

Course-Section: PHYS 100 0101  
 Title IDEAS IN PHYSICS  
 Instructor: SINSKY, JOEL  
 Enrollment: 122  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1274  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

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	2	0	0	0	5	9	31	4.58	540/1639	4.58	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	38	4.80	199/1639	4.80	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	41	4.89	168/1397	4.89	4.40	4.28	4.18	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	28	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	270/1583	4.72	4.02	4.19	4.01	4.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	3	2	4	9	24	4.17	655/1532	4.17	3.74	4.01	3.88	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	31	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	367/1504	4.50	3.92	4.05	3.78	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	5	36	4.75	218/1612	4.75	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	37	7	4.11	1447/1635	4.11	4.89	4.65	4.56	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	3	15	22	4.47	416/1579	4.48	4.03	4.08	3.95	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	40	4.87	271/1518	4.87	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	41	4.95	273/1520	4.95	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	9	34	4.75	299/1517	4.75	4.20	4.27	4.20	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	5	36	4.67	446/1550	4.67	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	2	11	31	4.52	256/1295	4.52	4.03	3.94	3.84	4.52	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	5	4	16	4.31	582/1398	4.31	3.80	4.07	3.85	4.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	0	10	16	4.62	534/1391	4.62	4.17	4.30	4.07	4.62	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	1	2	5	19	4.56	609/1388	4.56	4.08	4.28	4.01	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	12	1	1	1	1	11	4.33	307/ 958	4.33	3.88	3.93	3.71	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 224	****	3.76	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 240	****	3.77	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.14	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.26	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	44	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.01	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	43	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	44	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: PHYS 100 0101  
 Title IDEAS IN PHYSICS  
 Instructor: SINSKY, JOEL  
 Enrollment: 122  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1274  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	24	Required for Majors	30	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	9	Under-grad	47	Non-major	46
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0101  
 Title BASIC PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: CUI, LILI (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1275  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	615/1639	4.20	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	813/1639	4.13	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	342/1397	4.25	4.40	4.28	4.18	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	402/1583	3.81	4.02	4.19	4.01	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	0	6	4.11	692/1532	3.52	3.74	4.01	3.88	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	1	0	5	4.00	824/1504	3.74	3.92	4.05	3.78	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	1175/1612	4.15	4.26	4.16	4.10	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1635	4.96	4.89	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	3	5	0	3.44	1345/1579	3.95	4.03	4.08	3.95	4.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	561/1518	4.47	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	546/1520	4.76	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	1083/1517	4.02	4.20	4.27	4.20	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	860/1550	4.25	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	167/1295	4.15	4.03	3.94	3.84	4.85	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	105/ 224	3.51	3.76	4.10	3.90	4.20	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	2	1	0	1	6	3.80	182/ 240	3.69	3.77	4.11	4.01	3.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	138/ 219	4.21	4.14	4.44	4.44	4.40	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 215	4.10	4.26	4.35	4.43	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	19/ 198	3.88	4.01	4.18	4.25	4.80	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0101  
 Title BASIC PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: DAVIDSON, ANTHO (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1276  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	615/1639	4.20	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	813/1639	4.13	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	342/1397	4.25	4.40	4.28	4.18	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	402/1583	3.81	4.02	4.19	4.01	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	0	6	4.11	692/1532	3.52	3.74	4.01	3.88	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	1	0	5	4.00	824/1504	3.74	3.92	4.05	3.78	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	1175/1612	4.15	4.26	4.16	4.10	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1635	4.96	4.89	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	269/1579	3.95	4.03	4.08	3.95	4.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	529/1518	4.47	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	674/1520	4.76	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	510/1517	4.02	4.20	4.27	4.20	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	231/1550	4.25	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1295	4.15	4.03	3.94	3.84	4.85	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	105/ 224	3.51	3.76	4.10	3.90	4.20	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	2	1	0	1	6	3.80	182/ 240	3.69	3.77	4.11	4.01	3.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	138/ 219	4.21	4.14	4.44	4.44	4.40	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 215	4.10	4.26	4.35	4.43	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	19/ 198	3.88	4.01	4.18	4.25	4.80	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0102  
 Title BASIC PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: DAVIDSON, ANTHO  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1277  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	2	1	2	3	8	3.88	1274/1639	4.20	4.28	4.27	4.08	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	1	4	8	4.00	1090/1639	4.13	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	1	5	7	4.00	973/1397	4.25	4.40	4.28	4.18	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	3	4	2	5	3.47	1423/1583	3.81	4.02	4.19	4.01	3.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	3	7	3.87	942/1532	3.52	3.74	4.01	3.88	3.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	3	2	0	6	3.82	1003/1504	3.74	3.92	4.05	3.78	3.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	2	2	9	4.20	882/1612	4.15	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	463/1635	4.96	4.89	4.65	4.56	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	569/1579	3.95	4.03	4.08	3.95	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	3	3	7	3.93	1293/1518	4.47	4.50	4.43	4.38	3.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	1166/1520	4.76	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	5	2	6	3.73	1268/1517	4.02	4.20	4.27	4.20	3.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	5	0	8	3.87	1182/1550	4.25	4.20	4.22	4.17	3.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	2	0	3	7	4.25	459/1295	4.15	4.03	3.94	3.84	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1398	3.33	3.80	4.07	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1391	3.33	4.17	4.30	4.07	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/1388	3.33	4.08	4.28	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 958	****	3.88	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	3	1	1	5	4	3.43	200/ 224	3.51	3.76	4.10	3.90	3.43	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	2	3	0	4	5	3.50	206/ 240	3.69	3.77	4.11	4.01	3.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	135/ 219	4.21	4.14	4.44	4.44	4.43	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	70/ 215	4.10	4.26	4.35	4.43	4.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	72/ 198	3.88	4.01	4.18	4.25	4.43	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0103  
 Title BASIC PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: SCHOU, PAUL B  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1278  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	1	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	919/1639	4.20	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1090/1639	4.13	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	925/1397	4.25	4.40	4.28	4.18	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1440/1583	3.81	4.02	4.19	4.01	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1421/1532	3.52	3.74	4.01	3.88	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1249/1504	3.74	3.92	4.05	3.78	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	1	2	2	3.38	1447/1612	4.15	4.26	4.16	4.10	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	706/1635	4.96	4.89	4.65	4.56	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	1	4.00	889/1579	3.95	4.03	4.08	3.95	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	1094/1518	4.47	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1292/1520	4.76	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1199/1517	4.02	4.20	4.27	4.20	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1077/1550	4.25	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	1023/1295	4.15	4.03	3.94	3.84	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1183/1398	3.33	3.80	4.07	3.85	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1265/1391	3.33	4.17	4.30	4.07	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1248/1388	3.33	4.08	4.28	4.01	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 958	****	3.88	3.93	3.71	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	203/ 224	3.51	3.76	4.10	3.90	3.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	202/ 240	3.69	3.77	4.11	4.01	3.57
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	199/ 219	4.21	4.14	4.44	4.44	3.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	204/ 215	4.10	4.26	4.35	4.43	3.29
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	187/ 198	3.88	4.01	4.18	4.25	3.29

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0104  
 Title BASIC PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: SCHOU, PAUL B (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1279  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	3	5	4.44	698/1639	4.20	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	617/1639	4.13	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	367/1397	4.25	4.40	4.28	4.18	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1261/1583	3.81	4.02	4.19	4.01	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1136/1532	3.52	3.74	4.01	3.88	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1141/1504	3.74	3.92	4.05	3.78	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	364/1612	4.15	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1635	4.96	4.89	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1284/1579	3.95	4.03	4.08	3.95	4.12	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	807/1518	4.47	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	622/1520	4.76	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	758/1517	4.02	4.20	4.27	4.20	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	208/1550	4.25	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	135/1295	4.15	4.03	3.94	3.84	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1398	3.33	3.80	4.07	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1391	3.33	4.17	4.30	4.07	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1388	3.33	4.08	4.28	4.01	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	172/ 224	3.51	3.76	4.10	3.90	3.78	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	148/ 240	3.69	3.77	4.11	4.01	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	114/ 219	4.21	4.14	4.44	4.44	4.56	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	135/ 215	4.10	4.26	4.35	4.43	4.22	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	129/ 198	3.88	4.01	4.18	4.25	4.00	

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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0104  
 Title BASIC PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1280  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	3	5	4.44	698/1639	4.20	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	617/1639	4.13	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	367/1397	4.25	4.40	4.28	4.18	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1261/1583	3.81	4.02	4.19	4.01	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1136/1532	3.52	3.74	4.01	3.88	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1141/1504	3.74	3.92	4.05	3.78	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	364/1612	4.15	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1635	4.96	4.89	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1579	3.95	4.03	4.08	3.95	4.12	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1518	4.47	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1520	4.76	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1517	4.02	4.20	4.27	4.20	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1550	4.25	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1398	3.33	3.80	4.07	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1391	3.33	4.17	4.30	4.07	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1388	3.33	4.08	4.28	4.01	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	172/ 224	3.51	3.76	4.10	3.90	3.78	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	148/ 240	3.69	3.77	4.11	4.01	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	114/ 219	4.21	4.14	4.44	4.44	4.56	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	135/ 215	4.10	4.26	4.35	4.43	4.22	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	129/ 198	3.88	4.01	4.18	4.25	4.00	

