

Course-Section: MATH 100 0101
 Title INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH
 Instructor: SEIDMAN, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1051
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	5	2	4	3.27	1557/1649	2.99	4.13	4.28	4.11	3.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	7	3	1	4	3.13	1582/1648	3.26	4.21	4.23	4.16	3.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	3	4	4	3.40	1243/1375	3.89	4.26	4.27	4.10	3.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	6	2	2	3.45	1421/1595	3.43	4.05	4.20	4.03	3.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	5	4	2	3.21	1381/1533	3.17	3.79	4.04	3.87	3.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	0	4	1	2	3.38	1330/1512	3.16	4.04	4.10	3.86	3.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	4	4	1	3	2.80	1571/1623	3.49	4.33	4.16	4.08	2.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	9	4	4.13	1484/1646	4.48	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	2	4	1	2	2.91	1535/1621	2.81	3.95	4.06	3.96	2.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	3	2	2	6	3.47	1468/1568	3.63	4.47	4.43	4.39	3.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	0	2	11	4.47	1273/1572	4.34	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	2	4	3	3	3.07	1491/1564	2.93	4.09	4.28	4.20	3.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	3	2	4	3.13	1462/1559	3.03	4.16	4.29	4.20	3.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1270/1352	3.11	3.67	3.98	3.86	2.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	2	1	4	1	2.82	1312/1384	2.78	3.50	4.08	3.86	2.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	2	1	4	2	3.40	1233/1382	2.87	3.60	4.29	4.03	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	2	4	2	1	3.22	1260/1368	3.02	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.50	3.95	3.75	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	3.93	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	3.60	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	3.71	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.07	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	3.90	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.40	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	2.81	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.73	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.27	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.40	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.89	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.60	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	3.13	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	2.78	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: MATH 100 0101
 Title INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH
 Instructor: SEIDMAN, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1051
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	2	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	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 100 0201
 Title INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH
 Instructor: CAMPBELL, ROBER
 Enrollment: 54
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1052
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	0	3	5	6	2	2	2.72	1634/1649	2.99	4.13	4.28	4.11	2.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	6	3	5	3.39	1532/1648	3.26	4.21	4.23	4.16	3.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	684/1375	3.89	4.26	4.27	4.10	4.39	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	4	6	3	4	3.41	1440/1595	3.43	4.05	4.20	4.03	3.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	8	2	3	3.12	1419/1533	3.17	3.79	4.04	3.87	3.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	8	0	3	2.94	1449/1512	3.16	4.04	4.10	3.86	2.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	3	3	9	4.19	894/1623	3.49	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	0	17	4.83	782/1646	4.48	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	3	1	7	3	0	2.71	1566/1621	2.81	3.95	4.06	3.96	2.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	6	5	3	3.79	1391/1568	3.63	4.47	4.43	4.39	3.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	1412/1572	4.34	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.21	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	4	7	1	1	2.79	1528/1564	2.93	4.09	4.28	4.20	2.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	3	5	2	2	2.93	1498/1559	3.03	4.16	4.29	4.20	2.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	1	5	5	2	3.43	1090/1352	3.11	3.67	3.98	3.86	3.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	2	4	1	2	2.75	1322/1384	2.78	3.50	4.08	3.86	2.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	4	1	6	1	0	2.33	1370/1382	2.87	3.60	4.29	4.03	2.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	1	6	1	1	2.82	1324/1368	3.02	3.63	4.30	4.01	2.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	8	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	****/ 948	4.00	3.50	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	3.93	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	3.60	4.12	4.08	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.07	4.35	4.38	****	

