

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 111 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Basic Physics I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Jacobson,John F</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>159</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>63</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	8	9	20	14	9	3.12	1492/1542	3.12	4.38	4.33	4.18	3.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	6	11	17	13	12	3.24	1474/1542	3.24	4.18	4.29	4.23	3.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	4	6	20	21	8	3.39	1244/1339	3.39	4.30	4.32	4.14	3.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	16	5	7	19	10	3	2.98	1459/1498	2.98	4.22	4.26	4.08	2.98
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	8	5	11	18	8	9	3.10	1351/1428	3.10	3.90	4.12	3.98	3.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	24	5	8	10	10	2	2.89	1371/1407	2.89	4.19	4.15	3.92	2.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	11	18	12	15	3.51	1331/1521	3.51	4.21	4.20	4.09	3.51
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	1	0	1	56	4.93	482/1541	4.93	4.83	4.70	4.66	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	3	8	11	25	5	1	2.60	1485/1518	2.60	4.10	4.11	4.00	2.60
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	3	5	16	20	16	3.68	1365/1472	3.68	4.45	4.46	4.38	3.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	6	16	36	4.47	1219/1475	4.47	4.66	4.72	4.63	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	3	19	20	11	5	2.93	1425/1471	2.93	4.09	4.32	4.23	2.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	9	12	17	11	9	2.98	1408/1470	2.98	4.25	4.33	4.21	2.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	8	11	7	10	9	13	3.12	1206/1310	3.12	4.22	4.06	3.93	3.12
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	39	0	8	3	3	7	3	2.75	1180/1210	2.75	3.96	4.18	3.91	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	39	0	6	1	3	6	8	3.38	1128/1211	3.38	4.12	4.37	4.15	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	39	0	3	1	4	11	5	3.58	1079/1207	3.58	4.12	4.41	4.12	3.58
4. Were special techniques successful	40	16	2	0	2	2	1	3.00	****/859	****	4.34	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 111 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Basic Physics I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Jacobson,John F</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>159</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>63</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	17	13	10	5	5	2.36	202/207	2.36	3.76	4.12	3.92	2.36
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	3	9	13	13	12	3.44	192/210	3.44	4.03	4.17	4.14	3.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	2	2	11	15	20	3.98	184/202	3.98	4.18	4.50	4.49	3.98
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	1	3	7	7	9	23	3.86	172/202	3.86	4.00	4.32	4.22	3.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	6	1	5	11	13	14	3.77	146/199	3.77	3.98	4.15	4.14	3.77
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	61	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/69	****	4.50	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	61	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	62	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	62	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 111 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Basic Physics I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Jacobson,John F</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>159</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>63</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	62	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.84	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 2	A 21	Required for Majors	47	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 2	B 18						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99 6	C 15	General	5	Under-grad	63	Non-major	63
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 10	D 2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 17	F 0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	1				
			? 7						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 112 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Basic Physics II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Anderson, Eric C</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>122</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>54</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	0	1	7	17	23	4.29	918/1542	4.29	4.38	4.33	4.18	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	1	6	18	23	4.31	855/1542	4.31	4.18	4.29	4.23	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	4	17	27	4.48	615/1339	4.48	4.30	4.32	4.14	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	16	0	0	3	11	17	4.45	618/1498	4.45	4.22	4.26	4.08	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	2	2	3	8	12	20	4.00	851/1428	4.00	3.90	4.12	3.98	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	21	1	0	6	7	12	4.12	819/1407	4.12	4.19	4.15	3.92	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	0	1	6	14	24	4.36	721/1521	4.36	4.21	4.20	4.09	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	1	45	4.98	207/1541	4.98	4.83	4.70	4.66	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	1	3	18	20	4.36	561/1518	4.36	4.10	4.11	4.00	4.36
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	2	15	31	4.53	778/1472	4.53	4.45	4.46	4.38	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	6	42	4.84	727/1475	4.84	4.66	4.72	4.63	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	2	2	14	30	4.43	755/1471	4.43	4.09	4.32	4.23	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	4	10	32	4.41	813/1470	4.41	4.25	4.33	4.21	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	1	1	3	12	31	4.48	354/1310	4.48	4.22	4.06	3.93	4.48
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	2	3	3	3	3.64	****/1210	****	3.96	4.18	3.91	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	****/1211	****	4.12	4.37	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	43	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	****/1207	****	4.12	4.41	4.12	****
4. Were special techniques successful	42	5	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	****/859	****	4.34	4.08	3.95	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 112 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Basic Physics II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Anderson, Eric C</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>122</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>54</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	8	2	6	7	6	3.03	194/207	3.03	3.76	4.12	3.92	3.03
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	3	6	7	5	8	3.31	200/210	3.31	4.03	4.17	4.14	3.31
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	5	7	3	5	9	3.21	200/202	3.21	4.18	4.50	4.49	3.21
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	6	4	6	6	7	3.14	193/202	3.14	4.00	4.32	4.22	3.14
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	6	0	3	4	7	9	3.96	129/199	3.96	3.98	4.15	4.14	3.96

