

Course-Section: STAT 121 0101
 Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S
 Instructor: KLEIN, MARTIN D
 Enrollment: 57
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1618
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	9	12	5	3.48	1517/1674	3.64	4.31	4.27	4.07	3.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	13	11	4.10	1083/1674	4.24	4.39	4.23	4.16	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	11	16	4.32	781/1423	4.39	4.44	4.27	4.16	4.32	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	839/1609	4.11	4.29	4.22	4.05	4.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	2	6	3	8	3.89	916/1585	3.79	3.98	3.96	3.88	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	2	5	4	7	3.89	1039/1535	3.90	4.15	4.08	3.89	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	7	10	14	4.23	901/1651	4.22	4.45	4.18	4.10	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1673	4.51	4.77	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	1	1	14	6	2	3.29	1458/1656	3.60	4.15	4.07	3.96	3.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	10	17	4.47	916/1586	4.54	4.68	4.43	4.37	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	9	17	4.43	1283/1585	4.53	4.73	4.69	4.60	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	7	12	10	4.03	1114/1582	4.17	4.39	4.26	4.17	4.03	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	4	10	12	4.00	1138/1575	4.09	4.42	4.27	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	24	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1380	3.86	3.58	3.94	3.78	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	3	5	5	10	3.27	1280/1520	3.35	3.63	4.01	3.76	3.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	4	8	6	10	3.60	1274/1515	3.64	3.95	4.24	3.97	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	0	11	6	11	3.80	1194/1511	3.72	4.09	4.27	4.00	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	24	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	****/ 994	4.07	3.72	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	168/ 265	4.13	4.13	4.23	3.97	4.13	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: STAT 121 0101
 Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S
 Instructor: KLEIN, MARTIN D
 Enrollment: 57
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1618
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	31	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	1						

Course-Section: STAT 121 0201
 Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S
 Instructor: KHALATBARI, FAR
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1619
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	4	10	10	9	3.43	1534/1674	3.64	4.31	4.27	4.07	3.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	7	8	19	4.11	1077/1674	4.24	4.39	4.23	4.16	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	8	23	4.30	811/1423	4.39	4.44	4.27	4.16	4.30		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	22	0	0	7	3	5	3.87	1248/1609	4.11	4.29	4.22	4.05	3.87	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	9	2	3	7	9	5	3.46	1252/1585	3.79	3.98	3.96	3.88	3.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	1	1	4	7	4	3.71	1185/1535	3.90	4.15	4.08	3.89	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	4	4	8	18	4.00	1097/1651	4.22	4.45	4.18	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	27	7	4.14	1504/1673	4.51	4.77	4.69	4.67	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	3	3	9	5	5	3.24	1478/1656	3.60	4.15	4.07	3.96	3.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	3	1	6	26	4.43	960/1586	4.54	4.68	4.43	4.37	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	3	4	7	23	4.35	1341/1585	4.53	4.73	4.69	4.60	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	3	7	10	15	3.89	1222/1582	4.17	4.39	4.26	4.17	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	2	15	15	3.97	1161/1575	4.09	4.42	4.27	4.17	3.97	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	5	2	4	4	15	3.73	916/1380	3.86	3.58	3.94	3.78	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	7	3	7	4	11	3.28	1273/1520	3.35	3.63	4.01	3.76	3.28	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	4	7	4	7	11	3.42	1333/1515	3.64	3.95	4.24	3.97	3.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	5	5	9	3	11	3.30	1359/1511	3.72	4.09	4.27	4.00	3.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	27	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/ 994	4.07	3.72	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 265	4.13	4.13	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	A	22	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	37	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	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	21				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 121 0301
 Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S
 Instructor: KEGAN, BONNIE E
 Enrollment: 81
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1620
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	5	8	22	19	4.02	1187/1674	3.64	4.31	4.27	4.07	4.02	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	11	38	4.52	566/1674	4.24	4.39	4.23	4.16	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	8	41	4.55	517/1423	4.39	4.44	4.27	4.16	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	2	10	12	27	4.19	930/1609	4.11	4.29	4.22	4.05	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	4	8	15	19	4.00	769/1585	3.79	3.98	3.96	3.88	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	12	18	21	4.12	817/1535	3.90	4.15	4.08	3.89	4.12	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	6	13	33	4.43	643/1651	4.22	4.45	4.18	4.10	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	33	20	4.38	1332/1673	4.51	4.77	4.69	4.67	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	0	5	21	16	4.26	706/1656	3.60	4.15	4.07	3.96	4.