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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						



Course-Section: PHYS 111 0105  
 Title BASIC PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: DAVIDSON, ANTHO (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1281  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	2	3	4.33	814/1639	4.20	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	517/1639	4.13	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	517/1397	4.25	4.40	4.28	4.18	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	852/1583	3.81	4.02	4.19	4.01	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1046/1532	3.52	3.74	4.01	3.88	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	544/1504	3.74	3.92	4.05	3.78	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	718/1612	4.15	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	4.96	4.89	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	889/1579	3.95	4.03	4.08	3.95	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	602/1518	4.47	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	725/1520	4.76	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1083/1517	4.02	4.20	4.27	4.20	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	638/1550	4.25	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	623/1295	4.15	4.03	3.94	3.84	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	204/ 224	3.51	3.76	4.10	3.90	3.17	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	221/ 240	3.69	3.77	4.11	4.01	3.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	1	2	0	1	2	3.17	211/ 219	4.21	4.14	4.44	4.44	3.17	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	96/ 215	4.10	4.26	4.35	4.43	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	184/ 198	3.88	4.01	4.18	4.25	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	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	Other	4
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0105  
 Title BASIC PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1282  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	814/1639	4.20	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	517/1639	4.13	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	517/1397	4.25	4.40	4.28	4.18	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	852/1583	3.81	4.02	4.19	4.01	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1046/1532	3.52	3.74	4.01	3.88	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	544/1504	3.74	3.92	4.05	3.78	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	718/1612	4.15	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	4.96	4.89	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	889/1579	3.95	4.03	4.08	3.95	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	204/ 224	3.51	3.76	4.10	3.90	3.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	221/ 240	3.69	3.77	4.11	4.01	3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	1	2	0	1	2	3.17	211/ 219	4.21	4.14	4.44	4.44	3.17
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	96/ 215	4.10	4.26	4.35	4.43	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	184/ 198	3.88	4.01	4.18	4.25	3.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0106  
 Title BASIC PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: SCHOU, PAUL B  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1283  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	4	0	3.43	1523/1639	4.20	4.28	4.27	4.08	3.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	1513/1639	4.13	4.28	4.22	4.17	3.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1219/1397	4.25	4.40	4.28	4.18	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	0	3	0	0	2.20	1577/1583	3.81	4.02	4.19	4.01	2.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1471/1532	3.52	3.74	4.01	3.88	2.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	1259/1504	3.74	3.92	4.05	3.78	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1299/1612	4.15	4.26	4.16	4.10	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1635	4.96	4.89	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	5	1	1	3.43	1354/1579	3.95	4.03	4.08	3.95	3.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1021/1518	4.47	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	725/1520	4.76	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1405/1517	4.02	4.20	4.27	4.20	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1274/1550	4.25	4.20	4.22	4.17	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	783/1295	4.15	4.03	3.94	3.84	3.83	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	2	0	3	2	0	2.71	215/ 224	3.51	3.76	4.10	3.90	2.71	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	1	4	1	0	2.71	230/ 240	3.69	3.77	4.11	4.01	2.71	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	179/ 219	4.21	4.14	4.44	4.44	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	186/ 215	4.10	4.26	4.35	4.43	3.86	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	168/ 198	3.88	4.01	4.18	4.25	3.57	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0107  
 Title BASIC PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: WALL, KIMBERLY  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1284  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	6	8	4.11	1055/1639	4.20	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	2	10	3.94	1193/1639	4.13	4.28	4.22	4.17	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	4	9	4.00	973/1397	4.25	4.40	4.28	4.18	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	1	3	1	4	3.60	1367/1583	3.81	4.02	4.19	4.01	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	1	1	2	8	3.56	1206/1532	3.52	3.74	4.01	3.88	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	1	3	0	4	3.30	1323/1504	3.74	3.92	4.05	3.78	3.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	1	13	4.39	656/1612	4.15	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1635	4.96	4.89	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	657/1579	3.95	4.03	4.08	3.95	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	947/1518	4.47	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	1033/1520	4.76	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	3	1	2	8	3.87	1205/1517	4.02	4.20	4.27	4.20	3.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	1	3	8	3.93	1135/1550	4.25	4.20	4.22	4.17	3.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	1	2	2	7	3.79	819/1295	4.15	4.03	3.94	3.84	3.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1398	3.33	3.80	4.07	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1391	3.33	4.17	4.30	4.07	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1388	3.33	4.08	4.28	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	3.88	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	5	8	5	4.00	129/ 224	3.51	3.76	4.10	3.90	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	2	2	6	7	4.06	143/ 240	3.69	3.77	4.11	4.01	4.06	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	150/ 219	4.21	4.14	4.44	4.44	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/ 215	4.10	4.26	4.35	4.43	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	45/ 198	3.88	4.01	4.18	4.25	4.61	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 1		

