05	3.77	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	15	16	15	10	10	2.76	1209/1259	2.76	3.76	4.29	4.06	2.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	17	4	17	13	12	2.98	1172/1256	2.98	3.92	4.30	4.08	2.98	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	43	8	3	6	2	4	2.61	755/ 788	2.61	3.09	4.00	3.80	2.61	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	73	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	3.89	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	76	0	4	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	4.20	4.11	3.95	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	77	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	77	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	77	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	79	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	79	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	78	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	78	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	78	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	78	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	78	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27 25	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55 21	1.00-1.99 1	B 26			
56-83 7	2.00-2.99 6	C 21	General 0	Under-grad 80	Non-major 77
84-150 1	3.00-3.49 18	D 4			
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00 26	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
		P 1			

I	0	Other	63
?	2		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	5	0	5	9	17	26	18	3.57	1334/1481	3.57	4.14	4.29	4.14	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	3	19	23	30	3.99	1023/1481	3.99	4.01	4.23	4.18	3.99	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	3	3	6	30	33	4.16	810/1249	4.16	4.01	4.27	4.14	4.16	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	25	3	5	5	19	18	3.88	1101/1424	3.88	3.98	4.21	4.06	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	1	5	6	12	29	21	3.75	918/1396	3.75	3.81	3.98	3.89	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	39	6	2	4	12	12	3.61	1065/1342	3.61	4.07	4.07	3.88	3.61	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	1	0	4	13	23	33	4.16	854/1459	4.16	3.76	4.16	4.17	4.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	2	0	0	0	2	71	4.97	211/1480	4.97	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	44	6	0	1	3	16	10	4.17	722/1450	3.46	3.89	4.09	3.97	3.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	50	0	2	1	6	10	11	3.90	1218/1409	3.66	4.16	4.42	4.36	3.66	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	51	0	1	0	3	11	14	4.28	1249/1407	4.01	4.46	4.69	4.57	4.01	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	52	0	2	1	3	14	8	3.89	1100/1399	3.44	3.90	4.26	4.23	3.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	51	5	1	4	5	7	7	3.63	1197/1400	3.30	3.95	4.27	4.19	3.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	51	22	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	****/1179	3.33	3.39	3.96	3.85	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	28	4	8	14	12	2.67	1206/1262	2.67	3.60	4.05	3.77	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	15	16	15	10	10	2.76	1209/1259	2.76	3.76	4.29	4.06	2.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	17	4	17	13	12	2.98	1172/1256	2.98	3.92	4.30	4.08	2.98	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	43	8	3	6	2	4	2.61	755/ 788	2.61	3.09	4.00	3.80	2.61	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	73	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	3.89	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	76	0	4	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	4.20	4.11	3.95	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	77	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	77	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	77	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	79	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	79	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	78	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	78	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	78	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	78	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	78	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27 25	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55 21	1.00-1.99 1	B 26			
56-83 7	2.00-2.99 6	C 21	General 0	Under-grad 80	Non-major 77
84-150 1	3.00-3.49 18	D 4			
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00 26	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
		P 1			

I	0	Other	63
?	2		

Course-Section: PHYS 122 0101  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ERIC (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 191  
 Questionnaires: 67

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1149  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	6	25	35	4.44	639/1481	4.44	4.14	4.29	4.14	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	23	36	4.39	671/1481	4.39	4.01	4.23	4.18	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	22	40	4.52	488/1249	4.52	4.01	4.27	4.14	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	30	0	1	8	14	13	4.08	918/1424	4.08	3.98	4.21	4.06	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	16	16	32	4.22	536/1396	4.22	3.81	3.98	3.89	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	29	0	0	3	17	16	4.36	444/1342	4.36	4.07	4.07	3.88	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	7	18	39	4.45	550/1459	4.45	3.76	4.16	4.17	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	65	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	1	6	28	25	4.28	599/1450	3.84	3.89	4.09	3.97	3.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	4	16	45	4.58	682/1409	4.27	4.16	4.42	4.36	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	10	53	4.78	766/1407	4.37	4.46	4.69	4.57	4.37	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	8	23	32	4.33	763/1399	4.12	3.90	4.26	4.23	4.12	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	1	8	17	36	4.31	816/1400	3.80	3.95	4.27	4.19	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	2	3	14	22	16	3.82	746/1179	3.82	3.39	3.96	3.85	3.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	18	8	10	10	10	2.75	1196/1262	2.75	3.60	4.05	3.77	2.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	14	5	13	13	10	3.00	1162/1259	3.00	3.76	4.29	4.06	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	9	7	6	9	19	3.44	1116/1256	3.44	3.92	4.30	4.08	3.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	34	2	4	6	5	1	2.94	723/ 788	2.94	3.09	4.00	3.80	2.94	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 23	Required for Majors	4
28-55	13	1.00-1.99 0	B 32		Graduate 0
56-83	19	2.00-2.99 11	C 10	General	1
84-150	13	3.00-3.49 20	D 0		67
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 21	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	59
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHYS 122 0101  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: BUNCH, ANDREW D (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 191  
 Questionnaires: 67