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	8	43	4.72	560/1586	4.54	4.68	4.43	4.37	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	10	44	4.81	786/1585	4.53	4.73	4.69	4.60	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	1	12	39	4.58	546/1582	4.17	4.39	4.26	4.17	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	3	1	6	10	32	4.29	932/1575	4.09	4.42	4.27	4.17	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	4	4	6	9	25	3.98	705/1380	3.86	3.58	3.94	3.78	3.98	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	5	6	8	5	15	3.49	1179/1520	3.35	3.63	4.01	3.76	3.49	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	3	3	8	8	19	3.90	1137/1515	3.64	3.95	4.24	3.97	3.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	3	7	10	18	4.05	1034/1511	3.72	4.09	4.27	4.00	4.05	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	12	0	2	7	7	13	4.07	456/ 994	4.07	3.72	3.94	3.73	4.07	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 265	4.13	4.13	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	50	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	2	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	2	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50	2	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	2	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	52	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	2	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	3	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: STAT 121 0301
 Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S
 Instructor: KEGAN, BONNIE E
 Enrollment: 81
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1620
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 1	A 29	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	15	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 8	C 5	General 4	Under-grad 56 Non-major 21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 9	D 1		
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 35	
			? 1		

Course-Section: STAT 350 0101
 Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI
 Instructor: VALLEJOS, RONNY
 Enrollment: 76
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1621
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	14	29	4.50	607/1674	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.26	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	14	34	4.71	325/1674	4.29	4.39	4.23	4.21	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	8	40	4.83	181/1423	4.12	4.44	4.27	4.27	4.83		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	8	11	23	4.23	892/1609	3.98	4.29	4.22	4.27	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	11	11	22	4.20	612/1585	3.70	3.98	3.96	3.95	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	3	2	8	5	18	3.92	1006/1535	3.63	4.15	4.08	4.15	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	6	36	4.66	340/1651	4.42	4.45	4.18	4.16	4.66	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	46	5.00	1/1673	4.99	4.77	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	0	0	2	12	20	4.53	366/1656	3.87	4.15	4.07	4.07	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	45	4.92	192/1586	4.61	4.68	4.43	4.42	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	44	4.94	397/1585	4.61	4.73	4.69	4.66	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	9	37	4.77	299/1582	4.12	4.39	4.26	4.26	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	9	36	4.72	407/1575	4.30	4.42	4.27	4.25	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	29	3	3	2	4	5	3.29	1145/1380	3.49	3.58	3.94	4.01	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	1	4	8	27	4.28	626/1520	3.74	3.63	4.01	4.09	4.28	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	1	5	10	26	4.30	865/1515	3.80	3.95	4.24	4.32	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	1	7	6	25	4.24	906/1511	3.82	4.09	4.27	4.34	4.24	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	30	1	1	3	1	5	3.73	****/ 994	****	3.72	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 265	****	4.13	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	43	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.91	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	46	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	46	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: STAT 350 0101
 Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI
 Instructor: VALLEJOS, RONNY
 Enrollment: 76
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1621
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	25	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	13	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	48	Non-major	14
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	10	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	35				
				?	1						

Course-Section: STAT 350 0201
 Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI
 Instructor: WILSON, MARY C
 Enrollment: 76
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1622
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	9	11	15	3.90	1328/1674	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.26	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	5	7	14	12	3.87	1298/1674	4.29	4.39	4.23	4.21	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	10	8	8	11	3.41	1296/1423	4.12	4.44	4.27	4.27	3.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	7	2	9	9	3.74	1327/1609	3.98	4.29	4.22	4.27	3.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	5	6	5	8	7	3.19	1388/1585	3.70	3.98	3.96	3.95	3.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	3	3	9	4	7	3.35	1352/1535	3.63	4.15	4.08	4.15	3.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	3	6	10	19	4.18	945/1651	4.42	4.45	4.18	4.16	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	38	4.97	212/1673	4.99	4.77	4.69	4.68	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	3	3	13	10	3	3.22	1490/1656	3.87	4.15	4.07	4.07	3.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	5	11	21	4.31	1104/1586	4.61	4.68	4.43	4.42	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	6	10	21	4.28	1383/1585	4.61	4.73	4.69	4.66	4.28	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	6	7	10	11	3.47	1416/1582	4.12	4.39	4.26	4.26	3.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	3	3	9	19	3.87	1230/1575	4.30	4.42	4.27	4.25	3.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	3	3	5	6	11	3.68	956/1380	3.49	3.58	3.94	4.01	3.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	7	3	9	10	7	3.19	1306/1520	3.74	3.63	4.01	4.09	3.19	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	5	4	11	7	9	3.31	1370/1515	3.80	3.95	4.24	4.32	3.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	4	4	11	8	9	3.39	1338/1511	3.82	4.09	4.27	4.34	3.39	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	30	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	****/ 994	****	3.72	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 21	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 5	C 7	General	0