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	44	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	54	Non-major	54
84-150	19	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	12						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 121 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introductory Physics I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>George,Ian M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>266</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>71</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	14	22	20	12	3.41	1460/1542	3.41	4.38	4.33	4.18	3.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	10	18	21	19	3.68	1332/1542	3.68	4.18	4.29	4.23	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	9	14	16	28	3.86	1082/1339	3.86	4.30	4.32	4.14	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	23	0	2	14	14	16	3.96	1109/1498	3.96	4.22	4.26	4.08	3.96
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	11	4	7	21	13	12	3.39	1271/1428	3.39	3.90	4.12	3.98	3.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	37	0	2	10	7	11	3.90	973/1407	3.90	4.19	4.15	3.92	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	4	18	21	25	3.99	1064/1521	3.99	4.21	4.20	4.09	3.99
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	2	51	14	4.18	1380/1541	4.18	4.83	4.70	4.66	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	2	6	5	25	17	2	3.07	1415/1518	3.07	4.10	4.11	4.00	3.07
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	8	14	26	21	3.87	1308/1472	3.87	4.45	4.46	4.38	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	3	3	11	18	34	4.12	1382/1475	4.12	4.66	4.72	4.63	4.12
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	8	15	10	20	15	3.28	1382/1471	3.28	4.09	4.32	4.23	3.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	14	12	8	16	18	3.18	1389/1470	3.18	4.25	4.33	4.21	3.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	9	9	13	21	15	3.36	1133/1310	3.36	4.22	4.06	3.93	3.36
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	4	8	13	40	4.32	594/1210	4.32	3.96	4.18	3.91	4.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	2	11	18	33	4.18	840/1211	4.18	4.12	4.37	4.15	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	4	15	18	25	3.94	965/1207	3.94	4.12	4.41	4.12	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	6	18	2	3	7	18	17	3.96	512/859	3.96	4.34	4.08	3.95	3.96