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	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	5	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	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	10	12	6	3.65	1443/1649	3.98	4.13	4.28	4.11	3.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	9	15	4.23	931/1648	4.31	4.21	4.23	4.16	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	9	15	4.13	901/1375	4.22	4.26	4.27	4.10	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	3	2	2	11	7	3.68	1323/1595	4.03	4.05	4.20	4.03	3.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	15	2	4	2	4	2	3.00	1441/1533	3.58	3.79	4.04	3.87	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	16	3	3	3	2	1	2.58	1491/1512	3.68	4.04	4.10	3.86	2.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	2	9	15	4.17	915/1623	4.22	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	2	1	3	17	1	3.58	1310/1621	3.89	3.95	4.06	3.96	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	7	19	4.50	852/1568	4.45	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	3	24	4.70	1034/1572	4.71	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	6	8	14	4.10	1083/1564	4.28	4.09	4.28	4.20	4.10	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	3	9	15	4.17	1031/1559	4.35	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	19	3	0	3	3	2	3.09	1208/1352	3.56	3.67	3.98	3.86	3.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	2	5	4	7	3.74	976/1384	3.61	3.50	4.08	3.86	3.74	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	3	9	7	4.10	923/1382	3.69	3.60	4.29	4.03	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	5	8	4	3.78	1085/1368	3.67	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	16	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 948	3.40	3.50	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	2	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 221	3.86	3.93	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	****/ 243	3.37	3.60	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 212	3.71	3.71	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 209	4.07	4.07	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	2	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 555	4.29	2.65	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	3.90	3.90	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	4.00	4.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	3.40	3.40	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	2.81	2.81	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	3.73	3.73	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	4.27	4.27	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	4.00	4.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	3.71	3.09	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	3.40	3.40	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	3.89	3.89	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	3.60	3.60	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	3.13	3.13	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	3.33	2.78	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: MATH 106 0101
 Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC
 Instructor: SHARMA, NEERAJ
 Enrollment: 57
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1053
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	9	A	7	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	31
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	1	7	12	15	3.92	1254/1649	3.98	4.13	4.28	4.11	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	10	20	4.32	811/1648	4.31	4.21	4.23	4.16	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	12	22	4.45	617/1375	4.22	4.26	4.27	4.10	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	2	5	5	10	4.05	1044/1595	4.03	4.05	4.20	4.03	4.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	3	1	5	10	8	3.70	1113/1533	3.58	3.79	4.04	3.87	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	1	0	10	5	3	3.47	1282/1512	3.68	4.04	4.10	3.86	3.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	6	8	22	4.29	780/1623	4.22	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	29	4.76	897/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	7	15	9	4.00	914/1621	3.89	3.95	4.06	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	9	27	4.63	683/1568	4.45	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	0	7	29	4.63	1108/1572	4.71	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	4	15	17	4.21	981/1564	4.28	4.09	4.28	4.20	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	13	23	4.55	640/1559	4.35	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	21	2	0	6	5	3	3.44	1085/1352	3.56	3.67	3.98	3.86	3.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	4	8	6	14	3.69	1002/1384	3.61	3.50	4.08	3.86	3.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	4	7	6	9	9	3.34	1248/1382	3.69	3.60	4.29	4.03	3.34	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	2	16	4	9	3.41	1203/1368	3.67	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.41	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	23	1	2	3	2	3	3.36	763/ 948	3.40	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.36	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	7	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 221	3.86	3.93	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	2	1	0	3	2	3.25	****/ 243	3.37	3.60	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	4	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 212	3.71	3.71	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 209	4.07	4.07	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 555	4.29	2.65	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 88	3.90	3.90	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	4.00	4.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	3.40	3.40	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	2	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 52	2.81	2.81	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 48	3.73	3.73	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 39	4.27	4.27	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	4.00	4.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	2	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 312	3.71	3.09	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	****/ 53	3.40	3.40	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	1	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 30	3.89	3.89	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	2	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 41	3.60	3.60	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 24	3.13	3.13	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 110	3.33	2.78	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: MATH 106 0201
 Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC
 Instructor: MARFANI, ERUM F
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1054
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	3	A	13	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	38	Non-major	37
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 106 0801
 Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC
 Instructor: GASSMAN, AMANDA
 Enrollment: 61
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1056
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	16	15	4.25	965/1649	3.98	4.13	4.28	4.11	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	24	4.56	498/1648	4.31	4.21	4.23	4.16	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	11	16	4.11	908/1375	4.22	4.26	4.27	4.10	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	3	6	6	14	4.07	1032/1595	4.03	4.05	4.20	4.03	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	3	3	8	7	3.90	915/1533	3.58	3.79	4.04	3.87	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	4	8	12	4.33	595/1512	3.68	4.04	4.10	3.86	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	9	8	15	4.03	1019/1623	4.22	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.03	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	33	4.94	398/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	1	0	2	13	8	4.13	835/1621	3.89	3.95	4.06	3.96	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	1	3	25	4.70	588/1568	4.45	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	1	0	0	2	25	4.79	876/1572	4.71	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	1	8	20	4.53	620/1564	4.28	4.09	4.28	4.20	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	2	5	22	4.69	487/1559	4.35	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	16	3	1	0	4	7	3.73	928/1352	3.56	3.67	3.98	3.86	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	8	3	11	4.04	781/1384	3.61	3.50	4.08	3.86	4.04	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	2	2	6	14	4.33	774/1382	3.69	3.60	4.29	4.03	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	4	7	11	4.22	866/1368	3.67	3.63	4.30	4.01	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	12	2	2	1	1	5	3.45	722/ 948	3.40	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.45	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	3.86	3.93	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 243	3.37	3.60	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 212	3.71	3.71	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 209	4.07	4.07	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 555	4.29	2.65	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	3.90	3.90	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	4.00	4.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	3.40	3.40	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 52	2.81	2.81	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 48	3.73	3.73	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	4.27	4.27	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 39	4.00	4.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 312	3.71	3.09	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	3.40	3.40	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	3.89	3.89	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	3.60	3.60	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	3.13	3.13	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	3.33	2.78	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: MATH 106 0801
 Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC
 Instructor: GASSMAN, AMANDA
 Enrollment: 61
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1056
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	2	Under-grad	36	Non-major	36
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 106 1501
 Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC
 Instructor: RILEY, SAMANTHA
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1057
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	510/1649	3.98	4.13	4.28	4.11	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	0	7	4.40	702/1648	4.31	4.21	4.23	4.16	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	763/1375	4.22	4.26	4.27	4.10	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1067/1595	4.03	4.05	4.20	4.03	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	594/1533	3.58	3.79	4.04	3.87	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	380/1512	3.68	4.04	4.10	3.86	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	395/1623	4.22	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	664/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	914/1621	3.89	3.95	4.06	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	699/1568	4.45	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1071/1572	4.71	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	473/1564	4.28	4.09	4.28	4.20	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	448/1559	4.35	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	582/1352	3.56	3.67	3.98	3.86	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	247/1384	3.61	3.50	4.08	3.86	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	831/1382	3.69	3.60	4.29	4.03	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	844/1368	3.67	3.63	4.30	4.01	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	152/ 948	3.40	3.50	3.95	3.75	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 106 1601
 Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC
 Instructor: RILEY, SAMANTHA
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1058
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	912/1649	3.98	4.13	4.28	4.11	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	216/1648	4.31	4.21	4.23	4.16	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	166/1375	4.22	4.26	4.27	4.10	4.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	236/1595	4.03	4.05	4.20	4.03	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	703/1533	3.58	3.79	4.04	3.87	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	310/1512	3.68	4.04	4.10	3.86	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	395/1623	4.22	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	914/1621	3.89	3.95	4.06	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	588/1568	4.45	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1572	4.71	4.66	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1564	4.28	4.09	4.28	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	227/1559	4.35	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	379/1352	3.56	3.67	3.98	3.86	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	0	0	0	3	3.00	1254/1384	3.61	3.50	4.08	3.86	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	1233/1382	3.69	3.60	4.29	4.03	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1181/1368	3.67	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 948	3.40	3.50	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	3.86	3.93	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	110/ 243	3.37	3.60	4.12	4.08	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	3.71	3.71	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 209	4.07	4.07	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	4.29	2.65	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	3.90	3.90	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	4.00	4.00	4.47	4.30	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	2.81	2.81	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	3.73	3.73	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	4.27	4.27	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	4.00	4.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	3.71	3.09	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	32/ 53	3.40	3.40	4.30	4.17	4.25	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	14/ 30	3.89	3.89	4.16	4.06	4.33	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	40/ 41	3.60	3.60	4.43	4.27	3.33	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	3.13	3.13	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	3.33	2.78	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: MATH 106 1601
 Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC
 Instructor: RILEY, SAMANTHA
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1058
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 106 1701
 Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC
 Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL
 Enrollment: 51
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1059
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	7	5	5	3.26	1557/1649	3.98	4.13	4.28	4.11	3.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	8	9	4.04	1100/1648	4.31	4.21	4.23	4.16	4.04	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	5	11	3.96	992/1375	4.22	4.26	4.27	4.10	3.96	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	3	1	3	10	2	3.37	1459/1595	4.03	4.05	4.20	4.03	3.37	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	1	1	5	3	0	3.00	1441/1533	3.58	3.79	4.04	3.87	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	3	1	2	5	1	3.00	1428/1512	3.68	4.04	4.10	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	4	14	4.30	757/1623	4.22	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	332/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	3	1	1	2	9	2	3.67	1261/1621	3.89	3.95	4.06	3.96	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	4	6	10	4.14	1205/1568	4.45	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	7	15	4.52	1222/1572	4.71	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	5	10	4	3.59	1362/1564	4.28	4.09	4.28	4.20	3.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	1	6	10	3.82	1241/1559	4.35	4.16	4.29	4.20	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	2	1	1	6	1	3.27	1153/1352	3.56	3.67	3.98	3.86	3.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	3	4	6	5	3.33	1159/1384	3.61	3.50	4.08	3.86	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	3	4	4	3	6	3.25	1275/1382	3.69	3.60	4.29	4.03	3.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	1	5	6	4	3.37	1219/1368	3.67	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.37	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	19	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 948	3.40	3.50	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	4	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	****/ 221	3.86	3.93	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	3	4	1	1	2	2.55	240/ 243	3.37	3.60	4.12	4.08	2.55	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	5	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 212	3.71	3.71	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	4	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 209	4.07	4.07	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	4.29	2.65	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	2	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	****/ 88	3.90	3.90	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	2	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	****/ 85	4.00	4.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	5	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	4	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 92	3.40	3.40	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	2	1	1	1	0	2.20	****/ 52	2.81	2.81	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	****/ 48	3.73	3.73	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 39	4.27	4.27	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	2	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 39	4.00	4.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	3	2	1	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 312	3.71	3.09	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	4	1	0	4	2	2.91	52/ 53	3.40	3.40	4.30	4.17	2.91	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	2	1	1	3	4	3.55	26/ 30	3.89	3.89	4.16	4.06	3.55	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	2	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	32/ 41	3.60	3.60	4.43	4.27	3.89	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	6	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/ 24	3.13	3.13	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	8	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 110	3.33	2.78	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: MATH 106 1701
 Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC
 Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL
 Enrollment: 51
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1059
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	2						
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	10				
				?	3						