84-150	14	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		Under-grad 39
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	35
			? 1		

Course-Section: STAT 351 0101
 Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO
 Instructor: BEBU, IONUT I
 Enrollment: 76
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1623
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	5	13	4.45	703/1674	4.25	4.31	4.27	4.26	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	392/1674	4.34	4.39	4.23	4.21	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	203/1423	4.36	4.44	4.27	4.27	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	1198/1609	4.00	4.29	4.22	4.27	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	557/1585	4.06	3.98	3.96	3.95	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	328/1535	4.09	4.15	4.08	4.15	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	2	14	4.47	568/1651	4.42	4.45	4.18	4.16	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1673	4.64	4.77	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	838/1656	4.01	4.15	4.07	4.07	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	389/1586	4.62	4.68	4.43	4.42	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	917/1585	4.68	4.73	4.69	4.66	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	2	17	4.75	313/1582	4.41	4.39	4.26	4.26	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	359/1575	4.48	4.42	4.27	4.25	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	379/1380	3.74	3.58	3.94	4.01	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	355/1520	4.12	3.63	4.01	4.09	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	808/1515	4.30	3.95	4.24	4.32	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	729/1511	4.32	4.09	4.27	4.34	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	11	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 994	3.83	3.72	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 265	****	4.13	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.91	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: STAT 351 0101
 Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO
 Instructor: BEBU, IONUT I
 Enrollment: 76
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1623
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	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	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 351 0201
 Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI
 Enrollment: 76
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1624
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	17	13	4.14	1085/1674	4.25	4.31	4.27	4.26	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	11	21	4.47	625/1674	4.34	4.39	4.23	4.21	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	8	22	4.44	648/1423	4.36	4.44	4.27	4.27	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	4	8	16	4.34	729/1609	4.00	4.29	4.22	4.27	4.34	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	3	5	5	14	4.00	769/1585	4.06	3.98	3.96	3.95	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	2	7	6	9	3.80	1110/1535	4.09	4.15	4.08	4.15	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	10	21	4.43	643/1651	4.42	4.45	4.18	4.16	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	28	8	4.22	1442/1673	4.64	4.77	4.69	4.68	4.22	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	1	3	13	9	4.15	838/1656	4.01	4.15	4.07	4.07	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	11	23	4.57	784/1586	4.62	4.68	4.43	4.42	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	29	4.80	811/1585	4.68	4.73	4.69	4.66	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	15	14	4.20	998/1582	4.41	4.39	4.26	4.26	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	9	22	4.49	717/1575	4.48	4.42	4.27	4.25	4.49	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	25	2	2	1	3	2	3.10	1208/1380	3.74	3.58	3.94	4.01	3.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	0	5	7	16	4.06	790/1520	4.12	3.63	4.01	4.09	4.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	4	9	17	4.32	837/1515	4.30	3.95	4.24	4.32	4.32	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	0	5	6	18	4.23	927/1511	4.32	4.09	4.27	4.34	4.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	15	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	474/ 994	3.83	3.72	3.94	3.96	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	2	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	****/ 265	****	4.13	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: STAT 351 0201
 Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI
 Enrollment: 76
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1624
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	8	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	36	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	1						

Course-Section: STAT 351 0301
 Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO
 Instructor: WILSON, MARY C
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1625