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0108  
 Title BASIC PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: WALL, KIMBERLY  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1285  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	4	1	4.20	951/1639	4.20	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	915/1639	4.13	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	417/1397	4.25	4.40	4.28	4.18	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1010/1583	3.81	4.02	4.19	4.01	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1046/1532	3.52	3.74	4.01	3.88	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1303/1504	3.74	3.92	4.05	3.78	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1044/1612	4.15	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	811/1635	4.96	4.89	4.65	4.56	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	137/1579	3.95	4.03	4.08	3.95	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	947/1518	4.47	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	802/1520	4.76	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	726/1517	4.02	4.20	4.27	4.20	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	522/1550	4.25	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	623/1295	4.15	4.03	3.94	3.84	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1398	3.33	3.80	4.07	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1391	3.33	4.17	4.30	4.07	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1388	3.33	4.08	4.28	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 958	****	3.88	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	167/ 224	3.51	3.76	4.10	3.90	3.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	130/ 240	3.69	3.77	4.11	4.01	4.20	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	104/ 219	4.21	4.14	4.44	4.44	4.60	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	83/ 215	4.10	4.26	4.35	4.43	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	47/ 198	3.88	4.01	4.18	4.25	4.60	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0109  
 Title BASIC PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: LIU, SHENG  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1286  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	1	1	6	3	4.00	1138/1639	4.20	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	1	3.91	1262/1639	4.13	4.28	4.22	4.17	3.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	1144/1397	4.25	4.40	4.28	4.18	3.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	4	1	1	3.29	1477/1583	3.81	4.02	4.19	4.01	3.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1136/1532	3.52	3.74	4.01	3.88	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	1	6	0	3.63	1141/1504	3.74	3.92	4.05	3.78	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	790/1612	4.15	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1635	4.96	4.89	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	5	4	0	3.09	1464/1579	3.95	4.03	4.08	3.95	3.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	757/1518	4.47	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	1158/1520	4.76	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1025/1517	4.02	4.20	4.27	4.20	4.10	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	2	4	3.82	1209/1550	4.25	4.20	4.22	4.17	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	8	2	4.00	623/1295	4.15	4.03	3.94	3.84	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	2	3	5	0	3.09	206/ 224	3.51	3.76	4.10	3.90	3.09	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	2	0	7	2	3.82	180/ 240	3.69	3.77	4.11	4.01	3.82	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	198/ 219	4.21	4.14	4.44	4.44	3.90	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	3	2	0	2	4	3.18	205/ 215	4.10	4.26	4.35	4.43	3.18	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	2	2	6	0	3.18	188/ 198	3.88	4.01	4.18	4.25	3.18	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 12 Non-major 12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	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 8	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0110  
 Title BASIC PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: LIU, SHENG  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1287  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	1	4.00	1138/1639	4.20	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1090/1639	4.13	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	722/1397	4.25	4.40	4.28	4.18	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	3.81	4.02	4.19	4.01	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1421/1532	3.52	3.74	4.01	3.88	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	824/1504	3.74	3.92	4.05	3.78	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	718/1612	4.15	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1635	4.96	4.89	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1477/1579	3.95	4.03	4.08	3.95	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1518	4.47	4.50	4.43	4.38	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	4.76	4.71	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1083/1517	4.02	4.20	4.27	4.20	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	832/1550	4.25	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	398/1295	4.15	4.03	3.94	3.84	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	202/ 224	3.51	3.76	4.10	3.90	3.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	115/ 240	3.69	3.77	4.11	4.01	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	91/ 219	4.21	4.14	4.44	4.44	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	214/ 215	4.10	4.26	4.35	4.43	2.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	184/ 198	3.88	4.01	4.18	4.25	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0111  
 Title BASIC PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: LIU, SHENG  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1288  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1016/1639	4.20	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1090/1639	4.13	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1131/1397	4.25	4.40	4.28	4.18	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1497/1583	3.81	4.02	4.19	4.01	3.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	4	0	3.14	1396/1532	3.52	3.74	4.01	3.88	3.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	1010/1504	3.74	3.92	4.05	3.78	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1214/1612	4.15	4.26	4.16	4.10	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1635	4.96	4.89	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	889/1579	3.95	4.03	4.08	3.95	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	919/1518	4.47	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	961/1520	4.76	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1083/1517	4.02	4.20	4.27	4.20	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	875/1550	4.25	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	545/1295	4.15	4.03	3.94	3.84	4.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	1	3	2	0	2.86	212/ 224	3.51	3.76	4.10	3.90	2.86	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	2	3	0	1	2.71	230/ 240	3.69	3.77	4.11	4.01	2.71	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	171/ 219	4.21	4.14	4.44	4.44	4.14	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	3	1	2	1	0	2.14	215/ 215	4.10	4.26	4.35	4.43	2.14	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	2	4	0	0	1	2.14	198/ 198	3.88	4.01	4.18	4.25	2.14	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: PHYS 111 0112  
 Title BASIC PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: WALL, KIMBERLY  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1289  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	2	4.40	754/1639	4.20	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1090/1639	4.13	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1248/1397	4.25	4.40	4.28	4.18	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1010/1583	3.81	4.02	4.19	4.01	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	1421/1532	3.52	3.74	4.01	3.88	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1212/1504	3.74	3.92	4.05	3.78	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	632/1612	4.15	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	811/1635	4.96	4.89	4.65	4.56	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	889/1579	3.95	4.03	4.08	3.95	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1141/1518	4.47	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	4.76	4.71	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1083/1517	4.02	4.20	4.27	4.20	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	944/1550	4.25	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	894/1295	4.15	4.03	3.94	3.84	3.67	
Discussion															
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1388	3.33	4.08	4.28	4.01	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	167/ 224	3.51	3.76	4.10	3.90	3.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	32/ 240	3.69	3.77	4.11	4.01	4.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 219	4.21	4.14	4.44	4.44	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 215	4.10	4.26	4.35	4.43	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	19/ 198	3.88	4.01	4.18	4.25	4.80	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: PHYS 112 0101  
 Title BASIC PHYSICS II  
 Instructor: CUI, LILI (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1290  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	890/1639	4.54	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	517/1639	4.63	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	687/1397	4.46	4.40	4.28	4.18	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1406/1583	4.29	4.02	4.19	4.01	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1201/1532	3.95	3.74	4.01	3.88	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	667/1504	4.01	3.92	4.05	3.78	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	490/1612	4.46	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.89	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	6	1	3.88	1079/1579	4.35	4.03	4.08	3.95	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	454/1518	4.67	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1520	4.82	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	1007/1517	4.28	4.20	4.27	4.20	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	638/1550	4.28	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	234/1295	4.03	4.03	3.94	3.84	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1398	4.00	3.80	4.07	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1391	5.00	4.17	4.30	4.07	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1388	5.00	4.08	4.28	4.01	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	175/ 224	3.67	3.76	4.10	3.90	3.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	168/ 240	3.96	3.77	4.11	4.01	3.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	203/ 219	3.75	4.14	4.44	4.44	3.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	96/ 215	4.54	4.26	4.35	4.43	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	51/ 198	4.40	4.01	4.18	4.25	4.57	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	5.00	5.00	4.16	3.90	****	

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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 112 0101  
 Title BASIC PHYSICS II  
 Instructor: LINK, DANIEL O (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1291  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	890/1639	4.54	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	517/1639	4.63	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	687/1397	4.46	4.40	4.28	4.18	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1406/1583	4.29	4.02	4.19	4.01	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1201/1532	3.95	3.74	4.01	3.88	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	667/1504	4.01	3.92	4.05	3.78	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	490/1612	4.46	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.89	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	889/1579	4.35	4.03	4.08	3.95	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1237/1518	4.67	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1033/1520	4.82	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	800/1517	4.28	4.20	4.27	4.20	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1274/1550	4.28	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	398/1295	4.03	4.03	3.94	3.84	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1398	4.00	3.80	4.07	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1391	5.00	4.17	4.30	4.07	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1388	5.00	4.08	4.28	4.01	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	175/ 224	3.67	3.76	4.10	3.90	3.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	168/ 240	3.96	3.77	4.11	4.01	3.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	203/ 219	3.75	4.14	4.44	4.44	3.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	96/ 215	4.54	4.26	4.35	4.43	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	51/ 198	4.40	4.01	4.18	4.25	4.57	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	5.00	5.00	4.16	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: PHYS 112 0102  
 Title BASIC PHYSICS II  
 Instructor: LINK, DANIEL O (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1292  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	3	4.75	318/1639	4.54	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1639	4.63	4.28	4.22	4.17	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1397	4.46	4.40	4.28	4.18	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	4.29	4.02	4.19	4.01	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1532	3.95	3.74	4.01	3.88	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	544/1504	4.01	3.92	4.05	3.78	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	814/1612	4.46	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.89	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	175/1579	4.35	4.03	4.08	3.95	4.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	454/1518	4.67	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	4.82	4.71	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	886/1517	4.28	4.20	4.27	4.20	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	897/1550	4.28	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	265/1295	4.03	4.03	3.94	3.84	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	770/1398	4.00	3.80	4.07	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.17	4.30	4.07	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.08	4.28	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	841/ 958	3.00	3.88	3.93	3.71	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	195/ 224	3.67	3.76	4.10	3.90	3.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	148/ 240	3.96	3.77	4.11	4.01	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	179/ 219	3.75	4.14	4.44	4.44	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 215	4.54	4.26	4.35	4.43	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	61/ 198	4.40	4.01	4.18	4.25	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.50	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.12	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.25	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.39	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	5.00	4.16	3.90	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.04	3.61	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.00	4.05	3.51	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.79	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	5.00	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.60	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	2	
?	0			