Course-Section: MATH 106 1801
 Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC
 Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1060
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	2	9	7	4.05	1149/1649	3.98	4.13	4.28	4.11	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	10	5	3.95	1176/1648	4.31	4.21	4.23	4.16	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	3	9	3.95	992/1375	4.22	4.26	4.27	4.10	3.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	4	9	4	3.89	1213/1595	4.03	4.05	4.20	4.03	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	2	5	4	3	3.25	1366/1533	3.58	3.79	4.04	3.87	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	4	2	4	2	5	3.12	1414/1512	3.68	4.04	4.10	3.86	3.12	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	5	5	7	3.80	1241/1623	4.22	4.33	4.16	4.08	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	6	5	2	3.47	1369/1621	3.89	3.95	4.06	3.96	3.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	6	4	9	4.05	1257/1568	4.45	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	931/1572	4.71	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	4	3	6	7	3.80	1273/1564	4.28	4.09	4.28	4.20	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	5	8	3.90	1197/1559	4.35	4.16	4.29	4.20	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	3	2	7	2	4	3.11	1204/1352	3.56	3.67	3.98	3.86	3.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	6	3	6	3.30	1175/1384	3.61	3.50	4.08	3.86	3.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	4	6	2	6	3.30	1259/1382	3.69	3.60	4.29	4.03	3.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	5	7	3	3	3.00	1286/1368	3.67	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	12	4	1	2	0	1	2.13	935/ 948	3.40	3.50	3.95	3.75	2.13	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	12	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	163/ 221	3.86	3.93	4.16	4.05	3.86	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	3	1	7	3	4	3.22	219/ 243	3.37	3.60	4.12	4.08	3.22	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	10	0	1	3	0	3	3.71	192/ 212	3.71	3.71	4.40	4.43	3.71	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	3	0	2	3	1	8	4.07	148/ 209	4.07	4.07	4.35	4.38	4.07	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	10	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	349/ 555	4.29	2.65	4.29	4.14	4.29	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	7	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	81/ 88	3.90	3.90	4.54	4.31	3.90	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	11	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	67/ 85	4.00	4.00	4.47	4.30	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	14	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	12	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	84/ 92	3.40	3.40	4.35	4.01	3.40	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	12	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	6	0	4	3	3	2.81	43/ 52	2.81	2.81	4.06	3.72	2.81	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	1	3	2	2	7	3.73	37/ 48	3.73	3.73	4.09	3.65	3.73	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	6	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	24/ 39	4.27	4.27	4.47	4.36	4.27	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	7	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	27/ 39	4.00	4.00	4.38	4.37	4.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	9	0	1	3	0	3	3.71	200/ 312	3.71	3.09	3.68	3.51	3.71	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	0	5	3	5	3.44	45/ 53	3.40	3.40	4.30	4.17	3.44	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	1	2	1	3	1	8	3.80	22/ 30	3.89	3.89	4.16	4.06	3.80	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	4	2	2	1	1	6	3.58	35/ 41	3.60	3.60	4.43	4.27	3.58	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	8	1	2	2	1	2	3.13	23/ 24	3.13	3.13	4.42	4.24	3.13	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	10	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	100/ 110	3.33	2.78	3.99	3.83	3.33	

Course-Section: MATH 106 1801
 Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC
 Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1060
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
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	7				
				?	2						

Course-Section: MATH 106 1901
 Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC
 Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1061
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1295/1649	3.98	4.13	4.28	4.11	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	1043/1648	4.31	4.21	4.23	4.16	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	1049/1375	4.22	4.26	4.27	4.10	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	417/1595	4.03	4.05	4.20	4.03	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1366/1533	3.58	3.79	4.04	3.87	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	883/1512	3.68	4.04	4.10	3.86	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1029/1623	4.22	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	812/1621	3.89	3.95	4.06	3.96	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	1279/1568	4.45	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	931/1572	4.71	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	939/1564	4.28	4.09	4.28	4.20	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1277/1559	4.35	4.16	4.29	4.20	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	1177/1352	3.56	3.67	3.98	3.86	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	0	1	1	2.67	1335/1384	3.61	3.50	4.08	3.86	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	2	1	1	2	3.14	1302/1382	3.69	3.60	4.29	4.03	3.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1115/1368	3.67	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	3.40	3.50	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	3.86	3.93	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	3.37	3.60	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212	3.71	3.71	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	4.07	4.07	4.35	4.38	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	3.40	3.40	4.35	4.01	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	2.81	2.81	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	3.73	3.73	4.09	3.65	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	50/ 53	3.40	3.40	4.30	4.17	3.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	3.89	3.89	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	3.60	3.60	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	3.13	3.13	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	3.33	2.78	3.99	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