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1150  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	6	25	35	4.44	639/1481	4.44	4.14	4.29	4.14	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	23	36	4.39	671/1481	4.39	4.01	4.23	4.18	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	22	40	4.52	488/1249	4.52	4.01	4.27	4.14	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	30	0	1	8	14	13	4.08	918/1424	4.08	3.98	4.21	4.06	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	16	16	32	4.22	536/1396	4.22	3.81	3.98	3.89	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	29	0	0	3	17	16	4.36	444/1342	4.36	4.07	4.07	3.88	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	7	18	39	4.45	550/1459	4.45	3.76	4.16	4.17	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	65	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	26	8	0	2	19	9	3	3.39	1269/1450	3.84	3.89	4.09	3.97	3.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	43	0	1	2	4	7	10	3.96	1185/1409	4.27	4.16	4.42	4.36	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	43	0	0	3	5	6	10	3.96	1310/1407	4.37	4.46	4.69	4.57	4.37	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	43	0	0	4	4	6	10	3.92	1086/1399	4.12	3.90	4.26	4.23	4.12	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	42	4	5	1	4	5	6	3.29	1278/1400	3.80	3.95	4.27	4.19	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	42	20	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	****/1179	3.82	3.39	3.96	3.85	3.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	18	8	10	10	10	2.75	1196/1262	2.75	3.60	4.05	3.77	2.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	14	5	13	13	10	3.00	1162/1259	3.00	3.76	4.29	4.06	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	9	7	6	9	19	3.44	1116/1256	3.44	3.92	4.30	4.08	3.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	34	2	4	6	5	1	2.94	723/ 788	2.94	3.09	4.00	3.80	2.94	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 23	Required for Majors	4
28-55	13	1.00-1.99 0	B 32		Graduate 0
56-83	19	2.00-2.99 11	C 10	General	1
84-150	13	3.00-3.49 20	D 0		Under-grad 67
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 21	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	59
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHYS 122H 0101  
 Title  
 Instructor: GOUGOUSI, THEOD (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1151  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	0	2	4	4.29	805/1481	4.29	4.14	4.29	4.14	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	149/1481	4.86	4.01	4.23	4.18	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.01	4.27	4.14	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	645/1424	4.33	3.98	4.21	4.06	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	193/1396	4.67	3.81	3.98	3.89	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	135/1342	4.75	4.07	4.07	3.88	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	460/1459	4.50	3.76	4.16	4.17	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	334/1450	4.50	3.89	4.09	3.97	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	261/1409	4.68	4.16	4.42	4.36	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.46	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	170/1399	4.68	3.90	4.26	4.23	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	361/1400	4.61	3.95	4.27	4.19	4.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	894/1179	3.50	3.39	3.96	3.85	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	146/1262	4.86	3.60	4.05	3.77	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	402/1259	4.71	3.76	4.29	4.06	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	272/1256	4.83	3.92	4.30	4.08	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	133/ 788	4.67	3.09	4.00	3.80	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 122H 0101  
 Title  
 Instructor: GOUGOUSI, THEOD (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1152  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	0	2	4	4.29	805/1481	4.29	4.14	4.29	4.14	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	149/1481	4.86	4.01	4.23	4.18	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.01	4.27	4.14	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	645/1424	4.33	3.98	4.21	4.06	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	193/1396	4.67	3.81	3.98	3.89	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	135/1342	4.75	4.07	4.07	3.88	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	460/1459	4.50	3.76	4.16	4.17	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	334/1450	4.50	3.89	4.09	3.97	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	762/1409	4.68	4.16	4.42	4.36	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.46	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	567/1399	4.68	3.90	4.26	4.23	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	591/1400	4.61	3.95	4.27	4.19	4.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	894/1179	3.50	3.39	3.96	3.85	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	146/1262	4.86	3.60	4.05	3.77	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	402/1259	4.71	3.76	4.29	4.06	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	272/1256	4.83	3.92	4.30	4.08	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	133/ 788	4.67	3.09	4.00	3.80	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