Course-Section: PHYS 112 0102  
 Title BASIC PHYSICS II  
 Instructor: (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1293  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	3	4.75	318/1639	4.54	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1639	4.63	4.28	4.22	4.17	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1397	4.46	4.40	4.28	4.18	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	4.29	4.02	4.19	4.01	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1532	3.95	3.74	4.01	3.88	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	544/1504	4.01	3.92	4.05	3.78	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	814/1612	4.46	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.89	4.65	4.56	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	770/1398	4.00	3.80	4.07	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.17	4.30	4.07	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.08	4.28	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	841/ 958	3.00	3.88	3.93	3.71	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	195/ 224	3.67	3.76	4.10	3.90	3.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	148/ 240	3.96	3.77	4.11	4.01	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	179/ 219	3.75	4.14	4.44	4.44	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 215	4.54	4.26	4.35	4.43	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	61/ 198	4.40	4.01	4.18	4.25	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.50	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.12	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.25	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.39	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	5.00	4.16	3.90	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.04	3.61	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.00	4.05	3.51	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.79	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	5.00	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.60	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 112 0104  
 Title BASIC PHYSICS II  
 Instructor: ROSENBLOOM, JOS  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1294  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	2	4.50	615/1639	4.54	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	859/1639	4.63	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	973/1397	4.46	4.40	4.28	4.18	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1261/1583	4.29	4.02	4.19	4.01	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1330/1532	3.95	3.74	4.01	3.88	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1494/1504	4.01	3.92	4.05	3.78	2.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	490/1612	4.46	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.89	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	657/1579	4.35	4.03	4.08	3.95	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	807/1518	4.67	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	1188/1520	4.82	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1260/1517	4.28	4.20	4.27	4.20	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1237/1550	4.28	4.20	4.22	4.17	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	623/1295	4.03	4.03	3.94	3.84	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	129/ 224	3.67	3.76	4.10	3.90	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	187/ 240	3.96	3.77	4.11	4.01	3.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	209/ 219	3.75	4.14	4.44	4.44	3.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	133/ 215	4.54	4.26	4.35	4.43	4.25	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	129/ 198	4.40	4.01	4.18	4.25	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 112 0106  
 Title BASIC PHYSICS II  
 Instructor: ROSENBLOOM, JOS  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1295  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	3	4.75	318/1639	4.54	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	517/1639	4.63	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	517/1397	4.46	4.40	4.28	4.18	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	4.29	4.02	4.19	4.01	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1360/1532	3.95	3.74	4.01	3.88	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	4.01	3.92	4.05	3.78	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	218/1612	4.46	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.89	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	657/1579	4.35	4.03	4.08	3.95	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1518	4.67	4.50	4.43	4.38	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	890/1520	4.82	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	886/1517	4.28	4.20	4.27	4.20	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	638/1550	4.28	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	135/1295	4.03	4.03	3.94	3.84	4.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	195/ 224	3.67	3.76	4.10	3.90	3.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	125/ 240	3.96	3.77	4.11	4.01	4.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	203/ 219	3.75	4.14	4.44	4.44	3.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	158/ 215	4.54	4.26	4.35	4.43	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	98/ 198	4.40	4.01	4.18	4.25	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: PHYS 121 0101  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: CORBITT, PAUL T  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1296  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	3	3	6	4.08	1089/1639	3.78	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	959/1639	3.79	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	813/1397	4.05	4.40	4.28	4.18	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	1010/1583	3.35	4.02	4.19	4.01	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	989/1532	3.16	3.74	4.01	3.88	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1141/1504	3.15	3.92	4.05	3.78	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	2	8	4.15	924/1612	3.93	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.15	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	529/1635	4.97	4.89	4.65	4.56	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	7	1	2	3.36	1379/1579	3.41	4.03	4.08	3.95	3.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	770/1518	4.09	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	1101/1520	4.25	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	907/1517	3.86	4.20	4.27	4.20	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	860/1550	3.41	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	505/1295	3.43	4.03	3.94	3.84	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	863/1398	2.89	3.80	4.07	3.85	3.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	647/1391	3.44	4.17	4.30	4.07	4.46	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	944/1388	3.32	4.08	4.28	4.01	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	405/ 958	3.18	3.88	3.93	3.71	4.15	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	3.76	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.77	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.14	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.26	4.35	4.43	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0102  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: LIANG, JUNLIN  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1297  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	5	5	5	4.00	1138/1639	3.78	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	5	4	3.87	1287/1639	3.79	4.28	4.22	4.17	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	4	3	4	3.69	1204/1397	4.05	4.40	4.28	4.18	3.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1506/1583	3.35	4.02	4.19	4.01	3.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	4	5	2	3.46	1264/1532	3.16	3.74	4.01	3.88	3.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1183/1504	3.15	3.92	4.05	3.78	3.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	4.00	1044/1612	3.93	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	766/1635	4.97	4.89	4.65	4.56	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1208/1579	3.41	4.03	4.08	3.95	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	1206/1518	4.09	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.09	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	1349/1520	4.25	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.27	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	1083/1517	3.86	4.20	4.27	4.20	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	1	4	2	4	3.82	1209/1550	3.41	4.20	4.22	4.17	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	1	2	2	3	1	3.11	1146/1295	3.43	4.03	3.94	3.84	3.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	4	2	4	0	2.54	1354/1398	2.89	3.80	4.07	3.85	2.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	4	2	5	1	3.08	1311/1391	3.44	4.17	4.30	4.07	3.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	0	6	4	1	3.15	1294/1388	3.32	4.08	4.28	4.01	3.15	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	2	0	5	4	2	3.31	794/ 958	3.18	3.88	3.93	3.71	3.31	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	3.77	4.11	4.01	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.05	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	Required for Majors 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 6	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 5	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Non-major 14
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 10

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

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0103  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ERIC  
 Enrollment: 52  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1298  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	5	6	3.94	1217/1639	3.78	4.28	4.27	4.08	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	4	4.06	1044/1639	3.79	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	687/1397	4.05	4.40	4.28	4.18	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	939/1583	3.35	4.02	4.19	4.01	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	1	7	3	3.77	1035/1532	3.16	3.74	4.01	3.88	3.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1259/1504	3.15	3.92	4.05	3.78	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	955/1612	3.93	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1635	4.97	4.89	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	11	2	4.00	889/1579	3.41	4.03	4.08	3.95	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	733/1518	4.09	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	1087/1520	4.25	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	956/1517	3.86	4.20	4.27	4.20	4.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	6	6	4.00	1077/1550	3.41	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	2	2	8	3	3.63	917/1295	3.43	4.03	3.94	3.84	3.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	3	5	4	3.64	1045/1398	2.89	3.80	4.07	3.85	3.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	1	1	6	5	3.93	1048/1391	3.44	4.17	4.30	4.07	3.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	0	8	4	3.93	1016/1388	3.32	4.08	4.28	4.01	3.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	2	0	1	6	3	3.67	658/ 958	3.18	3.88	3.93	3.71	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 224	****	3.76	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	3.77	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 219	****	4.14	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 215	****	4.26	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 198	****	4.01	4.18	4.25	****	
Self Paced															
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	

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	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0104  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: LIANG, JUNLIN  
 Enrollment: 49  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1299  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	7	9	4.10	1068/1639	3.78	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	7	4.05	1052/1639	3.79	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	13	4.45	603/1397	4.05	4.40	4.28	4.18	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	3	2	2	2	4	3.15	1508/1583	3.35	4.02	4.19	4.01	3.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	3	5	4	4	3.16	1393/1532	3.16	3.74	4.01	3.88	3.16	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	3	0	2	4	3	3.33	1303/1504	3.15	3.92	4.05	3.78	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	5	9	4.05	1010/1612	3.93	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1635	4.97	4.89	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	2	10	3	1	3.06	1470/1579	3.41	4.03	4.08	3.95	3.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	4	7	5	3.68	1388/1518	4.09	4.50	4.43	4.38	3.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	3	7	8	4.11	1397/1520	4.25	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.11	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	0	8	4	5	3.53	1339/1517	3.86	4.20	4.27	4.20	3.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	1	6	3	4	3.00	1440/1550	3.41	4.20	4.22	4.17	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	2	3	3	4	1	2.92	1191/1295	3.43	4.03	3.94	3.84	2.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	6	2	4	3	3	2.72	1335/1398	2.89	3.80	4.07	3.85	2.72	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	4	3	3	4	4	3.06	1314/1391	3.44	4.17	4.30	4.07	3.06	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	6	0	6	1	5	2.94	1333/1388	3.32	4.08	4.28	4.01	2.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	5	1	2	2	5	3.07	836/ 958	3.18	3.88	3.93	3.71	3.07	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	****/ 224	****	3.76	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 240	****	3.77	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 219	****	4.14	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 215	****	4.26	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 198	****	4.01	4.18	4.25	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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	15				
				?	2						

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0105  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: CORBITT, PAUL T  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1300  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	2	4	2	3.60	1454/1639	3.78	4.28	4.27	4.08	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	1	3.64	1427/1639	3.79	4.28	4.22	4.17	3.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	1190/1397	4.05	4.40	4.28	4.18	3.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	1532/1583	3.35	4.02	4.19	4.01	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	2	2	1	1	2.44	1506/1532	3.16	3.74	4.01	3.88	2.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	1	4	0	3.14	1378/1504	3.15	3.92	4.05	3.78	3.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	1	5	1	3.20	1488/1612	3.93	4.26	4.16	4.10	3.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1635	4.97	4.89	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	2	3	5	0	3.09	1464/1579	3.41	4.03	4.08	3.95	3.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	989/1518	4.09	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	1	1	7	4.09	1398/1520	4.25	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.09	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1083/1517	3.86	4.20	4.27	4.20	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1348/1550	3.41	4.20	4.22	4.17	3.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	825/1295	3.43	4.03	3.94	3.84	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	3	2	3.27	1201/1398	2.89	3.80	4.07	3.85	3.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	2	3	4	1	3.18	1292/1391	3.44	4.17	4.30	4.07	3.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	1	1	5	3	3.73	1105/1388	3.32	4.08	4.28	4.01	3.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	2	0	5	3	0	2.90	881/ 958	3.18	3.88	3.93	3.71	2.90	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 2		0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	8