I	0	Other	5
?	1		

Course-Section: MATH 106Y 0101
 Title ALGEBRA AND ELEM. FUNC
 Instructor: MARFANI, ERUM F
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1062
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1580/1649	3.17	4.13	4.28	4.11	3.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.21	4.23	4.16	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1071/1375	3.83	4.26	4.27	4.10	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1490/1595	3.25	4.05	4.20	4.03	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	1511/1533	2.50	3.79	4.04	3.87	2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	1504/1512	2.25	4.04	4.10	3.86	2.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	915/1623	4.17	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1037/1646	4.67	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	789/1621	4.17	3.95	4.06	3.96	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	983/1568	4.40	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.66	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1127/1564	4.00	4.09	4.28	4.20	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1121/1559	4.00	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1352	4.50	3.67	3.98	3.86	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	0	0	2	3.00	1254/1384	3.00	3.50	4.08	3.86	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	1175/1382	3.60	3.60	4.29	4.03	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1286/1368	3.00	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	776/ 948	3.33	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	3.90	4.54	4.31	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.40	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.54	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	3.40	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	3.89	4.16	4.06	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 115 0201
 Title FINITE MATHEMATICS
 Instructor: KOGAN, JACOB
 Enrollment: 56
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1063
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	5	2	8	0	1	2.38	1643/1649	2.38	4.13	4.28	4.11	2.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	6	0	6	3	0	2.40	1640/1648	2.40	4.21	4.23	4.16	2.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	2	4	4	1	2.63	1363/1375	2.63	4.26	4.27	4.10	2.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	4	3	1	1	2.55	1582/1595	2.55	4.05	4.20	4.03	2.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	1	4	2	0	2.67	1499/1533	2.67	3.79	4.04	3.87	2.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	3	1	5	1	0	2.40	1498/1512	2.40	4.04	4.10	3.86	2.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	4	1	2	4	4	3.20	1496/1623	3.20	4.33	4.16	4.08	3.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	1258/1646	4.44	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	3	2	4	2	0	2.45	1592/1621	2.45	3.95	4.06	3.96	2.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	4	3	2	0	3	2.58	1551/1568	2.58	4.47	4.43	4.39	2.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	3	1	2	1	5	3.33	1547/1572	3.33	4.66	4.70	4.64	3.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	4	2	3	2	1	2.50	1547/1564	2.50	4.09	4.28	4.20	2.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	2	4	0	2	2.50	1528/1559	2.50	4.16	4.29	4.20	2.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	2	2	0	0	1	2.20	1330/1352	2.20	3.67	3.98	3.86	2.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	6	0	3	0	0	1.67	1375/1384	1.67	3.50	4.08	3.86	1.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	3	2	2	0	2	2.56	1359/1382	2.56	3.60	4.29	4.03	2.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	2	4	0	0	2.11	1355/1368	2.11	3.63	4.30	4.01	2.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	8	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	3.75	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 131 0101
 Title MATH FOR ELEM TCHRS I
 Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1064
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	5	12	4.53	617/1649	4.53	4.13	4.28	4.11	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	291/1648	4.72	4.21	4.23	4.16	4.72	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	380/1375	4.68	4.26	4.27	4.10	4.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	218/1595	4.78	4.05	4.20	4.03	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	584/1533	4.29	3.79	4.04	3.87	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	294/1512	4.63	4.04	4.10	3.86	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	241/1623	4.74	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.74	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	6	4.32	1356/1646	4.32	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.32	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	643/1621	4.29	3.95	4.06	3.96	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	667/1568	4.64	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	414/1572	4.93	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	2	1	10	4.43	754/1564	4.43	4.09	4.28	4.20	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	261/1559	4.86	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	10	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1352	****	3.67	3.98	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1384	****	3.50	4.08	3.86	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	946/1382	4.00	3.60	4.29	4.03	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1071/1368	3.80	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	3.75	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	7	14	20	31	3.92	1254/1649	3.98	4.13	4.28	4.11	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	14	19	39	4.28	862/1648	4.19	4.21	4.23	4.16	4.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	3	6	16	48	4.49	557/1375	4.41	4.26	4.27	4.10	4.49	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	12	1	4	11	14	31	4.15	956/1595	4.06	4.05	4.20	4.03	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	15	2	7	14	12	20	3.75	1074/1533	3.71	3.79	4.04	3.87	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	26	2	2	11	12	20	3.98	924/1512	3.92	4.04	4.10	3.86	3.98	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	7	13	18	33	4.04	1009/1623	4.23	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.04	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	1	1	0	1	69	4.89	697/1646	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	1	0	11	28	16	4.04	897/1621	3.94	3.95	4.06	3.96	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	7	14	51	4.53	827/1568	4.54	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	12	59	4.78	876/1572	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	9	7	20	34	4.04	1109/1564	4.08	4.09	4.28	4.20	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	4	12	11	44	4.29	938/1559	4.32	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	21	6	4	11	11	18	3.62	991/1352	3.39	3.67	3.98	3.86	3.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	9	23	13	21	3.54	1064/1384	3.68	3.50	4.08	3.86	3.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	6	9	17	17	20	3.52	1207/1382	3.47	3.60	4.29	4.03	3.52	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	8	8	19	17	15	3.34	1225/1368	3.48	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.34	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	40	6	4	5	6	6	3.07	838/ 948	3.20	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.07	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	62	5	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	****/ 221	****	3.93	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	64	0	2	0	4	3	2	3.27	****/ 243	****	3.60	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	66	2	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	****/ 212	****	3.71	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	65	3	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	****/ 209	****	4.07	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	64	5	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	68	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 88	****	3.90	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	70	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	70	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	70	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 92	****	3.40	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	70	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	68	0	3	0	1	2	1	2.71	****/ 52	****	2.81	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	69	0	2	0	3	0	1	2.67	****/ 48	****	3.73	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	70	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 39	****	4.27	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	69	3	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	68	2	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	68	0	0	1	3	0	3	3.71	****/ 53	****	3.40	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	69	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/ 30	****	3.89	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	68	1	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	****/ 41	****	3.60	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	68	2	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 24	****	3.13	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	69	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 110	****	2.78	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: MATH 150 0101
 Title PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC
 Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL
 Enrollment: 164
 Questionnaires: 75