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 121 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introductory Physics I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>George,Ian M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>266</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>71</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	66	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/207	****	3.76	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	67	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/210	****	4.03	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	67	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/202	****	4.18	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	67	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/202	****	4.00	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	67	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/199	****	3.98	4.15	4.14	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	68	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/69	****	4.50	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	69	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	69	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/68	****	4.50	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	69	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	69	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.17	3.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	69	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/32	****	5.00	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	69	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/35	****	****	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	69	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	69	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	68	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	5.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	68	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	68	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	68	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.82	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 121 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introductory Physics I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>George,Ian M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>266</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>71</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	68	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	68	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	1	A	17	Required for Majors	61	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	26						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	7	C	18	General	3	Under-grad	71	Non-major	71
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	9	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	22	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 121H 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Physics I-Honors</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Cui,Lili</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	187/1542	4.89	4.38	4.33	4.18	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1542	5.00	4.18	4.29	4.23	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1339	5.00	4.30	4.32	4.14	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.22	4.26	4.08	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1428	5.00	3.90	4.12	3.98	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	306/1407	4.60	4.19	4.15	3.92	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1521	5.00	4.21	4.20	4.09	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.83	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	169/1518	4.78	4.10	4.11	4.00	4.78
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1472	5.00	4.45	4.46	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	592/1475	4.89	4.66	4.72	4.63	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	319/1471	4.78	4.09	4.32	4.23	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	203/1470	4.89	4.25	4.33	4.21	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	127/1310	4.78	4.22	4.06	3.93	4.78
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	145/1210	4.89	3.96	4.18	3.91	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1211	5.00	4.12	4.37	4.15	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1207	5.00	4.12	4.41	4.12	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 121H 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Physics I-Honors</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Cui,Lili</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/859	5.00	4.34	4.08	3.95	5.00

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 9
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 0	
			? 0		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 122 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introductory Physics II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Cui,Lili</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>207</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>125</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	2	2	16	29	73	4.39	805/1542	4.39	4.38	4.33	4.18	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	4	2	12	41	63	4.29	892/1542	4.29	4.18	4.29	4.23	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	1	2	7	36	74	4.50	582/1339	4.50	4.30	4.32	4.14	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	30	1	1	21	29	40	4.15	956/1498	4.15	4.22	4.26	4.08	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	35	7	11	24	18	27	3.54	1215/1428	3.54	3.90	4.12	3.98	3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	66	0	3	16	9	27	4.09	832/1407	4.09	4.19	4.15	3.92	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	2	0	2	7	20	90	4.66	330/1521	4.66	4.21	4.20	4.09	4.66
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	0	2	117	4.98	138/1541	4.98	4.83	4.70	4.66	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	2	2	4	20	39	38	4.04	896/1518	4.04	4.10	4.11	4.00	4.04
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	3	2	6	26	81	4.53	791/1472	4.53	4.45	4.46	4.38	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	2	1	1	24	91	4.69	1013/1475	4.69	4.66	4.72	4.63	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	6	2	20	33	57	4.13	1046/1471	4.13	4.09	4.32	4.23	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	2	3	7	11	24	72	4.32	897/1470	4.32	4.25	4.33	4.21	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	2	4	9	30	66	4.39	445/1310	4.39	4.22	4.06	3.93	4.39
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	82	0	1	2	8	12	20	4.12	733/1210	4.12	3.96	4.18	3.91	4.12
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	83	0	1	1	7	9	24	4.29	777/1211	4.29	4.12	4.37	4.15	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	84	0	1	2	11	9	18	4.00	918/1207	4.00	4.12	4.41	4.12	4.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 122 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introductory Physics II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Cui,Lili</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>207</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>125</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	84	14	1	2	3	6	15	4.19	****/859	****	4.34	4.08	3.95	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	48	Required for Majors	96	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	20	1.00-1.99	0	B	42						
56-83	16	2.00-2.99	8	C	14	General	5	Under-grad	125	Non-major	124
84-150	19	3.00-3.49	18	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	34	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	20						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 122H 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introductory Physics II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Anderson,Eric C</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	410/1542	4.69	4.38	4.33	4.18	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	366/1542	4.71	4.18	4.29	4.23	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	682/1339	4.41	4.30	4.32	4.14	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	722/1498	4.38	4.22	4.26	4.08	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	6	4	4	3.56	1207/1428	3.56	3.90	4.12	3.98	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/1407	****	4.19	4.15	3.92	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	278/1521	4.71	4.21	4.20	4.09	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.83	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	457/1518	4.44	4.10	4.11	4.00	4.44
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	538/1472	4.71	4.45	4.46	4.38	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.66	4.72	4.63	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	3	9	4.24	961/1471	4.24	4.09	4.32	4.23	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	217/1470	4.88	4.25	4.33	4.21	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	85/1310	4.88	4.22	4.06	3.93	4.88
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	356/1210	4.63	3.96	4.18	3.91	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	470/1211	4.65	4.12	4.37	4.15	4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	1	14	4.69	480/1207	4.69	4.12	4.41	4.12	4.69