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

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0106  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: CORBITT, PAUL T (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1301  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	2	0	6	6	2	3.38	1536/1639	3.78	4.28	4.27	4.08	3.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	5	3	4	3.38	1528/1639	3.79	4.28	4.22	4.17	3.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	4	4	6	3.93	1052/1397	4.05	4.40	4.28	4.18	3.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	2	1	2	3	1	3.00	1532/1583	3.35	4.02	4.19	4.01	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	3	3	4	0	2.75	1477/1532	3.16	3.74	4.01	3.88	2.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	3	1	1	3	0	2.50	1477/1504	3.15	3.92	4.05	3.78	2.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	1044/1612	3.93	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1635	4.97	4.89	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	5	5	0	3.27	1412/1579	3.41	4.03	4.08	3.95	3.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	2	2	4	6	3.63	1400/1518	4.09	4.50	4.43	4.38	3.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	0	4	9	4.27	1352/1520	4.25	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.01	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	3	4	4	3.57	1321/1517	3.86	4.20	4.27	4.20	3.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	0	3	4	4	3.27	1400/1550	3.41	4.20	4.22	4.17	2.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	2	2	4	3	1	2.92	1195/1295	3.43	4.03	3.94	3.84	2.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	3	2	3	0	2.07	1382/1398	2.89	3.80	4.07	3.85	2.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	3	1	4	4	3	3.20	1289/1391	3.44	4.17	4.30	4.07	3.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	4	2	4	4	1	2.73	1358/1388	3.32	4.08	4.28	4.01	2.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	4	1	4	2	1	2.58	909/ 958	3.18	3.88	3.93	3.71	2.58	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0106  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1302  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	2	0	6	6	2	3.38	1536/1639	3.78	4.28	4.27	4.08	3.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	5	3	4	3.38	1528/1639	3.79	4.28	4.22	4.17	3.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	4	4	6	3.93	1052/1397	4.05	4.40	4.28	4.18	3.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	2	1	2	3	1	3.00	1532/1583	3.35	4.02	4.19	4.01	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	3	3	4	0	2.75	1477/1532	3.16	3.74	4.01	3.88	2.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	3	1	1	3	0	2.50	1477/1504	3.15	3.92	4.05	3.78	2.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	1044/1612	3.93	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1635	4.97	4.89	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1579	3.41	4.03	4.08	3.95	3.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1368/1518	4.09	4.50	4.43	4.38	3.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1465/1520	4.25	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.01	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1347/1517	3.86	4.20	4.27	4.20	3.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	1	1	1	0	2.00	1518/1550	3.41	4.20	4.22	4.17	2.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1295	3.43	4.03	3.94	3.84	2.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	3	2	3	0	2.07	1382/1398	2.89	3.80	4.07	3.85	2.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	3	1	4	4	3	3.20	1289/1391	3.44	4.17	4.30	4.07	3.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	4	2	4	4	1	2.73	1358/1388	3.32	4.08	4.28	4.01	2.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	4	1	4	2	1	2.58	909/ 958	3.18	3.88	3.93	3.71	2.58	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1303  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	0	8	4.78	293/1639	4.78	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	466/1639	4.56	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	175/1397	4.89	4.40	4.28	4.18	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	4.02	4.19	4.01	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1136/1532	3.67	3.74	4.01	3.88	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1259/1504	3.40	3.92	4.05	3.78	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	128/1612	4.88	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.89	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	241/1579	4.50	4.03	4.08	3.95	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1518	4.89	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	674/1520	4.87	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	510/1517	4.51	4.20	4.27	4.20	4.51	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	231/1550	4.71	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	185/1295	4.40	4.03	3.94	3.84	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	242/1398	4.78	3.80	4.07	3.85	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	248/1391	4.89	4.17	4.30	4.07	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	363/1388	4.78	4.08	4.28	4.01	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	155/ 958	4.67	3.88	3.93	3.71	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 224	****	3.76	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	3.77	4.11	4.01	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.14	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.26	4.35	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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



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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1304  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	0	8	4.78	293/1639	4.78	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	466/1639	4.56	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	175/1397	4.89	4.40	4.28	4.18	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	4.02	4.19	4.01	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1136/1532	3.67	3.74	4.01	3.88	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1259/1504	3.40	3.92	4.05	3.78	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	128/1612	4.88	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.89	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	569/1579	4.50	4.03	4.08	3.95	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	416/1518	4.89	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	622/1520	4.87	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	674/1517	4.51	4.20	4.27	4.20	4.51	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	580/1550	4.71	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	561/1295	4.40	4.03	3.94	3.84	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	242/1398	4.78	3.80	4.07	3.85	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	248/1391	4.89	4.17	4.30	4.07	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	363/1388	4.78	4.08	4.28	4.01	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	155/ 958	4.67	3.88	3.93	3.71	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 224	****	3.76	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	3.77	4.11	4.01	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.14	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.26	4.35	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: PHYS 122 0101  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: WU, TIANPENG  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1305  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	16	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	841/1639	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	16	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	583/1639	4.34	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	16	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	574/1397	4.34	4.40	4.28	4.18	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	16	6	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/1583	3.82	4.02	4.19	4.01	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	883/1532	3.56	3.74	4.01	3.88	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	16	4	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1034/1504	3.51	3.92	4.05	3.78	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	16	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	207/1612	4.44	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	16	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	4.95	4.89	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	1056/1579	3.58	4.03	4.08	3.95	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	770/1518	4.28	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	1101/1520	4.56	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	560/1517	4.09	4.20	4.27	4.20	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	2	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	814/1550	4.07	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	2	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	746/1295	3.75	4.03	3.94	3.84	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	770/1398	3.65	3.80	4.07	3.85	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	2	3	3	5	3.85	1100/1391	3.97	4.17	4.30	4.07	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	5	5	5	4.00	944/1388	3.76	4.08	4.28	4.01	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	16	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	359/ 958	3.93	3.88	3.93	3.71	4.23
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****

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	2	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 29
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHYS 122 0102  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: BUNCH, ANDREW  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1306  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	13	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	754/1639	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	13	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	813/1639	4.34	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	13	1	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	925/1397	4.34	4.40	4.28	4.18	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	13	1	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1010/1583	3.82	4.02	4.19	4.01	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	13	4	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	1241/1532	3.56	3.74	4.01	3.88	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	4	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	1212/1504	3.51	3.92	4.05	3.78	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	13	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	882/1612	4.44	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	13	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1635	4.95	4.89	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	889/1579	3.58	4.03	4.08	3.95	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	1118/1518	4.28	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1033/1520	4.56	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	917/1517	4.09	4.20	4.27	4.20	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	2	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	1029/1550	4.07	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	2	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	864/1295	3.75	4.03	3.94	3.84	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1030/1398	3.65	3.80	4.07	3.85	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	2	0	3	4	4.00	983/1391	3.97	4.17	4.30	4.07	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	918/1388	3.76	4.08	4.28	4.01	4.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	411/ 958	3.93	3.88	3.93	3.71	4.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	3.76	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.77	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.14	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.26	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.01	4.18	4.25	****	
Self Paced															
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 122 0103  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: BUNCH, ANDREW  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1307  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	11	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	977/1639	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	11	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	822/1639	4.34	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	11	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	497/1397	4.34	4.40	4.28	4.18	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	7	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	939/1583	3.82	4.02	4.19	4.01	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	11	1	1	2	4	5	4	3.56	1206/1532	3.56	3.74	4.01	3.88	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	11	8	0	2	4	1	2	3.33	1303/1504	3.51	3.92	4.05	3.78	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	408/1612	4.44	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	691/1635	4.95	4.89	4.65	4.56	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	0	3	8	3	4.00	889/1579	3.58	4.03	4.08	3.95	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	733/1518	4.28	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	1006/1520	4.56	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	4	7	5	4.06	1048/1517	4.09	4.20	4.27	4.20	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	2	3	5	6	3.94	1135/1550	4.07	4.20	4.22	4.17	3.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	5	1	4	0	4	2	3.18	1127/1295	3.75	4.03	3.94	3.84	3.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	1	3	3	5	3.57	1083/1398	3.65	3.80	4.07	3.85	3.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	778/1391	3.97	4.17	4.30	4.07	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	1	2	6	4	3.60	1157/1388	3.76	4.08	4.28	4.01	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	2	3	1	6	3.92	523/ 958	3.93	3.88	3.93	3.71	3.92	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	3.76	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	3.77	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.14	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.26	4.35	4.43	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 122 0104  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: BUNCH, ANDREW  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1308  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	16	0	1	0	2	10	13	4.31	841/1639	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	16	0	0	0	2	8	16	4.54	486/1639	4.34	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	16	0	0	0	2	7	17	4.58	447/1397	4.34	4.40	4.28	4.18	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	15	11	1	0	3	6	6	4.00	1010/1583	3.82	4.02	4.19	4.01	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	18	4	1	1	3	6	9	4.05	737/1532	3.56	3.74	4.01	3.88	4.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	17	10	2	1	3	4	5	3.60	1154/1504	3.51	3.92	4.05	3.78	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	17	0	0	2	1	4	18	4.52	469/1612	4.44	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	17	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	265/1635	4.95	4.89	4.65	4.56	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	0	1	6	15	3	3.80	1133/1579	3.58	4.03	4.08	3.95	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	0	3	10	9	4.27	1077/1518	4.28	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	1173/1520	4.56	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	0	0	4	12	7	4.13	999/1517	4.09	4.20	4.27	4.20	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	3	1	1	3	9	9	4.04	1057/1550	4.07	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.04	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	5	1	2	1	9	4	3.76	832/1295	3.75	4.03	3.94	3.84	3.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	2	6	10	7	3.77	958/1398	3.65	3.80	4.07	3.85	3.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	3	5	7	11	4.00	983/1391	3.97	4.17	4.30	4.07	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	7	8	10	4.00	944/1388	3.76	4.08	4.28	4.01	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	5	2	2	3	7	6	3.65	662/ 958	3.93	3.88	3.93	3.71	3.65	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 4	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		Under-grad 42
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 1	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	23
			? 1		