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1065
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	2	A	18	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	20	General	1	Under-grad	75	Non-major	75
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	40				
				?	1						

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	9	28	21	4.03	1162/1649	3.98	4.13	4.28	4.11	4.03	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	5	11	16	30	4.15	1021/1648	4.19	4.21	4.23	4.16	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	8	22	31	4.30	763/1375	4.41	4.26	4.27	4.10	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	13	1	3	13	15	16	3.88	1219/1595	4.06	4.05	4.20	4.03	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	14	7	3	14	14	9	3.32	1344/1533	3.71	3.79	4.04	3.87	3.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	20	0	5	12	12	12	3.76	1119/1512	3.92	4.04	4.10	3.86	3.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	3	10	16	31	4.20	883/1623	4.23	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	1	2	57	4.93	465/1646	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	1	0	2	17	13	9	3.71	1234/1621	3.94	3.95	4.06	3.96	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	2	9	10	38	4.42	956/1568	4.54	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	3	11	41	4.64	1096/1572	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	2	2	17	13	23	3.93	1200/1564	4.08	4.09	4.28	4.20	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	2	13	13	29	4.21	994/1559	4.32	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	23	5	6	7	8	5	3.06	1211/1352	3.39	3.67	3.98	3.86	3.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	4	9	13	23	4.06	774/1384	3.68	3.50	4.08	3.86	4.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	3	7	15	12	13	3.50	1216/1382	3.47	3.60	4.29	4.03	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	2	4	16	14	12	3.63	1138/1368	3.48	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	27	4	2	4	7	5	3.32	784/ 948	3.20	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.32	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	3	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	****/ 221	****	3.93	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	58	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	****/ 243	****	3.60	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	59	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 212	****	3.71	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	60	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 209	****	4.07	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	60	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	61	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 88	****	3.90	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	61	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	61	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	61	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	3.40	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	59	1	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	63	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	2.81	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	63	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	3.73	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	63	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.27	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	63	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	61	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	62	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 53	****	3.40	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	62	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	3.89	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	62	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	3.60	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	62	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	3.13	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	62	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	2.78	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: MATH 150 0201
 Title PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC
 Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL
 Enrollment: 166
 Questionnaires: 65

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1066
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 2	A 15	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 4	C 11	General 1	Under-grad 65 Non-major 65
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 2		
			I 0		
			? 0		

Course-Section: MATH 150 0301
 Title PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC
 Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI
 Enrollment: 164
 Questionnaires: 75

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1067
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	3	16	29	24	3.99	1200/1649	3.98	4.13	4.28	4.11	3.99	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	5	9	29	30	4.15	1010/1648	4.19	4.21	4.23	4.16	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	3	25	42	4.44	629/1375	4.41	4.26	4.27	4.10	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	30	1	0	9	14	19	4.16	930/1595	4.06	4.05	4.20	4.03	4.16	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	28	1	3	7	14	19	4.07	774/1533	3.71	3.79	4.04	3.87	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	45	1	2	4	9	12	4.04	868/1512	3.92	4.04	4.10	3.86	4.04	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	0	1	10	16	44	4.45	568/1623	4.23	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	26	45	4.63	1070/1646	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	3	0	1	15	23	21	4.07	881/1621	3.94	3.95	4.06	3.96	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	17	52	4.66	652/1568	4.54	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.66	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	3	23	46	4.56	1184/1572	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	11	22	37	4.27	918/1564	4.08	4.09	4.28	4.20	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	10	14	47	4.45	763/1559	4.32	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	50	2	1	7	5	5	3.50	1049/1352	3.39	3.67	3.98	3.86	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	10	4	14	13	19	3.45	1101/1384	3.68	3.50	4.08	3.86	3.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	9	2	17	17	13	3.40	1235/1382	3.47	3.60	4.29	4.03	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	9	1	17	16	15	3.47	1191/1368	3.48	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.47	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	41	3	5	4	2	3	2.82	****/ 948	3.20	3.50	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	68	3	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	****/ 221	****	3.93	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	68	0	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	****/ 243	****	3.60	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	68	3	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 212	****	3.71	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	69	2	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 209	****	4.07	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	69	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	72	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 88	****	3.90	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	72	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	72	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	72	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	3.40	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	70	1	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	73	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	2.81	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	73	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	****	3.73	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	73	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.27	4.47	4.36	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	73	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.40	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	73	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	3.89	4.16	4.06	****	

Course-Section: MATH 150 0301
 Title PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC
 Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI
 Enrollment: 164
 Questionnaires: 75

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1067
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	5	A	15	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	20	General	4	Under-grad	75	Non-major	75
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 151 0101
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY I
 Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI
 Enrollment: 64
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1068
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	8	7	12	4.15	1076/1649	4.06	4.13	4.28	4.11	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	15	4.33	797/1648	4.26	4.21	4.23	4.16	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	10	12	4.11	908/1375	4.16	4.26	4.27	4.10	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	2	2	3	10	4.24	841/1595	4.10	4.05	4.20	4.03	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	0	2	10	7	4.26	614/1533	3.79	3.79	4.04	3.87	4.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	553/1512	3.97	4.04	4.10	3.86	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	5	16	4.37	671/1623	4.50	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	26	4.93	531/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	11	8	4.13	824/1621	4.08	3.95	4.06	3.96	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	652/1568	4.65	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	1084/1572	4.68	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	7	15	4.42	754/1564	4.27	4.09	4.28	4.20	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	573/1559	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	16	2	1	1	1	4	3.44	1080/1352	3.87	3.67	3.98	3.86	3.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	9	5	3	4	3	2.46	1350/1384	3.74	3.50	4.08	3.86	2.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	4	4	5	6	4	3.09	1311/1382	3.60	3.60	4.29	4.03	3.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	5	1	8	7	1	2.91	1313/1368	3.66	3.63	4.30	4.01	2.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	22	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 948	3.55	3.50	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	3	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	3.93	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	****/ 243	****	3.60	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 212	****	3.71	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 209	****	4.07	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	5	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	3.90	4.54	4.31	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 92	****	3.40	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	****/ 52	****	2.81	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	****/ 48	****	3.73	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 39	****	4.27	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 53	****	3.40	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 30	****	3.89	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	1	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 41	****	3.60	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	1	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	3.13	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	2.78	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: MATH 151 0101
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I
 Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI
 Enrollment: 64
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1068
 FEB 11, 2009
 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 12	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 27 Non-major 25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	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		
			? 0	Other 17	