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 122H 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introductory Physics II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Anderson, Eric C</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	120/859	4.75	4.34	4.08	3.95	4.75

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	12
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	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 220 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Computational Phys</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>McCann, Kevin J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	499/1542	4.61	4.38	4.33	4.35	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	967/1542	4.22	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	843/1498	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.31	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	552/1428	4.33	3.90	4.12	4.17	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	405/1407	4.50	4.19	4.15	4.14	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	1	6	6	3.67	1257/1521	3.67	4.21	4.20	4.22	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.83	4.70	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	9	5	4.12	832/1518	4.12	4.10	4.11	4.12	4.12
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	503/1472	4.72	4.45	4.46	4.53	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	592/1475	4.89	4.66	4.72	4.79	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	9	7	4.28	930/1471	4.28	4.09	4.32	4.37	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	692/1470	4.50	4.25	4.33	4.40	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	127/1310	4.78	4.22	4.06	4.19	4.78
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1210	****	3.96	4.18	4.18	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1211	****	4.12	4.37	4.34	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 220 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Computational Phys</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>McCann, Kevin J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1207	****	4.12	4.41	4.40	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 224 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introductory Physics III</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Worchesky,Terra</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	410/1542	4.69	4.38	4.33	4.35	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	492/1542	4.60	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	518/1339	4.56	4.30	4.32	4.40	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	996/1498	4.11	4.22	4.26	4.31	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	809/1428	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.17	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	467/1407	4.45	4.19	4.15	4.14	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	630/1521	4.43	4.21	4.20	4.22	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.83	4.70	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	310/1518	4.58	4.10	4.11	4.12	4.58
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	256/1472	4.88	4.45	4.46	4.53	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.66	4.72	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	6	9	4.44	740/1471	4.44	4.09	4.32	4.37	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	297/1470	4.81	4.25	4.33	4.40	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	6	2	7	4.07	728/1310	4.07	4.22	4.06	4.19	4.07
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	945/1210	3.71	3.96	4.18	4.18	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	796/1211	4.25	4.12	4.37	4.34	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	499/1207	4.67	4.12	4.41	4.40	4.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 224 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Introductory Physics III</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Worchesky,Terra</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/207	****	3.76	4.12	4.26	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	3
84-150	0	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	1				
				?	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 320L 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Electronics Lab</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Worchesky,Terra</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>13</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	596/1542	4.54	4.38	4.33	4.37	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	867/1542	4.31	4.18	4.29	4.31	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	465/1339	4.62	4.30	4.32	4.36	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	802/1498	4.31	4.22	4.26	4.32	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	3	6	1	0	2.64	1405/1428	2.64	3.90	4.12	4.15	2.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	530/1407	4.40	4.19	4.15	4.20	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	5	5	3.92	1120/1521	3.92	4.21	4.20	4.23	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1157/1541	4.46	4.83	4.70	4.71	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	920/1518	4.00	4.10	4.11	4.13	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	1222/1472	4.00	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	1226/1475	4.46	4.66	4.72	4.74	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	1	7	2	3.62	1303/1471	3.62	4.09	4.32	4.33	3.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	1204/1470	3.85	4.25	4.33	4.35	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	761/1310	4.00	4.22	4.06	4.11	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1210	****	3.96	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1211	****	4.12	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1207	****	4.12	4.41	4.51	****
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	33/207	4.64	3.76	4.12	4.17	4.64

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 320L 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Electronics Lab</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Worchesky,Terra</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>13</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	44/210	4.55	4.03	4.17	4.21	4.55
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	100/202	4.55	4.18	4.50	4.54	4.55
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	125/202	4.18	4.00	4.32	4.44	4.18
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	5	5	0	3.36	177/199	3.36	3.98	4.15	4.18	3.36