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	6	9	4.15	1066/1674	4.25	4.31	4.27	4.26	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	11	4	3.90	1271/1674	4.34	4.39	4.23	4.21	3.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	10	5	3.85	1131/1423	4.36	4.44	4.27	4.27	3.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	5	7	4	3.72	1341/1609	4.00	4.29	4.22	4.27	3.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	3	3	9	3.94	851/1585	4.06	3.98	3.96	3.95	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1022/1535	4.09	4.15	4.08	4.15	3.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	3	12	4.35	741/1651	4.42	4.45	4.18	4.16	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	1040/1673	4.64	4.77	4.69	4.68	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	4	11	0	3.73	1252/1656	4.01	4.15	4.07	4.07	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	901/1586	4.62	4.68	4.43	4.42	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	1225/1585	4.68	4.73	4.69	4.66	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	8	8	4.28	914/1582	4.41	4.39	4.26	4.26	4.28	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	992/1575	4.48	4.42	4.27	4.25	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	2	0	9	5	3.72	923/1380	3.74	3.58	3.94	4.01	3.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	9	5	3.74	1043/1520	4.12	3.63	4.01	4.09	3.74	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	930/1515	4.30	3.95	4.24	4.32	4.21	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	4	5	10	4.32	835/1511	4.32	4.09	4.27	4.34	4.32	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	13	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	676/ 994	3.83	3.72	3.94	3.96	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 1
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 0		

Course-Section: STAT 355 0101
 Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT
 Instructor: WU, YANPING
 Enrollment: 82
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1626
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	0	0	1	1	12	18	27	4.17	1056/1674	3.97	4.31	4.27	4.26	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	13	45	4.75	281/1674	4.35	4.39	4.23	4.21	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	12	46	4.76	250/1423	4.57	4.44	4.27	4.27	4.76	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	8	14	25	4.36	701/1609	4.16	4.29	4.22	4.27	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	17	1	4	12	11	12	3.72	1075/1585	3.42	3.98	3.96	3.95	3.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	19	1	3	7	10	17	4.03	861/1535	3.56	4.15	4.08	4.15	4.03	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	5	11	41	4.63	361/1651	4.50	4.45	4.18	4.16	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	10	46	4.82	850/1673	4.77	4.77	4.69	4.68	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	2	29	17	4.31	641/1656	3.98	4.15	4.07	4.07	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	8	50	4.86	284/1586	4.58	4.68	4.43	4.42	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	9	49	4.84	713/1585	4.78	4.73	4.69	4.66	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	13	41	4.64	481/1582	4.37	4.39	4.26	4.26	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	13	40	4.59	601/1575	4.46	4.42	4.27	4.25	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	43	1	2	2	2	8	3.93	757/1380	3.43	3.58	3.94	4.01	3.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	14	7	13	9	11	2.93	1402/1520	3.14	3.63	4.01	4.09	2.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	7	18	16	11	3.50	1303/1515	3.62	3.95	4.24	4.32	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	4	2	17	12	17	3.69	1253/1511	3.67	4.09	4.27	4.34	3.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	37	1	5	5	1	3	3.00	881/ 994	3.11	3.72	3.94	3.96	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	3	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	****/ 265	****	4.13	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	50	5	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	4	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	4	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	54	2	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	54	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	1	0	4	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	1	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	1	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: STAT 355 0101
 Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT
 Instructor: WU, YANPING
 Enrollment: 82
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1626
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	3	A	34	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	1	B	16						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	5	C	6	General	4	Under-grad	59	Non-major	3
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	15	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	54				
				?	1						

Course-Section: STAT 355 0201
 Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT
 Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL
 Enrollment: 68
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1627
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	3	12	10	10	3.55	1495/1674	3.97	4.31	4.27	4.26	3.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	5	16	13	3.95	1221/1674	4.35	4.39	4.23	4.21	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	10	22	4.37	739/1423	4.57	4.44	4.27	4.27	4.37	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	2	10	6	13	3.88	1242/1609	4.16	4.29	4.22	4.27	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	2	6	7	7	7	3.38	1311/1585	3.42	3.98	3.96	3.95	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	3	8	12	6	3.55	1273/1535	3.56	4.15	4.08	4.15	3.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	10	23	4.42	643/1651	4.50	4.45	4.18	4.16	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	37	5.00	1/1673	4.77	4.77	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	3	1	1	9	12	1	3.46	1399/1656	3.98	4.15	4.07	4.07	3.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	4	13	16	4.29	1112/1586	4.58	4.68	4.43	4.42	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	6	26	4.66	1083/1585	4.78	4.73	4.69	4.66	4.66	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	3	6	12	13	4.03	1119/1582	4.37	4.39	4.26	4.26	4.03	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	2	5	10	15	4.09	1103/1575	4.46	4.42	4.27	4.25	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	23	3	2	2	1	2	2.70	1300/1380	3.43	3.58	3.94	4.01	2.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	7	3	5	6	8	3.17	1312/1520	3.14	3.63	4.01	4.09	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	2	4	8	14	4.10	993/1515	3.62	3.95	4.24	4.32	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	1	4	8	13	3.93	1112/1511	3.67	4.09	4.27	4.34	3.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	18	3	2	2	2	2	2.82	935/ 994	3.11	3.72	3.94	3.96	2.82	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.13	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: STAT 355 0201
 Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT
 Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL
 Enrollment: 68
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1627
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	37	Non-major	2
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	2						

Course-Section: STAT 355 0301
 Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT
 Instructor: HEINZ, FEDERICO
 Enrollment: 76
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1628
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	4	20	19	4.17	1046/1674	3.97	4.31	4.27	4.26	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	18	23	4.37	790/1674	4.35	4.39	4.23	4.21	4.37	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	14	29	4.58	493/1423	4.57	4.44	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	3	1	15	20	4.25	852/1609	4.16	4.29	4.22	4.27	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	18	6	4	3	8	6	3.15	1407/1585	3.42	3.98	3.96	3.95	3.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	7	4	5	7	7	3.10	1428/1535	3.56	4.15	4.08	4.15	3.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	12	27	4.44	613/1651	4.50	4.45	4.18	4.16	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	23	23	4.50	1203/1673	4.77	4.77	4.69	4.68	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	0	0	4	19	9	4.16	838/1656	3.98	4.15	4.07	4.07	4.16	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	11	31	4.59	774/1586	4.58	4.68	4.43	4.42	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	6	39	4.83	762/1585	4.78	4.73	4.69	4.66	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	15	26	4.43	733/1582	4.37	4.39	4.26	4.26	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	4	37	4.70	453/1575	4.46	4.42	4.27	4.25	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	26	2	2	4	2	8	3.67	962/1380	3.43	3.58	3.94	4.01	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	9	4	5	13	11	3.31	1266/1520	3.14	3.63	4.01	4.09	3.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	9	5	6	9	12	3.24	1383/1515	3.62	3.95	4.24	4.32	3.24	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	6	7	4	10	12	3.38	1338/1511	3.67	4.09	4.27	4.34	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	21	3	0	4	7	4	3.50	732/ 994	3.11	3.72	3.94	3.96	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	41	0	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	****/ 265	****	4.13	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	43	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	43	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	43	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: STAT 355 0301
 Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT
 Instructor: HEINZ, FEDERICO
 Enrollment: 76
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1628
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	23	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	21	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	46	Non-major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	42				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 417 0101
 Title TIME SERIES DATA ANLYS
 Instructor: ROY, ANINDYA
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1629
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	243/1674	4.80	4.31	4.27	4.42	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	737/1674	4.40	4.39	4.23	4.31	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1423	****	4.44	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	147/1609	4.86	4.29	4.22	4.30	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	482/1585	4.33	3.98	3.96	4.01	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	105/1535	4.88	4.15	4.08	4.18	4.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	116/1651	4.90	4.45	4.18	4.23	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.15	4.07	4.19	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	214/1586	4.90	4.68	4.43	4.46	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	811/1585	4.80	4.73	4.69	4.76	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	0	8	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.39	4.26	4.31	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	8	4.50	692/1575	4.50	4.42	4.27	4.35	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1380	****	3.58	3.94	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1520	****	3.63	4.01	4.18	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1515	****	3.95	4.24	4.40	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1511	****	4.09	4.27	4.45	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.72	3.94	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		2
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		8
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: STAT 433 0101
 Title STATISTICAL COMPUTING
 Instructor: NEERCHAL, NAGAR
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1630
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	367/1674	4.70	4.31	4.27	4.42	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.39	4.23	4.31	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	335/1423	4.70	4.44	4.27	4.34	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	432/1609	4.56	4.29	4.22	4.30	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	926/1585	3.89	3.98	3.96	4.01	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	283/1535	4.60	4.15	4.08	4.18	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	0	4	3.70	1360/1651	3.70	4.45	4.18	4.23	3.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	706/1673	4.90	4.77	4.69	4.67	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.15	4.07	4.19	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.68	4.43	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	567/1585	4.90	4.73	4.69	4.76	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.39	4.26	4.31	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	692/1575	4.50	4.42	4.27	4.35	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1380	****	3.58	3.94	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1520	****	3.63	4.01	4.18	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1515	****	3.95	4.24	4.40	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1511	****	4.09	4.27	4.45	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.72	3.94	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 451 0101