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	0	0	9	9	24	4.36	844/1649	4.06	4.13	4.28	4.11	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	30	4.62	427/1648	4.26	4.21	4.23	4.16	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	6	29	4.50	546/1375	4.16	4.26	4.27	4.10	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	1	2	1	8	14	4.23	841/1595	4.10	4.05	4.20	4.03	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	16	1	4	5	5	10	3.76	1055/1533	3.79	3.79	4.04	3.87	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	23	0	3	5	1	9	3.89	1035/1512	3.97	4.04	4.10	3.86	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	8	28	4.45	568/1623	4.50	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	35	7	4.17	1462/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	3	12	19	4.47	415/1621	4.08	3.95	4.06	3.96	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	8	32	4.71	554/1568	4.65	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	38	4.86	715/1572	4.68	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	10	29	4.62	537/1564	4.27	4.09	4.28	4.20	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	5	32	4.64	536/1559	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	23	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	690/1352	3.87	3.67	3.98	3.86	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	2	6	10	14	3.86	911/1384	3.74	3.50	4.08	3.86	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	2	7	7	17	4.00	946/1382	3.60	3.60	4.29	4.03	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	4	2	9	17	4.03	942/1368	3.66	3.63	4.30	4.01	4.03	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	15	1	1	3	7	8	4.00	431/ 948	3.55	3.50	3.95	3.75	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	41	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	3.93	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	3.60	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	3.71	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	4.07	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	3.40	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	2.81	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.73	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.27	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.40	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.89	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.60	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	3.13	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	2.78	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: MATH 151 0201
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I
 Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1069
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	2	A	18	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	42	Non-major	41
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 151 0301
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I
 Instructor: SONG, YOON J
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1070
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	5	14	19	4.05	1156/1649	4.06	4.13	4.28	4.11	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	15	20	4.23	920/1648	4.26	4.21	4.23	4.16	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	17	22	4.40	674/1375	4.16	4.26	4.27	4.10	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	1	2	8	8	12	3.90	1202/1595	4.10	4.05	4.20	4.03	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	1	0	5	11	13	4.17	703/1533	3.79	3.79	4.04	3.87	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	0	0	5	5	13	4.35	585/1512	3.97	4.04	4.10	3.86	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	5	32	4.58	416/1623	4.50	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	42	5.00	1/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	1	6	19	6	3.94	1016/1621	4.08	3.95	4.06	3.96	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	7	35	4.77	461/1568	4.65	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	9	32	4.70	1034/1572	4.68	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	6	8	25	4.23	960/1564	4.27	4.09	4.28	4.20	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	1	10	28	4.44	777/1559	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	21	0	2	4	6	8	4.00	690/1352	3.87	3.67	3.98	3.86	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	8	30	4.52	424/1384	3.74	3.50	4.08	3.86	4.52	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	5	7	12	17	4.00	946/1382	3.60	3.60	4.29	4.03	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	1	9	11	17	3.93	1015/1368	3.66	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	29	2	2	2	3	2	3.09	836/ 948	3.55	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.09	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 221	****	3.93	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	****/ 243	****	3.60	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 212	****	3.71	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 209	****	4.07	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 88	****	3.90	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.40	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	2	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 52	****	2.81	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 48	****	3.73	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.27	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 53	****	3.40	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 30	****	3.89	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.60	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 24	****	3.13	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 110	****	2.78	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: MATH 151 0301
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I
 Instructor: SONG, YOON J
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1070
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	2	A	13	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	43	Non-major	42
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	28				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 151 0401
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY I
 Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI
 Enrollment: 64
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1071
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	6	12	15	4.06	1149/1649	4.06	4.13	4.28	4.11	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	12	20	4.36	756/1648	4.26	4.21	4.23	4.16	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	7	13	14	4.06	932/1375	4.16	4.26	4.27	4.10	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	12	0	1	4	8	10	4.17	916/1595	4.10	4.05	4.20	4.03	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	4	7	6	7	3.56	1207/1533	3.79	3.79	4.04	3.87	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	24	2	0	1	3	6	3.92	1008/1512	3.97	4.04	4.10	3.86	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	8	23	4.47	541/1623	4.50	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	35	4.97	199/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	3	15	12	4.23	720/1621	4.08	3.95	4.06	3.96	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	9	26	4.69	588/1568	4.65	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	8	25	4.63	1121/1572	4.68	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	13	18	4.37	812/1564	4.27	4.09	4.28	4.20	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	12	22	4.56	640/1559	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	22	0	1	6	4	2	3.54	1034/1352	3.87	3.67	3.98	3.86	3.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	8	12	6	3	2.82	1311/1384	3.74	3.50	4.08	3.86	2.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	6	11	12	2	3	2.56	1359/1382	3.60	3.60	4.29	4.03	2.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	10	3	11	2	7	2.79	1328/1368	3.66	3.63	4.30	4.01	2.79
4. Were special techniques successful	3	27	0	1	5	0	1	3.14	****/ 948	3.55	3.50	3.95	3.75	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	3.93	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	3.60	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	3.71	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	4.07	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.14	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 11	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 10	General 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 2	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Other 25