Course-Section: PHYS 122 0105  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: WU, TIANPENG  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1309  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	13	0	2	1	0	4	5	3.75	1358/1639	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.08	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	13	0	1	1	0	6	4	3.92	1244/1639	4.34	4.28	4.22	4.17	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	13	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	878/1397	4.34	4.40	4.28	4.18	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	13	2	1	2	1	5	1	3.30	1472/1583	3.82	4.02	4.19	4.01	3.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	2	1	4	2	3.00	1421/1532	3.56	3.74	4.01	3.88	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	3	2	1	0	4	2	3.33	1303/1504	3.51	3.92	4.05	3.78	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	13	0	0	2	0	5	5	4.08	989/1612	4.44	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	13	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	595/1635	4.95	4.89	4.65	4.56	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	1	2	4	4	1	3.17	1448/1579	3.58	4.03	4.08	3.95	3.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1237/1518	4.28	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1520	4.56	4.71	4.70	4.61	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1260/1517	4.09	4.20	4.27	4.20	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	2	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/1550	4.07	4.20	4.22	4.17	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	1	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/1295	3.75	4.03	3.94	3.84	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	3	1	4	3	3.42	1156/1398	3.65	3.80	4.07	3.85	3.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	3	1	1	6	3.67	1177/1391	3.97	4.17	4.30	4.07	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	3	2	4	3	3.38	1232/1388	3.76	4.08	4.28	4.01	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	456/ 958	3.93	3.88	3.93	3.71	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	3.76	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	3.77	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	4.14	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.26	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.01	4.18	4.25	****	
Self Paced															
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
			Required for Majors	1	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	25
			Other	10	Non-major
					24
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHYS 122 0106  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: WU, TIANPENG  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1310  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	15	0	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	1042/1639	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	15	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	517/1639	4.34	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	15	1	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	850/1397	4.34	4.40	4.28	4.18	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	15	6	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	1296/1583	3.82	4.02	4.19	4.01	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	16	5	1	1	4	2	2	3.30	1343/1532	3.56	3.74	4.01	3.88	3.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	16	9	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	****/1504	3.51	3.92	4.05	3.78	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	16	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	546/1612	4.44	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	16	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	463/1635	4.95	4.89	4.65	4.56	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	0	2	3	5	2	0	2.58	1549/1579	3.58	4.03	4.08	3.95	2.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	2	0	0	3	7	4.08	1209/1518	4.28	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	1318/1520	4.56	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	2	0	2	2	6	3.83	1223/1517	4.09	4.20	4.27	4.20	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	1152/1550	4.07	4.20	4.22	4.17	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	2	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	505/1295	3.75	4.03	3.94	3.84	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	2	5	3	4	3.47	1128/1398	3.65	3.80	4.07	3.85	3.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	983/1391	3.97	4.17	4.30	4.07	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	2	1	5	2	5	3.47	1201/1388	3.76	4.08	4.28	4.01	3.47	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	0	1	2	4	2	6	3.67	658/ 958	3.93	3.88	3.93	3.71	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 224	****	3.76	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	3.77	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.14	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.26	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	4.01	4.18	4.25	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 122L 0101  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS L  
 Instructor: RENO, ROBERT C  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1311  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1138/1639	3.97	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	774/1639	4.31	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	323/1583	4.52	4.02	4.19	4.01	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	0	3	0	3.20	1378/1532	2.71	3.74	4.01	3.88	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	544/1504	4.11	3.92	4.05	3.78	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	317/1612	4.62	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	4.88	4.89	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1133/1579	3.90	4.03	4.08	3.95	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	684/1518	4.49	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	1273/1520	4.64	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	726/1517	4.10	4.20	4.27	4.20	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	769/1550	3.86	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	978/1295	3.36	4.03	3.94	3.84	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	329/1398	4.67	3.80	4.07	3.85	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	983/1391	4.00	4.17	4.30	4.07	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1130/1388	3.67	4.08	4.28	4.01	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	88/ 224	4.27	3.76	4.10	3.90	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	56/ 240	4.52	3.77	4.11	4.01	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 219	4.76	4.14	4.44	4.44	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	45/ 215	4.62	4.26	4.35	4.43	4.83	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	86/ 198	4.15	4.01	4.18	4.25	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

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



Course-Section: PHYS 122L 0102  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS L  
 Instructor: RENO, ROBERT C  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1312  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	8	2	3.92	1240/1639	3.97	4.28	4.27	4.08	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	517/1639	4.31	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.40	4.28	4.18	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	476/1583	4.52	4.02	4.19	4.01	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	3	2	3.08	1411/1532	2.71	3.74	4.01	3.88	3.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	775/1504	4.11	3.92	4.05	3.78	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	408/1612	4.62	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	884/1635	4.88	4.89	4.65	4.56	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	889/1579	3.90	4.03	4.08	3.95	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	643/1518	4.49	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	1074/1520	4.64	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1083/1517	4.10	4.20	4.27	4.20	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	6	3	2	3.64	1285/1550	3.86	4.20	4.22	4.17	3.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	806/1295	3.36	4.03	3.94	3.84	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1398	4.67	3.80	4.07	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1391	4.00	4.17	4.30	4.07	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1388	3.67	4.08	4.28	4.01	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	1	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	102/ 224	4.27	3.76	4.10	3.90	4.22	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	103/ 240	4.52	3.77	4.11	4.01	4.40	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	35/ 219	4.76	4.14	4.44	4.44	4.90	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	122/ 215	4.62	4.26	4.35	4.43	4.40	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	2	0	4	4	4.00	129/ 198	4.15	4.01	4.18	4.25	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.05	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 12	Non-major 10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 7		
				? 1			

Course-Section: PHYS 122L 0103  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS L  
 Instructor: RENO, ROBERT C  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1313  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	1138/1639	3.97	4.28	4.27	4.08	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1014/1639	4.31	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	597/1583	4.52	4.02	4.19	4.01	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	3	1	0	0	1.83	1529/1532	2.71	3.74	4.01	3.88	1.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	945/1504	4.11	3.92	4.05	3.78	3.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	388/1612	4.62	4.26	4.16	4.10	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	662/1635	4.88	4.89	4.65	4.56	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1071/1579	3.90	4.03	4.08	3.95	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	1118/1518	4.49	4.50	4.43	4.38	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	597/1520	4.64	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1193/1517	4.10	4.20	4.27	4.20	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1312/1550	3.86	4.20	4.22	4.17	3.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	3	3	1	1	2.78	1216/1295	3.36	4.03	3.94	3.84	2.78	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	99/ 224	4.27	3.76	4.10	3.90	4.25	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	80/ 240	4.52	3.77	4.11	4.01	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	143/ 219	4.76	4.14	4.44	4.44	4.38	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	81/ 215	4.62	4.26	4.35	4.43	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	122/ 198	4.15	4.01	4.18	4.25	4.13	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 1
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 9
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1		
					Other 5

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

Course-Section: PHYS 224 0101  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: GEORGE, IAN  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1314  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	4	9	4.69	391/1639	4.69	4.28	4.27	4.35	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	583/1639	4.46	4.28	4.22	4.27	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	632/1397	4.43	4.40	4.28	4.39	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	697/1583	4.33	4.02	4.19	4.28	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	506/1532	4.33	3.74	4.01	4.09	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	367/1504	4.50	3.92	4.05	4.09	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	218/1612	4.75	4.26	4.16	4.21	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	1	4.08	1466/1635	4.08	4.89	4.65	4.63	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	634/1579	4.27	4.03	4.08	4.14	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	968/1518	4.38	4.50	4.43	4.48	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	1101/1520	4.62	4.71	4.70	4.78	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	833/1517	4.31	4.20	4.27	4.34	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	690/1550	4.46	4.20	4.22	4.33	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	361/1295	4.38	4.03	3.94	4.07	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1198/1398	3.29	3.80	4.07	4.14	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1241/1391	3.43	4.17	4.30	4.35	3.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1165/1388	3.57	4.08	4.28	4.37	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 958	****	3.88	3.93	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 224	****	3.76	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.77	4.11	4.47	****	