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



Course-Section: PHYS 224 0101  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: GEORGE, IAN  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1153  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	196/1481	4.86	4.14	4.29	4.40	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	434/1481	4.57	4.01	4.23	4.29	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	334/1249	4.67	4.01	4.27	4.36	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1424	5.00	3.98	4.21	4.28	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	603/1396	4.14	3.81	3.98	3.94	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	542/1342	4.25	4.07	4.07	4.05	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	378/1459	4.57	3.76	4.16	4.17	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1193/1480	4.29	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	184/1450	4.71	3.89	4.09	4.15	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	261/1409	4.86	4.16	4.42	4.47	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1053/1407	4.57	4.46	4.69	4.78	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	491/1399	4.57	3.90	4.26	4.29	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	198/1400	4.86	3.95	4.27	4.34	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	526/1179	4.14	3.39	3.96	4.05	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	708/1262	4.00	3.60	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	783/1259	4.25	3.76	4.29	4.34	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256	5.00	3.92	4.30	4.28	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 7
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 303 0101  
 Title THERMAL/STATISTICAL PH  
 Instructor: WORCHESKY, TERR  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1154  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	3	5	12	4.45	626/1481	4.45	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	11	8	4.42	632/1481	4.42	4.01	4.23	4.23	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	451/1249	4.55	4.01	4.27	4.28	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	4	2	6	3.86	1123/1424	3.86	3.98	4.21	4.27	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	5	4	4	3.35	1158/1396	3.35	3.81	3.98	4.00	3.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	7	2	2	3.42	1160/1342	3.42	4.07	4.07	4.12	3.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	7	9	4.20	827/1459	4.20	3.76	4.16	4.17	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	494/1450	4.39	3.89	4.09	4.10	4.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	603/1409	4.63	4.16	4.42	4.43	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	300/1407	4.95	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	11	6	4.21	864/1399	4.21	3.90	4.26	4.27	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	5	9	4.00	1017/1400	4.00	3.95	4.27	4.28	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	16	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1179	****	3.39	3.96	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	610/1262	4.20	3.60	4.05	4.14	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	276/1259	4.83	3.76	4.29	4.34	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	296/1256	4.80	3.92	4.30	4.34	4.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 4	General	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives	1
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	19
			? 1		

Course-Section: PHYS 324 0101  
 Title MODERN PHYSICS  
 Instructor: RENO, ROBERT C  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1155  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	1	6	13	4.60	461/1481	4.60	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	661/1481	4.40	4.01	4.23	4.23	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	7	9	4.25	742/1249	4.25	4.01	4.27	4.28	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	533/1424	4.43	3.98	4.21	4.27	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	4	4	6	4	3.42	1125/1396	3.42	3.81	3.98	4.00	3.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/1342	****	4.07	4.07	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	3	16	4.70	242/1459	4.70	3.76	4.16	4.17	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	421/1480	4.95	4.64	4.68	4.65	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	431/1450	4.44	3.89	4.09	4.10	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	417/1409	4.75	4.16	4.42	4.43	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	500/1407	4.90	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	683/1399	4.40	3.90	4.26	4.27	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	3	13	4.40	704/1400	4.40	3.95	4.27	4.28	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	1	5	4	4	3.79	773/1179	3.79	3.39	3.96	4.02	3.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/1262	****	3.60	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/1259	****	3.76	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/1256	****	3.92	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.09	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 5	General 1	Under-grad 21 Non-major 7
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 19	
			? 2		