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 321 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intermediate Mechanics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Georganopoulos,</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	750/1542	4.43	4.38	4.33	4.37	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	7	1	3.50	1406/1542	3.50	4.18	4.29	4.31	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	982/1339	4.00	4.30	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1171/1498	3.89	4.22	4.26	4.32	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	552/1428	4.33	3.90	4.12	4.15	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1102/1407	3.71	4.19	4.15	4.20	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	630/1521	4.43	4.21	4.20	4.23	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.83	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	6	3	3	3.62	1242/1518	3.62	4.10	4.11	4.13	3.62
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	1003/1472	4.36	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	1256/1475	4.43	4.66	4.72	4.74	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	7	3	3.86	1201/1471	3.86	4.09	4.32	4.33	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	8	3	3.86	1201/1470	3.86	4.25	4.33	4.35	3.86

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 321 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intermediate Mechanics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Georganopoulos,</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Lecture</b>														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	761/1310	4.00	4.22	4.06	4.11	4.00

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 324 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Modern Physics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Takacs,Laszlo</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>19</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	608/1542	4.53	4.38	4.33	4.37	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	6	5	6	2	3.21	1478/1542	3.21	4.18	4.29	4.31	3.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	8	4	1	2.89	1307/1339	2.89	4.30	4.32	4.36	2.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	0	4	3	5	3.85	1193/1498	3.85	4.22	4.26	4.32	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	650/1428	4.24	3.90	4.12	4.15	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	662/1407	4.27	4.19	4.15	4.20	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	10	5	4.00	1046/1521	4.00	4.21	4.20	4.23	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.83	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	5	8	2	3.59	1255/1518	3.59	4.10	4.11	4.13	3.59
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	598/1472	4.67	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	951/1475	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.74	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	4	5	5	3.71	1267/1471	3.71	4.09	4.32	4.33	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	2	11	4.17	1030/1470	4.17	4.25	4.33	4.35	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1033/1310	3.57	4.22	4.06	4.11	3.57
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1210	****	3.96	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1211	****	4.12	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1207	****	4.12	4.41	4.51	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 324 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Modern Physics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Takacs,Laszlo</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>19</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/859	****	4.34	4.08	4.13	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 408 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Optics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Zhang,Zhibo</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	995/1542	4.22	4.38	4.33	4.42	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	833/1542	4.33	4.18	4.29	4.33	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	529/1339	4.56	4.30	4.32	4.44	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	966/1498	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.35	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1335/1428	3.17	3.90	4.12	4.22	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	599/1407	4.33	4.19	4.15	4.30	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	696/1521	4.38	4.21	4.20	4.24	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.83	4.70	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1147/1518	3.78	4.10	4.11	4.18	3.78
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	753/1472	4.56	4.45	4.46	4.50	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1241/1475	4.44	4.66	4.72	4.74	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1187/1471	3.89	4.09	4.32	4.36	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	764/1470	4.44	4.25	4.33	4.38	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	384/1310	4.44	4.22	4.06	4.09	4.44
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1210	****	3.96	4.18	4.34	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1211	****	4.12	4.37	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1207	****	4.12	4.41	4.53	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 408 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Optics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Zhang,Zhibo</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/859	****	4.34	4.08	4.19	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 415 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Observational Astronomy</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>George,Ian M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>3</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1542	5.00	4.38	4.33	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	416/1542	4.67	4.18	4.29	4.33	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.22	4.26	4.35	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	390/1428	4.50	3.90	4.12	4.22	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.19	4.15	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1268/1541	4.33	4.83	4.70	4.72	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.10	4.11	4.18	5.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1472	5.00	4.45	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.66	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1471	5.00	4.09	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1470	5.00	4.25	4.33	4.38	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 415 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Observational Astronomy</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>George, Ian M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>3</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Lecture</b>														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1310	5.00	4.22	4.06	4.09	5.00