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	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 303 0101  
 Title THERMAL/STATISTICAL PH  
 Instructor: WORCHESKY, TERR  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1315  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	293/1639	4.77	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	10	12	4.55	476/1639	4.55	4.28	4.22	4.20	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	7	12	4.35	713/1397	4.35	4.40	4.28	4.26	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	929/1583	4.12	4.02	4.19	4.24	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	8	11	4.26	571/1532	4.26	3.74	4.01	4.05	4.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	2	3	3	11	4.21	647/1504	4.21	3.92	4.05	4.12	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	3	17	4.57	428/1612	4.57	4.26	4.16	4.12	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	10	4.43	1205/1635	4.43	4.89	4.65	4.66	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	450/1579	4.45	4.03	4.08	4.07	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	271/1518	4.87	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	9	14	4.61	474/1517	4.61	4.20	4.27	4.23	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	424/1550	4.70	4.20	4.22	4.20	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	155/1295	4.71	4.03	3.94	3.95	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	908/1398	3.86	3.80	4.07	4.13	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	279/1391	4.86	4.17	4.30	4.35	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	435/1388	4.71	4.08	4.28	4.34	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 958	****	3.88	3.93	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 11		Graduate 1
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 23
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	21
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHYS 316 0101  
 Title EXTRAGALACTIC ASTRO/CO  
 Instructor: GEORGANOPOULOS,  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1316  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	391/1639	4.69	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	959/1639	4.15	4.28	4.22	4.20	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	813/1397	4.23	4.40	4.28	4.26	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	822/1583	4.22	4.02	4.19	4.24	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	388/1532	4.45	3.74	4.01	4.05	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	466/1504	4.43	3.92	4.05	4.12	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	913/1612	4.17	4.26	4.16	4.12	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.89	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	569/1579	4.33	4.03	4.08	4.07	4.33	
-----															
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	435/1518	4.77	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	648/1517	4.46	4.20	4.27	4.23	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	787/1550	4.38	4.20	4.22	4.20	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	459/1295	4.25	4.03	3.94	3.95	4.25	
-----															
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1271/1398	3.00	3.80	4.07	4.13	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	616/1391	4.50	4.17	4.30	4.35	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	834/1388	4.25	4.08	4.28	4.34	4.25	

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 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	6
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
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
			? 2		

Course-Section: PHYS 330L 0101  
 Title OPTICS LABORATORY  
 Instructor: PITTMAN, TODD B  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1317  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	3	4.75	318/1639	4.81	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	859/1639	4.63	4.28	4.22	4.20	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.40	4.28	4.26	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	239/1583	4.88	4.02	4.19	4.24	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	335/1532	4.35	3.74	4.01	4.05	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	544/1504	4.60	3.92	4.05	4.12	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	814/1612	4.63	4.26	4.16	4.12	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.89	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	569/1579	4.67	4.03	4.08	4.07	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.50	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.20	4.27	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	897/1550	4.56	4.20	4.22	4.20	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	185/1295	4.83	4.03	3.94	3.95	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	33/ 224	4.88	3.76	4.10	4.06	4.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	40/ 240	4.88	3.77	4.11	4.08	4.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 219	5.00	4.14	4.44	4.44	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	62/ 215	4.88	4.26	4.35	4.21	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	129/ 198	4.50	4.01	4.18	4.04	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 330L 0102  
 Title OPTICS LABORATORY  
 Instructor: PITTMAN, TODD B  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1318  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	7	4.88	196/1639	4.81	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1639	4.63	4.28	4.22	4.20	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.40	4.28	4.26	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1583	4.88	4.02	4.19	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	633/1532	4.35	3.74	4.01	4.05	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	122/1504	4.60	3.92	4.05	4.12	4.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1612	4.63	4.26	4.16	4.12	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.89	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1579	4.67	4.03	4.08	4.07	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.50	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.20	4.27	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	208/1550	4.56	4.20	4.22	4.20	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1295	4.83	4.03	3.94	3.95	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 224	4.88	3.76	4.10	4.06	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 240	4.88	3.77	4.11	4.08	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 219	5.00	4.14	4.44	4.44	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 215	4.88	4.26	4.35	4.21	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 198	4.50	4.01	4.18	4.04	5.00	

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 5		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		8
			P 0		Non-major
			I 0		0
			? 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				Electives	0
				Other	8

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1319  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	1252/1639	3.90	4.28	4.27	4.28	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1388/1639	3.70	4.28	4.22	4.20	3.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1397	****	4.40	4.28	4.26	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	2	1	3.20	1497/1583	3.20	4.02	4.19	4.24	3.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	4	2	1	3.38	1312/1532	3.38	3.74	4.01	4.05	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	1	3	3.56	1183/1504	3.56	3.92	4.05	4.12	3.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	3	2	3.30	1461/1612	3.30	4.26	4.16	4.12	3.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1135/1635	4.50	4.89	4.65	4.66	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1232/1579	3.62	4.03	4.08	4.07	3.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1351/1518	3.80	4.50	4.43	4.39	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1377/1520	4.20	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1384/1517	3.40	4.20	4.27	4.23	3.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	1368/1550	3.40	4.20	4.22	4.20	3.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1295	****	4.03	3.94	3.95	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1398	****	3.80	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1391	****	4.17	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1388	****	4.08	4.28	4.34	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	2	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	129/ 224	4.00	3.76	4.10	4.06	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	220/ 240	3.13	3.77	4.11	4.08	3.13	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	3	2	3	0	3.00	213/ 219	3.00	4.14	4.44	4.44	3.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	4	1	2	3.50	196/ 215	3.50	4.26	4.35	4.21	3.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	3	2	2	1	3.13	191/ 198	3.13	4.01	4.18	4.04	3.13	

Frequency Distribution

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



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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1320  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	1252/1639	3.90	4.28	4.27	4.28	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1388/1639	3.70	4.28	4.22	4.20	3.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1397	****	4.40	4.28	4.26	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	2	1	3.20	1497/1583	3.20	4.02	4.19	4.24	3.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	4	2	1	3.38	1312/1532	3.38	3.74	4.01	4.05	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	1	3	3.56	1183/1504	3.56	3.92	4.05	4.12	3.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	3	2	3.30	1461/1612	3.30	4.26	4.16	4.12	3.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1135/1635	4.50	4.89	4.65	4.66	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1284/1579	3.62	4.03	4.08	4.07	3.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1518	3.80	4.50	4.43	4.39	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1520	4.20	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1517	3.40	4.20	4.27	4.23	3.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1550	3.40	4.20	4.22	4.20	3.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1295	****	4.03	3.94	3.95	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1398	****	3.80	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1391	****	4.17	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1388	****	4.08	4.28	4.34	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	2	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	129/ 224	4.00	3.76	4.10	4.06	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	220/ 240	3.13	3.77	4.11	4.08	3.13	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	3	2	3	0	3.00	213/ 219	3.00	4.14	4.44	4.44	3.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	4	1	2	3.50	196/ 215	3.50	4.26	4.35	4.21	3.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	3	2	2	1	3.13	191/ 198	3.13	4.01	4.18	4.04	3.13	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 407 0101  
 Title ELECTROMAGNETIC THEORY  
 Instructor: GOUGOUSI, THEOD  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1321  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	6	10	4.33	814/1639	4.33	4.28	4.27	4.42	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	12	4.44	617/1639	4.44	4.28	4.22	4.29	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	925/1397	4.12	4.40	4.28	4.38	4.12	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	939/1583	4.10	4.02	4.19	4.31	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	553/1532	4.29	3.74	4.01	4.07	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	758/1504	4.11	3.92	4.05	4.20	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	9	8	4.33	718/1612	4.33	4.26	4.16	4.18	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	397/1635	4.94	4.89	4.65	4.72	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	5	7	3	3.65	1245/1579	3.65	4.03	4.08	4.21	3.65	
-----															
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	807/1518	4.50	4.50	4.43	4.51	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	1006/1520	4.69	4.71	4.70	4.75	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	822/1517	4.31	4.20	4.27	4.34	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	6	5	3.75	1237/1550	3.75	4.20	4.22	4.24	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1295	****	4.03	3.94	4.01	****	
-----															
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1398	****	3.80	4.07	4.23	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1391	****	4.17	4.30	4.48	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/1388	****	4.08	4.28	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17
			? 2		