Course-Section: PHYS 331L 0101  
 Title MODERN PHYSICS LAB  
 Instructor: WU, EN-SHINN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1156  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	6	4.63	439/1481	4.63	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	374/1481	4.63	4.01	4.23	4.23	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.01	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	595/1424	4.38	3.98	4.21	4.27	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	435/1396	4.33	3.81	3.98	4.00	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	222/1342	4.63	4.07	4.07	4.12	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	647/1459	4.38	3.76	4.16	4.17	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	743/1480	4.88	4.64	4.68	4.65	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	127/1450	4.92	3.89	4.09	4.10	4.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	762/1409	4.50	4.16	4.42	4.43	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	963/1407	4.67	4.46	4.69	4.67	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	567/1399	4.50	3.90	4.26	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	791/1400	4.33	3.95	4.27	4.28	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	259/1179	4.50	3.39	3.96	4.02	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	31/ 246	4.83	3.89	4.20	4.20	4.83	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	45/ 249	4.71	4.20	4.11	4.23	4.71	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	137/ 242	4.43	4.18	4.40	4.36	4.43	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	94/ 240	4.57	4.45	4.20	3.96	4.57	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	78/ 217	4.43	4.13	4.04	4.11	4.43	

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 0	Major 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 8	Non-major 1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 6		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PHYS 331L 0101  
 Title MODERN PHYSICS LAB  
 Instructor: WU, EN-SHINN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1157  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	439/1481	4.63	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	374/1481	4.63	4.01	4.23	4.23	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.01	4.27	4.28	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	595/1424	4.38	3.98	4.21	4.27	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	435/1396	4.33	3.81	3.98	4.00	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	222/1342	4.63	4.07	4.07	4.12	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	647/1459	4.38	3.76	4.16	4.17	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	743/1480	4.88	4.64	4.68	4.65	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1450	4.92	3.89	4.09	4.10	4.92
-----														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	31/ 246	4.83	3.89	4.20	4.20	4.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	45/ 249	4.71	4.20	4.11	4.23	4.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	137/ 242	4.43	4.18	4.40	4.36	4.43
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	94/ 240	4.57	4.45	4.20	3.96	4.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	78/ 217	4.43	4.13	4.04	4.11	4.43

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	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 340L 0101  
 Title  
 Instructor: MCMILLAN, WALLA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1158  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	2	0	1	2	1	2	11	4.18	938/1481	4.18	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	4	9	3	3.76	1200/1481	3.76	4.01	4.23	4.23	3.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	2	7	7	4.12	846/1249	4.12	4.01	4.27	4.28	4.12	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	1	3	3	7	3.93	1048/1424	3.93	3.98	4.21	4.27	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	2	7	3	3	3.31	1176/1396	3.31	3.81	3.98	4.00	3.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	0	4	6	5	3.71	1183/1459	3.71	3.76	4.16	4.17	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	421/1480	4.94	4.64	4.68	4.65	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	5	7	3	3.69	1151/1450	3.34	3.89	4.09	4.10	3.34	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	1	5	9	4.18	1080/1409	3.77	4.16	4.42	4.43	3.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	5	11	4.47	1130/1407	3.83	4.46	4.69	4.67	3.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	4	7	4	3.71	1182/1399	3.40	3.90	4.26	4.27	3.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	6	8	4.18	929/1400	3.64	3.95	4.27	4.28	3.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	1	5	3	3	3.46	914/1179	2.92	3.39	3.96	4.02	2.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	507/1262	4.33	3.60	4.05	4.14	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	895/1259	4.00	3.76	4.29	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	826/1256	4.17	3.92	4.30	4.34	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 788	****	3.09	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	3	0	6	8	4.12	148/ 246	4.12	3.89	4.20	4.20	4.12	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	2	0	4	10	4.18	135/ 249	4.18	4.20	4.11	4.23	4.18	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	1	0	4	6	6	3.94	194/ 242	3.94	4.18	4.40	4.36	3.94	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	0	1	3	12	4.47	109/ 240	4.47	4.45	4.20	3.96	4.47	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	2	0	5	3	7	3.76	151/ 217	3.76	4.13	4.04	4.11	3.76	

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	2	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 2		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 2		