### Frequency Distribution

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

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 424 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Quantam Mechanics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Pittman,Todd B.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>17</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	187/1542	4.88	4.38	4.33	4.42	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	366/1542	4.71	4.18	4.29	4.33	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	176/1339	4.88	4.30	4.32	4.44	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	161/1498	4.86	4.22	4.26	4.35	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	301/1428	4.60	3.90	4.12	4.22	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.19	4.15	4.30	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	116/1521	4.88	4.21	4.20	4.24	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.83	4.70	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	146/1518	4.81	4.10	4.11	4.18	4.81
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	240/1472	4.88	4.45	4.46	4.50	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.66	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	186/1471	4.88	4.09	4.32	4.36	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	284/1470	4.82	4.25	4.33	4.38	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	842/1310	3.93	4.22	4.06	4.09	3.93
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1210	****	3.96	4.18	4.34	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1211	****	4.12	4.37	4.47	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 424 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Quantam Mechanics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Pittman,Todd B.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>17</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1207	****	4.12	4.41	4.53	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		Major 15
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 17
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Non-major 2
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 431L 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Modern Physics Lab</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gougousi,Theodo</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1542	5.00	4.38	4.33	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	615/1542	4.50	4.18	4.29	4.33	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1339	5.00	4.30	4.32	4.44	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	906/1498	4.20	4.22	4.26	4.35	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	252/1428	4.67	3.90	4.12	4.22	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	252/1407	4.67	4.19	4.15	4.30	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	159/1521	4.83	4.21	4.20	4.24	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	1124/1541	4.50	4.83	4.70	4.72	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	295/1518	4.60	4.10	4.11	4.18	4.60
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1472	5.00	4.45	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.66	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	244/1471	4.83	4.09	4.32	4.36	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1470	5.00	4.25	4.33	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1310	5.00	4.22	4.06	4.09	5.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	774/1210	4.00	3.96	4.18	4.34	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	918/1211	4.00	4.12	4.37	4.47	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	918/1207	4.00	4.12	4.41	4.53	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	478/859	4.00	4.34	4.08	4.19	4.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 431L 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Modern Physics Lab</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gougousi,Theodo</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/207	5.00	3.76	4.12	4.41	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	19/210	4.83	4.03	4.17	4.02	4.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/202	5.00	4.18	4.50	4.42	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	41/202	4.83	4.00	4.32	4.23	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	15/199	4.83	3.98	4.15	3.77	4.83
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	44/69	4.50	4.50	4.56	4.62	4.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/69	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.67	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	41/68	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.65	4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/73	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.72	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	24/67	4.50	4.50	4.17	4.37	4.50
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/32	5.00	5.00	4.20	4.39	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.36	4.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.56	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.70	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	3.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.00	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 431L 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Modern Physics Lab</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Gougousi,Theodo</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	2.67	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 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 6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 2		

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 440 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Computational Physics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>McCann, Kevin J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	869/1542	4.33	4.38	4.33	4.42	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	1052/1542	4.13	4.18	4.29	4.33	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	476/1339	4.60	4.30	4.32	4.44	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	906/1498	4.20	4.22	4.26	4.35	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	780/1428	4.11	3.90	4.12	4.22	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	467/1407	4.45	4.19	4.15	4.30	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	0	6	6	3.93	1111/1521	3.93	4.21	4.20	4.24	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.83	4.70	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	629/1518	4.30	4.10	4.11	4.18	4.30
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	871/1472	4.46	4.45	4.46	4.50	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	1000/1475	4.69	4.66	4.72	4.74	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	525/1471	4.62	4.09	4.32	4.36	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	976/1470	4.23	4.25	4.33	4.38	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	178/1310	4.69	4.22	4.06	4.09	4.69
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	924/1210	3.75	3.96	4.18	4.34	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1144/1211	3.25	4.12	4.37	4.47	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1038/1207	3.75	4.12	4.41	4.53	3.75