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MATH 151 0501
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY I
 Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY
 Enrollment: 62
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1072
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	0	1	2	8	24	4.57	550/1649	4.06	4.13	4.28	4.11	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	25	4.66	375/1648	4.26	4.21	4.23	4.16	4.66	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	26	4.71	360/1375	4.16	4.26	4.27	4.10	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	3	8	20	4.55	451/1595	4.10	4.05	4.20	4.03	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	2	0	5	6	12	4.04	788/1533	3.79	3.79	4.04	3.87	4.04	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	2	3	5	10	4.15	791/1512	3.97	4.04	4.10	3.86	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	4	26	4.60	395/1623	4.50	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	27	8	4.23	1419/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.23	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	9	18	4.55	331/1621	4.08	3.95	4.06	3.96	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	28	4.77	442/1568	4.65	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	30	4.83	790/1572	4.68	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	7	25	4.63	524/1564	4.27	4.09	4.28	4.20	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	29	4.77	361/1559	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	20	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	167/1352	3.87	3.67	3.98	3.86	4.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	4	7	7	13	3.76	965/1384	3.74	3.50	4.08	3.86	3.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	5	6	7	14	3.85	1053/1382	3.60	3.60	4.29	4.03	3.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	2	8	7	15	4.09	922/1368	3.66	3.63	4.30	4.01	4.09	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	19	1	1	1	7	3	3.77	596/ 948	3.55	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.77	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 221	****	3.93	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 243	****	3.60	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 212	****	3.71	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 209	****	4.07	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 88	****	3.90	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.40	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	2.81	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.73	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	4.27	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	3.40	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 30	****	3.89	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 41	****	3.60	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 24	****	3.13	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 110	****	2.78	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: MATH 151 0501
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I
 Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY
 Enrollment: 62
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1072
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	A	17	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	35	Non-major	35
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
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	24				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 151 0601
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY I
 Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI
 Enrollment: 64
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1073
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	0	1	12	11	17	4.07	1136/1649	4.06	4.13	4.28	4.11	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	13	22	4.39	715/1648	4.26	4.21	4.23	4.16	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	16	17	4.20	855/1375	4.16	4.26	4.27	4.10	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	5	9	16	4.29	770/1595	4.10	4.05	4.20	4.03	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	2	2	5	10	10	3.83	996/1533	3.79	3.79	4.04	3.87	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	17	1	0	2	6	12	4.33	595/1512	3.97	4.04	4.10	3.86	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	9	29	4.56	437/1623	4.50	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	1	38	4.88	714/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	0	0	3	13	15	4.39	535/1621	4.08	3.95	4.06	3.96	4.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	0	8	29	4.64	667/1568	4.65	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	4	7	26	4.44	1297/1572	4.68	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	15	21	4.44	741/1564	4.27	4.09	4.28	4.20	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	5	7	25	4.41	818/1559	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	20	2	1	3	3	10	3.95	766/1352	3.87	3.67	3.98	3.86	3.95	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	4	5	12	15	3.89	891/1384	3.74	3.50	4.08	3.86	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	3	5	7	10	13	3.66	1151/1382	3.60	3.60	4.29	4.03	3.66	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	4	8	9	13	3.75	1095/1368	3.66	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	23	3	2	4	0	4	3.00	844/ 948	3.55	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 221	****	3.93	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 243	****	3.60	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 212	****	3.71	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.07	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	1	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	3.90	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.40	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	2.81	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.73	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.27	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.40	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.89	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.60	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	3.13	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 110	****	2.78	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: MATH 151 0601
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I
 Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI
 Enrollment: 64
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1073
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	A	13	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	41	Non-major	40
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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	33				
				?	2						