Course-Section: PHYS 340L 0101  
 Title  
 Instructor: MCMILLAN, WALLA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1159  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	2	0	1	2	1	2	11	4.18	938/1481	4.18	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	4	9	3	3.76	1200/1481	3.76	4.01	4.23	4.23	3.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	2	7	7	4.12	846/1249	4.12	4.01	4.27	4.28	4.12	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	1	3	3	7	3.93	1048/1424	3.93	3.98	4.21	4.27	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	2	7	3	3	3.31	1176/1396	3.31	3.81	3.98	4.00	3.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	0	4	6	5	3.71	1183/1459	3.71	3.76	4.16	4.17	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	421/1480	4.94	4.64	4.68	4.65	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	2	0	7	2	1	3.00	1354/1450	3.34	3.89	4.09	4.10	3.34	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	2	3	2	3	3.36	1319/1409	3.77	4.16	4.42	4.43	3.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	1	3	1	5	1	3.18	1389/1407	3.83	4.46	4.69	4.67	3.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	2	2	1	5	1	3.09	1316/1399	3.40	3.90	4.26	4.27	3.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	1	2	2	1	3	2	3.10	1308/1400	3.64	3.95	4.27	4.28	3.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	3	3	1	2	2	0	2.38	1142/1179	2.92	3.39	3.96	4.02	2.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	507/1262	4.33	3.60	4.05	4.14	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	895/1259	4.00	3.76	4.29	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	826/1256	4.17	3.92	4.30	4.34	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 788	****	3.09	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	3	0	6	8	4.12	148/ 246	4.12	3.89	4.20	4.20	4.12	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	2	0	4	10	4.18	135/ 249	4.18	4.20	4.11	4.23	4.18	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	1	0	4	6	6	3.94	194/ 242	3.94	4.18	4.40	4.36	3.94	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	0	1	3	12	4.47	109/ 240	4.47	4.45	4.20	3.96	4.47	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	2	0	5	3	7	3.76	151/ 217	3.76	4.13	4.04	4.11	3.76	

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	2	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 2		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 2		

Course-Section: PHYS 408 0101  
 Title OPTICS  
 Instructor: KRAMER, IVAN  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1160  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	0	3	2	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.14	4.29	4.45	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.01	4.23	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	334/1249	4.67	4.01	4.27	4.44	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1424	4.50	3.98	4.21	4.35	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1025/1396	3.60	3.81	3.98	4.09	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.07	4.07	4.21	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	460/1459	4.50	3.76	4.16	4.25	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	722/1450	4.17	3.89	4.09	4.28	4.17	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1086/1409	4.17	4.16	4.42	4.51	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1107/1407	4.50	4.46	4.69	4.79	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	753/1399	4.33	3.90	4.26	4.36	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	591/1400	4.50	3.95	4.27	4.38	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1179	****	3.39	3.96	4.07	****	

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	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						



Course-Section: PHYS 424 0101  
 Title INTRO QUANTAM MECHANIC  
 Instructor: MCCANN, KEVIN  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1161  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	3	11	4.79	256/1481	4.79	4.14	4.29	4.45	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	264/1481	4.71	4.01	4.23	4.32	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	278/1249	4.71	4.01	4.27	4.44	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	364/1424	4.57	3.98	4.21	4.35	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	297/1396	4.50	3.81	3.98	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	91/1342	4.89	4.07	4.07	4.21	4.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	378/1459	4.57	3.76	4.16	4.25	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	159/1450	4.77	3.89	4.09	4.28	4.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.16	4.42	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.46	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	234/1399	4.79	3.90	4.26	4.36	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	198/1400	4.86	3.95	4.27	4.38	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	692/1179	3.90	3.39	3.96	4.07	3.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1262	****	3.60	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1259	****	3.76	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1256	****	3.92	4.30	4.60	****	

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 1 Major 11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 3	General	1	Under-grad 14 Non-major 4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				P 0			
				I 0	Other	12	
				? 0			