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 440 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Computational Physics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>McCann, Kevin J</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/859	****	4.34	4.08	4.19	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 4
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 3	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 2		

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 481 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Tech Theoretical Phys II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Henriksen,Mark</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>6</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	1524/1542	2.83	4.38	4.33	4.42	2.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	0	0	2.50	1531/1542	2.50	4.18	4.29	4.33	2.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	3.00	1296/1339	3.00	4.30	4.32	4.44	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1308/1498	3.60	4.22	4.26	4.35	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1409/1428	2.50	3.90	4.12	4.22	2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	1	0	2.67	1387/1407	2.67	4.19	4.15	4.30	2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1331/1521	3.50	4.21	4.20	4.24	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.83	4.70	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	2.17	1509/1518	2.17	4.10	4.11	4.18	2.17
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	2.83	1455/1472	2.83	4.45	4.46	4.50	2.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	2.83	1472/1475	2.83	4.66	4.72	4.74	2.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	1.67	1470/1471	1.67	4.09	4.32	4.36	1.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	2.17	1457/1470	2.17	4.25	4.33	4.38	2.17
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1123/1210	3.00	3.96	4.18	4.34	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1100/1211	3.50	4.12	4.37	4.47	3.50

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 481 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Tech Theoretical Phys II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Henriksen,Mark</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>6</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1172/1207	3.00	4.12	4.41	4.53	3.00

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 607 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Electromag Waves/Radiatn</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kramer,Ivan</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	869/1542	4.33	4.38	4.33	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	416/1542	4.67	4.18	4.29	4.31	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	757/1339	4.33	4.30	4.32	4.31	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1239/1498	3.75	4.22	4.26	4.25	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	2	3	0	2.89	1387/1428	2.89	3.90	4.12	4.13	2.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	874/1407	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.20	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	986/1521	4.11	4.21	4.20	4.24	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.83	4.70	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	445/1518	4.44	4.10	4.11	4.15	4.44
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	418/1472	4.78	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.66	4.72	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	637/1471	4.50	4.09	4.32	4.36	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	985/1470	4.22	4.25	4.33	4.34	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1310	****	4.22	4.06	3.99	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1210	****	3.96	4.18	4.28	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1211	****	4.12	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1207	****	4.12	4.41	4.53	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 607 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Electromag Waves/Radiatn</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Kramer,Ivan</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/859	****	4.34	4.08	4.08	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 609 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Modern Optics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Shih,Yan-hua</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>7</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1542	5.00	4.38	4.33	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	528/1542	4.57	4.18	4.29	4.31	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	205/1339	4.86	4.30	4.32	4.31	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	252/1498	4.75	4.22	4.26	4.25	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	117/1428	4.86	3.90	4.12	4.13	4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1407	****	4.19	4.15	4.20	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1170/1521	3.86	4.21	4.20	4.24	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.83	4.70	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	652/1518	4.29	4.10	4.11	4.15	4.29
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	1065/1472	4.29	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.66	4.72	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	755/1471	4.43	4.09	4.32	4.36	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	619/1470	4.57	4.25	4.33	4.34	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1310	****	4.22	4.06	3.99	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	924/1210	3.75	3.96	4.18	4.28	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	580/1211	4.50	4.12	4.37	4.51	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	815/1207	4.25	4.12	4.41	4.53	4.25



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 609 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Modern Optics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Shih,Yan-hua</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>7</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	478/859	4.00	4.34	4.08	4.08	4.00