Course-Section: PHYS 415 0101  
 Title OBSERVATIONAL ASTRONOM  
 Instructor: HENRIKSEN, MARK  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1322  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	3	4.75	318/1639	4.75	4.28	4.27	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	252/1639	4.75	4.28	4.22	4.29	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.40	4.28	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.02	4.19	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1532	5.00	3.74	4.01	4.07	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	3.92	4.05	4.20	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	218/1612	4.75	4.26	4.16	4.18	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.89	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	175/1579	4.75	4.03	4.08	4.21	4.75	
-----															
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.50	4.43	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.20	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.20	4.22	4.24	5.00	
-----															
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1398	5.00	3.80	4.07	4.23	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.17	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.08	4.28	4.50	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	3.88	3.93	4.24	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	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		4
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHYS 601 0101  
 Title QUANTUM MECHANICS  
 Instructor: FRANSON, JAMES  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1323  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	561/1639	4.56	4.28	4.27	4.42	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	231/1639	4.78	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	261/1397	4.78	4.40	4.28	4.37	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	355/1583	4.63	4.02	4.19	4.31	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	398/1532	4.44	3.74	4.01	4.10	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	182/1504	4.75	3.92	4.05	4.29	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	123/1612	4.89	4.26	4.16	4.27	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	691/1635	4.89	4.89	4.65	4.81	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	725/1579	4.20	4.03	4.08	4.17	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	242/1518	4.89	4.50	4.43	4.49	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	597/1520	4.89	4.71	4.70	4.79	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	674/1517	4.44	4.20	4.27	4.32	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	325/1550	4.78	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	459/1295	4.25	4.03	3.94	3.95	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	560/1398	4.33	3.80	4.07	4.22	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1177/1391	3.67	4.17	4.30	4.47	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	944/1388	4.00	4.08	4.28	4.49	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 603 0101  
 Title PHYSICS OF MATERIALS  
 Instructor: TUKACS, LASZLO  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1324  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	1	0	1	6	2	3.80	1326/1639	3.80	4.28	4.27	4.42	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	7	3	0	3.09	1575/1639	3.09	4.28	4.22	4.26	3.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1086/1397	3.91	4.40	4.28	4.37	3.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	939/1583	4.10	4.02	4.19	4.31	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	2	4	0	3.00	1421/1532	3.00	3.74	4.01	4.10	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1034/1504	3.78	3.92	4.05	4.29	3.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	6	2	3.73	1294/1612	3.73	4.26	4.16	4.27	3.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.89	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	3	6	1	3.55	1298/1579	3.55	4.03	4.08	4.17	3.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	345/1518	4.82	4.50	4.43	4.49	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	943/1520	4.73	4.71	4.70	4.79	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	7	0	3.64	1301/1517	3.64	4.20	4.27	4.32	3.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	805/1550	4.36	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	443/1295	4.27	4.03	3.94	3.95	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	1222/1398	3.20	3.80	4.07	4.22	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	863/1391	4.20	4.17	4.30	4.47	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	944/1388	4.00	4.08	4.28	4.49	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 958	****	3.88	3.93	4.01	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	3.76	4.10	4.43	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.77	4.11	3.96	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.14	4.44	4.23	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.26	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.01	4.18	4.74	****	

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 5		Graduate 5
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 6
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	4

Course-Section: PHYS 605 0101  
 Title MATHEMATICAL PHYSICS  
 Instructor: ROUS, PHILIP  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1325  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	8	5	4.29	860/1639	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.42	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	517/1639	4.50	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	196/1397	4.86	4.40	4.28	4.37	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	143/1583	4.90	4.02	4.19	4.31	4.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	478/1532	4.36	3.74	4.01	4.10	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	291/1504	4.60	3.92	4.05	4.29	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	340/1612	4.64	4.26	4.16	4.27	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	1311/1635	4.31	4.89	4.65	4.81	4.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	569/1579	4.33	4.03	4.08	4.17	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	397/1518	4.79	4.50	4.43	4.49	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	674/1520	4.86	4.71	4.70	4.79	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	510/1517	4.57	4.20	4.27	4.32	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	231/1550	4.86	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	561/1295	4.13	4.03	3.94	3.95	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	599/1398	4.29	3.80	4.07	4.22	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	793/1391	4.29	4.17	4.30	4.47	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	897/1388	4.14	4.08	4.28	4.49	4.14	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 6
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 8
Grad.	6	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 606 0101  
 Title CLASSICAL MECHANICS  
 Instructor: KRAMER, IVAN  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1326  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	1	4.33	814/1639	4.33	4.28	4.27	4.42	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	774/1639	4.33	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.40	4.28	4.37	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	4.02	4.19	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	335/1532	4.50	3.74	4.01	4.10	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	3.92	4.05	4.29	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	317/1612	4.67	4.26	4.16	4.27	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.89	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.03	4.08	4.17	5.00	
-----															
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	602/1518	4.67	4.50	4.43	4.49	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	405/1517	4.67	4.20	4.27	4.32	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	832/1550	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.33	
-----															
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	426/1398	4.50	3.80	4.07	4.22	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	616/1391	4.50	4.17	4.30	4.47	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.08	4.28	4.49	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	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 0
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHYS 609 0101  
 Title MODERN OPTICS  
 Instructor: SHIH, YANHUA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1327  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.28	4.22	4.26	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.40	4.28	4.37	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	697/1583	4.33	4.02	4.19	4.31	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1532	5.00	3.74	4.01	4.10	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	3.92	4.05	4.29	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1455/1612	3.33	4.26	4.16	4.27	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	884/1635	4.75	4.89	4.65	4.81	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	382/1579	4.75	4.03	4.08	4.17	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	602/1518	4.67	4.50	4.43	4.49	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	405/1517	4.67	4.20	4.27	4.32	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.20	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.03	3.94	3.95	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1398	5.00	3.80	4.07	4.22	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.17	4.30	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.08	4.28	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	3.88	3.93	4.01	5.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	234/ 240	1.00	3.77	4.11	3.96	1.00	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.74	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.52	5.00	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	44/ 53	3.00	4.00	4.05	4.03	3.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.78	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	5.00	4.45	4.39	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.50	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 43	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.61	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.37	4.31	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 21	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.42	5.00	

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



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.28	4.22	4.26	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.40	4.28	4.37	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	697/1583	4.33	4.02	4.19	4.31	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1532	5.00	3.74	4.01	4.10	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	3.92	4.05	4.29	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1455/1612	3.33	4.26	4.16	4.27	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	884/1635	4.75	4.89	4.65	4.81	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	4.75	4.03	4.08	4.17	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1398	5.00	3.80	4.07	4.22	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.17	4.30	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.08	4.28	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	3.88	3.93	4.01	5.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	234/ 240	1.00	3.77	4.11	3.96	1.00	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.74	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.52	5.00	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	44/ 53	3.00	4.00	4.05	4.03	3.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.78	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	5.00	4.45	4.39	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.50	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 43	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.61	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.37	4.31	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 21	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.42	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 690 0101  
 Title PROF SKILLS PHYS  
 Instructor: HAYDEN, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1329  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	4.28	4.27	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	831/1639	4.29	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	973/1397	4.00	4.40	4.28	4.37	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	852/1583	4.20	4.02	4.19	4.31	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	553/1532	4.29	3.74	4.01	4.10	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	585/1504	4.29	3.92	4.05	4.29	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	718/1612	4.33	4.26	4.16	4.27	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	736/1635	4.86	4.89	4.65	4.81	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1270/1579	3.60	4.03	4.08	4.17	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	807/1518	4.50	4.50	4.43	4.49	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	674/1520	4.86	4.71	4.70	4.79	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	947/1517	4.20	4.20	4.27	4.32	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	769/1550	4.40	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	623/1295	4.00	4.03	3.94	3.95	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	369/1398	4.60	3.80	4.07	4.22	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1391	4.80	4.17	4.30	4.47	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.08	4.28	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	201/ 958	4.50	3.88	3.93	4.01	4.50	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.74	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.50	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.16	4.37	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 707 0101  
 Title ADV ELECTROMAGNETIC TH  
 Instructor: MCCANN, KEVIN  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1330  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	890/1639	4.25	4.28	4.27	4.42	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	517/1639	4.50	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.40	4.28	4.37	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	900/1583	4.14	4.02	4.19	4.31	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	506/1532	4.33	3.74	4.01	4.10	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	491/1504	4.40	3.92	4.05	4.29	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.26	4.16	4.27	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.89	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	569/1579	4.33	4.03	4.08	4.17	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	720/1518	4.57	4.50	4.43	4.49	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1136/1520	4.57	4.71	4.70	4.79	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	700/1517	4.43	4.20	4.27	4.32	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	556/1550	4.57	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	894/1295	3.67	4.03	3.94	3.95	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1207/1398	3.25	3.80	4.07	4.22	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1146/1391	3.75	4.17	4.30	4.47	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	872/1388	4.20	4.08	4.28	4.49	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	841/ 958	3.00	3.88	3.93	4.01	3.00	

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

Course-Section: PHYS 721 0101  
 Title: ATMOS RADIATION  
 Instructor: MARTINS, JOSE  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1331  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	3	4.75	318/1639	4.75	4.28	4.27	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	252/1639	4.75	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1397	4.75	4.40	4.28	4.37	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	239/1583	4.75	4.02	4.19	4.31	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	178/1532	4.75	3.74	4.01	4.10	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	367/1504	4.50	3.92	4.05	4.29	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.26	4.16	4.27	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	884/1635	4.75	4.89	4.65	4.81	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	175/1579	4.75	4.03	4.08	4.17	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1094/1518	4.25	4.50	4.43	4.49	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	299/1517	4.75	4.20	4.27	4.32	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	351/1550	4.75	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	265/1295	4.50	4.03	3.94	3.95	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	770/1398	4.00	3.80	4.07	4.22	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.17	4.30	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	944/1388	4.00	4.08	4.28	4.49	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	3.88	3.93	4.01	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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