Course-Section: PHYS 602 0101  
 Title STATISTICAL MECHANICS  
 Instructor: KUNDU, PRASUN  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1162  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	3	4	3	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.14	4.29	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	1118/1481	3.90	4.01	4.23	4.11	3.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	3	2	3.50	1118/1249	3.50	4.01	4.27	4.24	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1251/1424	3.57	3.98	4.21	4.16	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	877/1396	3.80	3.81	3.98	4.00	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	683/1342	4.11	4.07	4.07	4.18	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1183/1459	3.70	3.76	4.16	4.01	3.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	4	3	2	3.50	1223/1450	3.50	3.89	4.09	3.96	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	514/1409	4.70	4.16	4.42	4.36	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	930/1407	4.70	4.46	4.69	4.73	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	2	1	4	3.60	1217/1399	3.60	3.90	4.26	4.16	3.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	1170/1400	3.70	3.95	4.27	4.17	3.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1099/1179	2.80	3.39	3.96	3.81	2.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	1	0	2	2.83	1186/1262	2.83	3.60	4.05	4.07	2.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	0	2	0	2	3.00	1162/1259	3.00	3.76	4.29	4.30	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1156/1256	3.17	3.92	4.30	4.33	3.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	564/ 788	3.67	3.09	4.00	3.97	3.67	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	4.20	4.11	3.93	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.23	****	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.65	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.27	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.58	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.95	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 607 0101  
 Title ELECTROMAG WAVES/RADIA  
 Instructor: RUBIN, MORTON H  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1163  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	3	4.75	292/1481	4.75	4.14	4.29	4.28	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.01	4.23	4.11	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.01	4.27	4.24	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	217/1424	4.75	3.98	4.21	4.16	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	502/1396	4.25	3.81	3.98	4.00	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	303/1342	4.50	4.07	4.07	4.18	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	196/1459	4.75	3.76	4.16	4.01	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	217/1450	4.67	3.89	4.09	3.96	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	417/1409	4.75	4.16	4.42	4.36	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	823/1407	4.75	4.46	4.69	4.73	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	828/1399	4.25	3.90	4.26	4.16	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1400	5.00	3.95	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	177/1179	4.67	3.39	3.96	3.81	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	887/1262	3.75	3.60	4.05	4.07	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	895/1259	4.00	3.76	4.29	4.30	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	773/1256	4.25	3.92	4.30	4.33	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	671/ 788	3.33	3.09	4.00	3.97	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 610 0101  
 Title QUANTUM ELECTRONICS  
 Instructor: SHIH, YANHUA  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1164  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	0	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.14	4.29	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.01	4.23	4.11	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.24	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	959/1424	4.00	3.98	4.21	4.16	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	707/1396	4.00	3.81	3.98	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.18	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1380/1459	3.00	3.76	4.16	4.01	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	836/1450	4.00	3.89	4.09	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.16	4.42	4.36	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.46	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	3.90	4.26	4.16	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1017/1400	4.00	3.95	4.27	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1177/1179	1.00	3.39	3.96	3.81	1.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	708/1262	4.00	3.60	4.05	4.07	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	3.76	4.29	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	901/1256	4.00	3.92	4.30	4.33	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	787/ 788	1.00	3.09	4.00	3.97	1.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: PHYS 615 0101  
 Title INTRO NANOPHYS/NANOSTR  
 Instructor: ROUS, PHILIP  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1165  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	395/1481	4.67	4.14	4.29	4.28	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.01	4.23	4.11	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1046/1249	3.75	4.01	4.27	4.24	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1138/1424	3.83	3.98	4.21	4.16	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	193/1396	4.67	3.81	3.98	4.00	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1115/1342	3.50	4.07	4.07	4.18	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1201/1459	3.67	3.76	4.16	4.01	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	2.83	1477/1480	2.83	4.64	4.68	4.74	2.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	546/1450	4.33	3.89	4.09	3.96	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	559/1409	4.67	4.16	4.42	4.36	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	659/1407	4.83	4.46	4.69	4.73	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	376/1399	4.67	3.90	4.26	4.16	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	421/1400	4.67	3.95	4.27	4.17	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	997/1179	3.25	3.39	3.96	3.81	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1262	****	3.60	4.05	4.07	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1259	****	3.76	4.29	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1256	****	3.92	4.30	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.20	4.11	3.93	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.23	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.46	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.16	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.71	****	

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 0		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
					5
					1
					1