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 622 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Atmos Physics II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hoff,Raymond M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	260/1542	4.80	4.38	4.33	4.39	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	492/1542	4.60	4.18	4.29	4.31	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	254/1339	4.80	4.30	4.32	4.31	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	688/1498	4.40	4.22	4.26	4.25	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1061/1428	3.80	3.90	4.12	4.13	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	530/1407	4.40	4.19	4.15	4.20	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1046/1521	4.00	4.21	4.20	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.83	4.70	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	181/1518	4.75	4.10	4.11	4.15	4.75
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	367/1472	4.80	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1119/1475	4.60	4.66	4.72	4.76	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	985/1471	4.20	4.09	4.32	4.36	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	588/1470	4.60	4.25	4.33	4.34	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	576/1310	4.25	4.22	4.06	3.99	4.25
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1007/1210	3.50	3.96	4.18	4.28	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	918/1211	4.00	4.12	4.37	4.51	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	630/1207	4.50	4.12	4.41	4.53	4.50

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 622 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Atmos Physics II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Hoff,Raymond M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/859	****	4.34	4.08	4.08	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 701 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Quantum Mechanics II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Franson,James D</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	1086/1542	4.13	4.38	4.33	4.39	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1229/1542	3.88	4.18	4.29	4.31	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	721/1339	4.38	4.30	4.32	4.31	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	854/1498	4.25	4.22	4.26	4.25	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1023/1428	3.86	3.90	4.12	4.13	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1013/1407	3.86	4.19	4.15	4.20	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	231/1521	4.75	4.21	4.20	4.24	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	1415/1541	4.13	4.83	4.70	4.75	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	686/1518	4.25	4.10	4.11	4.15	4.25
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1086/1472	4.25	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	1197/1475	4.50	4.66	4.72	4.76	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1104/1471	4.00	4.09	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	960/1470	4.25	4.25	4.33	4.34	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1271/1310	2.67	4.22	4.06	3.99	2.67
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	774/1210	4.00	3.96	4.18	4.28	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	796/1211	4.25	4.12	4.37	4.51	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1038/1207	3.75	4.12	4.41	4.53	3.75

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 701 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Quantum Mechanics II</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Franson,James D</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/859	****	4.34	4.08	4.08	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 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 5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 722 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Atmos Remote Sens</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Martins,Jose V</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	260/1542	4.80	4.38	4.33	4.39	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	229/1542	4.80	4.18	4.29	4.31	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	476/1339	4.60	4.30	4.32	4.31	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	428/1498	4.60	4.22	4.26	4.25	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	681/1428	4.20	3.90	4.12	4.13	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	252/1407	4.67	4.19	4.15	4.20	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1046/1521	4.00	4.21	4.20	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.83	4.70	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.10	4.11	4.15	5.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	690/1472	4.60	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.66	4.72	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	785/1471	4.40	4.09	4.32	4.36	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	588/1470	4.60	4.25	4.33	4.34	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	247/1310	4.60	4.22	4.06	3.99	4.60
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1210	5.00	3.96	4.18	4.28	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	580/1211	4.50	4.12	4.37	4.51	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	630/1207	4.50	4.12	4.41	4.53	4.50

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 722 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Atmos Remote Sens</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Martins,Jose V</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/859	****	4.34	4.08	4.08	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 731 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Atmos Dynamics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Sparling,Lynn C</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1343/1542	3.75	4.38	4.33	4.39	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1300/1542	3.75	4.18	4.29	4.31	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1160/1339	3.67	4.30	4.32	4.31	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1058/1498	4.00	4.22	4.26	4.25	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	629/1428	4.25	3.90	4.12	4.13	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	874/1407	4.00	4.19	4.15	4.20	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1219/1521	3.75	4.21	4.20	4.24	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1124/1541	4.50	4.83	4.70	4.75	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1213/1518	3.67	4.10	4.11	4.15	3.67
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1222/1472	4.00	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1039/1475	4.67	4.66	4.72	4.76	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1104/1471	4.00	4.09	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1108/1470	4.00	4.25	4.33	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	495/1310	4.33	4.22	4.06	3.99	4.33
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	774/1210	4.00	3.96	4.18	4.28	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	918/1211	4.00	4.12	4.37	4.51	4.00



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>PHYS 731 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Atmos Dynamics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Sparling,Lynn C</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	918/1207	4.00	4.12	4.41	4.53	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	2	Graduate	2	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						