 Title INTRO PROBABILITY THEO
 Instructor: WANG, XIAO
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1631
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	1	1	5	8	3.94	1271/1674	3.94	4.31	4.27	4.42	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	5	8	3	3.56	1475/1674	3.56	4.39	4.23	4.31	3.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	950/1423	4.11	4.44	4.27	4.34	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	1394/1609	3.64	4.29	4.22	4.30	3.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	3	0	1	2	5	3.55	1199/1585	3.55	3.98	3.96	4.01	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.15	4.08	4.18	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	2	13	4.39	700/1651	4.39	4.45	4.18	4.23	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	1124/1673	4.61	4.77	4.69	4.67	4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	2	4	4	2	3.14	1513/1656	3.14	4.15	4.07	4.19	3.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	1	14	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.68	4.43	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	0	7	9	4.28	1387/1585	4.28	4.73	4.69	4.76	4.28	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	4	5	3	5	3.39	1446/1582	3.39	4.39	4.26	4.31	3.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	1	6	4	3.22	1452/1575	3.22	4.42	4.27	4.35	3.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	2	1	3	5	3	3.43	1082/1380	3.43	3.58	3.94	4.04	3.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	2	0	2	1	3.00	1353/1520	3.00	3.63	4.01	4.18	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	3.95	4.24	4.40	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	4.09	4.27	4.45	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.72	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				

Course-Section: STAT 454 0101
 Title APPLIED STATISTICS
 Instructor: NEERCHAL, NAGAR
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1632
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	133/1674	4.91	4.31	4.27	4.42	4.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	392/1674	4.65	4.39	4.23	4.31	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	349/1423	4.68	4.44	4.27	4.34	4.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	312/1609	4.67	4.29	4.22	4.30	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	3	7	10	4.24	575/1585	4.24	3.98	3.96	4.01	4.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	481/1535	4.42	4.15	4.08	4.18	4.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	4	13	4.36	727/1651	4.36	4.45	4.18	4.23	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	850/1673	4.83	4.77	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	214/1656	4.71	4.15	4.07	4.19	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	371/1586	4.82	4.68	4.43	4.46	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	284/1585	4.95	4.73	4.69	4.76	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	286/1582	4.77	4.39	4.26	4.31	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	268/1575	4.82	4.42	4.27	4.35	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	110/1380	4.82	3.58	3.94	4.04	4.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	967/1520	3.83	3.63	4.01	4.18	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	960/1515	4.17	3.95	4.24	4.40	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	642/1511	4.50	4.09	4.27	4.45	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.72	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.13	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.42	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.13	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course-Section: STAT 454 0101
 Title APPLIED STATISTICS
 Instructor: NEERCHAL, NAGAR
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1632
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	19	Non-major	3
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: STAT 601 0101
 Title APPLIED STATISTICS I
 Instructor: ROY, ANINDYA
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1633
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	521/1674	4.57	4.31	4.27	4.44	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	11	2	4.07	1097/1674	4.07	4.39	4.23	4.34	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	4	4	3.79	1162/1423	3.79	4.44	4.27	4.28	3.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	743/1609	4.33	4.29	4.22	4.34	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	8	3	4.00	769/1585	4.00	3.98	3.96	4.23	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	608/1535	4.31	4.15	4.08	4.27	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	2	7	4.14	988/1651	4.14	4.45	4.18	4.32	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	655/1656	4.30	4.15	4.07	4.15	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	581/1586	4.71	4.68	4.43	4.50	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	1094/1585	4.64	4.73	4.69	4.79	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	1043/1582	4.14	4.39	4.26	4.33	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	793/1575	4.43	4.42	4.27	4.30	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1380	****	3.58	3.94	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	1	2	0	0	2.00	1507/1520	2.00	3.63	4.01	4.19	2.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1393/1515	3.20	3.95	4.24	4.47	3.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	896/1511	4.25	4.09	4.27	4.49	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.72	3.94	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 6	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		Graduate 8