Course-Section: PHYS 622 0101  
 Title: ATMOS PHYSICS II  
 Instructor: ~~MARTINS, JOSE~~ (Instr. A) Chu, Allen  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1166  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	844/1481	4.25	4.14	4.29	4.28	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.01	4.23	4.11	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.24	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	645/1424	4.33	3.98	4.21	4.16	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	435/1396	4.33	3.81	3.98	4.00	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	190/1342	4.67	4.07	4.07	4.18	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1.00	1456/1459	1.00	3.76	4.16	4.01	1.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	2.00	1443/1450	3.58	3.89	4.09	3.96	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	1405/1409	3.92	4.16	4.42	4.36	3.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1386/1407	3.92	4.46	4.69	4.73	3.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	2.25	1395/1399	3.75	3.90	4.26	4.16	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	1397/1400	3.42	3.95	4.27	4.17	3.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1041/1179	2.67	3.39	3.96	3.81	2.67	

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	2	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 622 0101  
 Title: ATMOS PHYSICS II  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1167  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	3	1	4.25	844/1481	4.25	4.14	4.29	4.28	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.01	4.23	4.11	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.24	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	645/1424	4.33	3.98	4.21	4.16	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	435/1396	4.33	3.81	3.98	4.00	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	190/1342	4.67	4.07	4.07	4.18	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1.00	1456/1459	1.00	3.76	4.16	4.01	1.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	836/1450	3.58	3.89	4.09	3.96	3.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	417/1409	3.92	4.16	4.42	4.36	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1296/1407	3.92	4.46	4.69	4.73	3.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	828/1399	3.75	3.90	4.26	4.16	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	867/1400	3.42	3.95	4.27	4.17	3.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1156/1179	2.67	3.39	3.96	3.81	2.67

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	2	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 622 0101  
 Title: ATMOS PHYSICS II  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1168  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	844/1481	4.25	4.14	4.29	4.28	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.01	4.23	4.11	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.24	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	645/1424	4.33	3.98	4.21	4.16	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	435/1396	4.33	3.81	3.98	4.00	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	190/1342	4.67	4.07	4.07	4.18	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1.00	1456/1459	1.00	3.76	4.16	4.01	1.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	164/1450	3.58	3.89	4.09	3.96	3.58	
-----															
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1409	3.92	4.16	4.42	4.36	3.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1107/1407	3.92	4.46	4.69	4.73	3.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	267/1399	3.75	3.90	4.26	4.16	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	867/1400	3.42	3.95	4.27	4.17	3.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1041/1179	2.67	3.39	3.96	3.81	2.67	

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	2	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
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	4				
				?	0						



Course-Section: PHYS 631 0101  
 Title THE PHYSICS OF ASTROPH  
 Instructor: HENRIKSEN, MARK  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1169  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	1	0	3.00	1451/1481	3.00	4.14	4.29	4.28	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1420/1481	3.00	4.01	4.23	4.11	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.24	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	740/1424	4.25	3.98	4.21	4.16	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	502/1396	4.25	3.81	3.98	4.00	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.07	4.07	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	961/1459	4.00	3.76	4.16	4.01	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1354/1450	3.00	3.89	4.09	3.96	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1293/1409	3.50	4.16	4.42	4.36	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.46	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1363/1399	2.75	3.90	4.26	4.16	2.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1312/1400	3.00	3.95	4.27	4.17	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	972/1179	3.33	3.39	3.96	3.81	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	995/1262	3.50	3.60	4.05	4.07	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1259	5.00	3.76	4.29	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	5.00	3.92	4.30	4.33	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 0	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	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 0
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 3		

Course-Section: PHYS 640 0101  
 Title COMPUTATIONAL PHYSICS  
 Instructor: MCCANN, KEVIN  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1170  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	0	4	6	4.36	718/1481	4.36	4.14	4.29	4.28	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	1172/1481	3.82	4.01	4.23	4.11	3.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.01	4.27	4.24	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	4	1	3	3.67	1224/1424	3.67	3.98	4.21	4.16	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	985/1396	3.67	3.81	3.98	4.00	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	270/1342	4.56	4.07	4.07	4.18	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	4	1	2	3.10	1369/1459	3.10	3.76	4.16	4.01	3.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	974/1480	4.64	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	8	0	3.89	989/1450	3.89	3.89	4.09	3.96	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	1074/1409	4.18	4.16	4.42	4.36	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	1076/1407	4.55	4.46	4.69	4.73	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1217/1399	3.60	3.90	4.26	4.16	3.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	921/1400	4.18	3.95	4.27	4.17	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	404/1179	4.30	3.39	3.96	3.81	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1262	4.67	3.60	4.05	4.07	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	729/1259	4.33	3.76	4.29	4.30	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	723/1256	4.33	3.92	4.30	4.33	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.09	4.00	3.97	****	

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 4		Graduate 6
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 5
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	9
			? 1		

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

Course-Section: PHYS 701 0101  
 Title QUANTUM MECHANICS II  
 Instructor: TAKACS, LASZLO  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1171  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	2	0	5	2	3.78	1242/1481	3.78	4.14	4.29	4.28	3.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1118/1481	3.90	4.01	4.23	4.11	3.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	4	1	3.44	1128/1249	3.44	4.01	4.27	4.24	3.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	0	2	3	1	3.13	1351/1424	3.13	3.98	4.21	4.16	3.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	707/1396	4.00	3.81	3.98	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	1060/1342	3.63	4.07	4.07	4.18	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1142/1459	3.78	3.76	4.16	4.01	3.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1081/1450	3.78	3.89	4.09	3.96	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	705/1409	4.56	4.16	4.42	4.36	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	728/1407	4.80	4.46	4.69	4.73	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1196/1399	3.67	3.90	4.26	4.16	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1135/1400	3.78	3.95	4.27	4.17	3.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	760/1179	3.80	3.39	3.96	3.81	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	1146/1262	3.00	3.60	4.05	4.07	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	895/1259	4.00	3.76	4.29	4.30	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1084/1256	3.60	3.92	4.30	4.33	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.09	4.00	3.97	****	

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 3		Graduate 5
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		5
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 1		

Course-Section: PHYS 722 0101  
 Title: ATMOS REMOTE SENS  
 Instructor: TORRES, OMAR (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1172  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	0	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.14	4.29	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	1476/1481	2.00	4.01	4.23	4.11	2.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1248/1249	1.50	4.01	4.27	4.24	1.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1415/1424	2.50	3.98	4.21	4.16	2.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1391/1396	2.00	3.81	3.98	4.00	2.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1269/1342	3.00	4.07	4.07	4.18	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	1438/1459	2.00	3.76	4.16	4.01	2.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1469/1480	3.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	3.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1354/1450	3.00	3.89	4.09	3.96	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1356/1409	2.75	4.16	4.42	4.36	2.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1296/1407	4.00	4.46	4.69	4.73	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1325/1399	3.00	3.90	4.26	4.16	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1230/1400	3.75	3.95	4.27	4.17	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1041/1179	3.00	3.39	3.96	3.81	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	708/1262	4.00	3.60	4.05	4.07	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1162/1259	3.00	3.76	4.29	4.30	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	901/1256	4.00	3.92	4.30	4.33	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	713/ 788	3.00	3.09	4.00	3.97	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: PHYS 722 0101  
 Title: ATMOS REMOTE SENS  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1173  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	0	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.14	4.29	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	1476/1481	2.00	4.01	4.23	4.11	2.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1248/1249	1.50	4.01	4.27	4.24	1.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1415/1424	2.50	3.98	4.21	4.16	2.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1391/1396	2.00	3.81	3.98	4.00	2.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1269/1342	3.00	4.07	4.07	4.18	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	1438/1459	2.00	3.76	4.16	4.01	2.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1469/1480	3.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	3.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1354/1450	3.00	3.89	4.09	3.96	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1395/1409	2.75	4.16	4.42	4.36	2.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1296/1407	4.00	4.46	4.69	4.73	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1325/1399	3.00	3.90	4.26	4.16	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1017/1400	3.75	3.95	4.27	4.17	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1041/1179	3.00	3.39	3.96	3.81	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	708/1262	4.00	3.60	4.05	4.07	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1162/1259	3.00	3.76	4.29	4.30	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	901/1256	4.00	3.92	4.30	4.33	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	713/ 788	3.00	3.09	4.00	3.97	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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