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 6
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

Course-Section: STAT 611 0101
 Title MATHEMATICAL STAT I
 Instructor: RUKHIN, ANDREW
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1634
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	0	10	4.64	445/1674	4.64	4.31	4.27	4.44	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	138/1674	4.91	4.39	4.23	4.34	4.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	739/1423	4.36	4.44	4.27	4.28	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	312/1609	4.67	4.29	4.22	4.34	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	301/1585	4.55	3.98	3.96	4.23	4.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	548/1535	4.36	4.15	4.08	4.27	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	361/1651	4.64	4.45	4.18	4.32	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	257/1656	4.67	4.15	4.07	4.15	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	214/1586	4.91	4.68	4.43	4.50	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.73	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	236/1582	4.82	4.39	4.26	4.33	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	171/1575	4.91	4.42	4.27	4.30	4.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	986/1520	3.80	3.63	4.01	4.19	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	3.95	4.24	4.47	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1194/1511	3.80	4.09	4.27	4.49	3.80	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 651 0101
 Title BASIC PROBABILITY
 Instructor: CHOI, TAERYON
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1635
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	406/1674	4.67	4.31	4.27	4.44	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	379/1674	4.67	4.39	4.23	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	376/1423	4.67	4.44	4.27	4.28	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	408/1609	4.57	4.29	4.22	4.34	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	482/1585	4.33	3.98	3.96	4.23	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	169/1535	4.75	4.15	4.08	4.27	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	208/1651	4.78	4.45	4.18	4.32	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	292/1656	4.63	4.15	4.07	4.15	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.68	4.43	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.73	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	286/1582	4.78	4.39	4.26	4.33	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	327/1575	4.78	4.42	4.27	4.30	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	143/1380	4.75	3.58	3.94	3.85	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	645/1520	4.25	3.63	4.01	4.19	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	898/1515	4.25	3.95	4.24	4.47	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	414/1511	4.75	4.09	4.27	4.49	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.72	3.94	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 700A 0101
 Title CROSSOVER DESIGNS
 Instructor: MATHEW, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1636
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.31	4.27	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	191/1674	4.83	4.39	4.23	4.34	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	181/1423	4.83	4.44	4.27	4.28	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1609	4.83	4.29	4.22	4.34	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	326/1585	4.50	3.98	3.96	4.23	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.15	4.08	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1651	4.83	4.45	4.18	4.32	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	832/1673	4.83	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.15	4.07	4.15	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.68	4.43	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	737/1585	4.83	4.73	4.69	4.79	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.39	4.26	4.33	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	246/1575	4.83	4.42	4.27	4.30	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1217/1380	3.00	3.58	3.94	3.85	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	645/1520	4.25	3.63	4.01	4.19	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	898/1515	4.25	3.95	4.24	4.47	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	642/1511	4.50	4.09	4.27	4.49	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	3.72	3.94	4.07	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: STAT 710 0101
 Title TOP:MATH STAT/STAT INF
 Instructor: RUKHIN, ANDREW
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1637
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.31	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	270/1674	4.75	4.39	4.23	4.34	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.28	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.29	4.22	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1585	5.00	3.98	3.96	4.23	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	169/1535	4.75	4.15	4.08	4.27	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.45	4.18	4.32	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1203/1673	4.50	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.15	4.07	4.15	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	496/1586	4.75	4.68	4.43	4.50	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.73	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	313/1582	4.75	4.39	4.26	4.33	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	359/1575	4.75	4.42	4.27	4.30	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1374/1380	1.50	3.58	3.94	3.85	1.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	3.63	4.01	4.19	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1515	5.00	3.95	4.24	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.09	4.27	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	1	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 2
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 2
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		