Course-Section: MATH 151 0701
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY I
 Instructor: AGHEKSANTERIAN,
 Enrollment: 62
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1074
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	5	11	5	3.60	1471/1649	4.06	4.13	4.28	4.11	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	11	7	3.76	1340/1648	4.26	4.21	4.23	4.16	3.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	5	9	6	3.52	1200/1375	4.16	4.26	4.27	4.10	3.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	2	1	2	6	6	3.76	1280/1595	4.10	4.05	4.20	4.03	3.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	2	2	8	3	3.63	1166/1533	3.79	3.79	4.04	3.87	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	2	0	2	4	1	3.22	1387/1512	3.97	4.04	4.10	3.86	3.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	10	13	4.40	635/1623	4.50	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	9	10	1	3.48	1363/1621	4.08	3.95	4.06	3.96	3.48	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	5	18	4.56	779/1568	4.65	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	473/1572	4.68	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	5	3	9	7	3.64	1344/1564	4.27	4.09	4.28	4.20	3.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	1	12	7	3.68	1315/1559	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.20	3.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	17	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	991/1352	3.87	3.67	3.98	3.86	3.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	0	5	5	8	3.48	1093/1384	3.74	3.50	4.08	3.86	3.48	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	4	4	5	4	6	3.17	1296/1382	3.60	3.60	4.29	4.03	3.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	4	1	6	6	6	3.39	1209/1368	3.66	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.39	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	17	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	****/ 948	3.55	3.50	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 221	****	3.93	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	3.60	4.12	4.08	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	4.07	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.14	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	3	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	3						
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	17				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 151 0801
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY I
 Instructor: GASSMAN, AMANDA
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1075
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	0	3	3	8	16	13	3.77	1371/1649	4.06	4.13	4.28	4.11	3.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	6	15	19	4.12	1054/1648	4.26	4.21	4.23	4.16	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	9	14	16	4.00	950/1375	4.16	4.26	4.27	4.10	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	1	0	7	12	8	3.93	1175/1595	4.10	4.05	4.20	4.03	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	23	4	2	6	2	5	3.11	1423/1533	3.79	3.79	4.04	3.87	3.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	28	1	2	4	3	5	3.60	1202/1512	3.97	4.04	4.10	3.86	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	12	25	4.35	708/1623	4.50	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	40	4.93	465/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	2	1	4	19	9	3.91	1045/1621	4.08	3.95	4.06	3.96	3.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	6	33	4.71	554/1568	4.65	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	2	2	37	4.76	912/1572	4.68	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	7	11	21	4.24	950/1564	4.27	4.09	4.28	4.20	4.24	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	8	10	22	4.21	994/1559	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	27	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	690/1352	3.87	3.67	3.98	3.86	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	3	9	25	4.44	509/1384	3.74	3.50	4.08	3.86	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	4	12	21	4.31	799/1382	3.60	3.60	4.29	4.03	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	7	12	18	4.15	896/1368	3.66	3.63	4.30	4.01	4.15	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	17	1	1	6	4	9	3.90	533/ 948	3.55	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.90	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	1	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	****/ 221	****	3.93	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	3.60	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 212	****	3.71	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 209	****	4.07	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 88	****	3.90	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 92	****	3.40	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 52	****	2.81	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 48	****	3.73	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.27	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	1	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 53	****	3.40	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 30	****	3.89	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 41	****	3.60	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	3.13	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	2.78	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: MATH 151 0801
 Title: CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I
 Instructor: GASSMAN, AMANDA
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1075
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	2	A	15	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	44	Non-major	43
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	28				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 151 0901
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY I
 Instructor: GARTSIDE, J
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1076
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1272/1649	4.06	4.13	4.28	4.11	3.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1229/1648	4.26	4.21	4.23	4.16	3.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	950/1375	4.16	4.26	4.27	4.10	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	6	0	3.86	1231/1595	4.10	4.05	4.20	4.03	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1065/1533	3.79	3.79	4.04	3.87	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	1042/1512	3.97	4.04	4.10	3.86	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	251/1623	4.50	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	4.79	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1261/1621	4.08	3.95	4.06	3.96	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	1021/1568	4.65	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	1346/1572	4.68	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1267/1564	4.27	4.09	4.28	4.20	3.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	1295/1559	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.20	3.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1016/1352	3.87	3.67	3.98	3.86	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	489/1384	3.74	3.50	4.08	3.86	4.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	4	2	4	3.73	1116/1382	3.60	3.60	4.29	4.03	3.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	0	1	2	6	3.91	1032/1368	3.66	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	3.55	3.50	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	3.93	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	3.60	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	3.71	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 209	****	4.07	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.14	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	3.40	4.30	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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	10				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	3	8	19	9	3.87	1295/1649	3.98	4.13	4.28	4.11	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	3	8	11	15	3.95	1187/1648	4.12	4.21	4.23	4.16	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	2	11	9	14	3.82	1081/1375	4.18	4.26	4.27	4.10	3.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	18	1	1	7	5	6	3.70	1311/1595	3.89	4.05	4.20	4.03	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	18	3	1	5	8	4	3.43	1303/1533	3.78	3.79	4.04	3.87	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	26	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	1119/1512	3.92	4.04	4.10	3.86	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	6	14	18	4.26	815/1623	4.37	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	34	4.87	714/1646	4.80	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	1	1	11	17	0	3.47	1369/1621	3.93	3.95	4.06	3.96	3.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	6	4	27	4.50	852/1568	4.56	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	3	3	30	4.68	1059/1572	4.65	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	4	9	12	10	3.65	1344/1564	4.04	4.09	4.28	4.20	3.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	4	4	11	16	3.87	1216/1559	4.19	4.16	4.29	4.20	3.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	25	1	0	5	3	4	3.69	955/1352	3.78	3.67	3.98	3.86	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	7	11	11	3	2.90	1301/1384	3.39	3.50	4.08	3.86	2.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	7	7	11	11	2	2.84	1347/1382	3.26	3.60	4.29	4.03	2.84	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	4	5	9	12	8	3.39	1209/1368	3.53	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.39	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	30	4	1	3	0	0	1.88	****/ 948	3.72	3.50	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	3	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 221	****	3.93	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 243	****	3.60	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 212	****	3.71	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 209	****	4.07	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	2	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.14	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.40	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.89	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.60	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	3.13	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	2.78	3.99	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	15	General	1	Under-grad	40	Non-major	40
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	32				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 152 0201
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY
 Instructor: SONG, YOON J
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1078
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	11	14	4.27	954/1649	3.98	4.13	4.28	4.11	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	9	17	4.37	756/1648	4.12	4.21	4.23	4.16	4.37	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	18	4.40	665/1375	4.18	4.26	4.27	4.10	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	818/1595	3.89	4.05	4.20	4.03	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	476/1533	3.78	3.79	4.04	3.87	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	782/1512	3.92	4.04	4.10	3.86	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	7	21	4.66	333/1623	4.37	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.66	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1646	4.80	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	3	15	7	4.16	789/1621	3.93	3.95	4.06	3.96	4.16	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	24	4.77	461/1568	4.56	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	8	22	4.73	967/1572	4.65	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	5	10	14	4.23	960/1564	4.04	4.09	4.28	4.20	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	19	4.43	790/1559	4.19	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	17	1	1	2	5	3	3.67	970/1352	3.78	3.67	3.98	3.86	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	5	5	16	4.33	613/1384	3.39	3.50	4.08	3.86	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	3	3	7	14	4.19	875/1382	3.26	3.60	4.29	4.03	4.19	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	4	1	3	4	15	3.93	1015/1368	3.53	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	11	2	2	5	5	2	3.19	816/ 948	3.72	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.19	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 221	****	3.93	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 243	****	3.60	4.12	4.08	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.07	4.35	4.38	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.27	4.47	4.36	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.89	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.60	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	3.13	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	2.78	3.99	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	30	Non-major	29
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 152 0301
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY
 Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY
 Enrollment: 61
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1079
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	10	27	4.60	510/1649	3.98	4.13	4.28	4.11	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	10	28	4.63	414/1648	4.12	4.21	4.23	4.16	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	32	4.78	271/1375	4.18	4.26	4.27	4.10	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	1	1	7	17	4.54	462/1595	3.89	4.05	4.20	4.03	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	4	4	5	16	4.03	794/1533	3.78	3.79	4.04	3.87	4.03	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	2	2	10	17	4.25	687/1512	3.92	4.04	4.10	3.86	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	11	27	4.67	321/1623	4.37	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	29	10	4.26	1398/1646	4.80	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.26	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	0	2	8	20	4.48	401/1621	3.93	3.95	4.06	3.96	4.48	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	3	32	4.78	424/1568	4.56	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	4	32	4.81	815/1572	4.65	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	6	27	4.59	560/1564	4.04	4.09	4.28	4.20	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	7	28	4.58	618/1559	4.19	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	19	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	258/1352	3.78	3.67	3.98	3.86	4.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	1	4	4	22	4.21	703/1384	3.39	3.50	4.08	3.86	4.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	1	9	6	16	3.97	971/1382	3.26	3.60	4.29	4.03	3.97	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	0	3	7	21	4.36	777/1368	3.53	3.63	4.30	4.01	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	19	0	2	2	2	10	4.25	342/ 948	3.72	3.50	3.95	3.75	4.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	3.93	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 243	****	3.60	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	36	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	3.71	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	1	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 209	****	4.07	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	3	0	3	0	0	1	2.75	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	3.90	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.40	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 52	****	2.81	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.73	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.27	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	0	0	2	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 53	****	3.40	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	3.89	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 41	****	3.60	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 24	****	3.13	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	2.78	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: MATH 152 0301
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY
 Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY
 Enrollment: 61
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1079
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	40	Non-major	36
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	1						

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	1	5	12	14	3.86	1303/1649	3.98	4.13	4.28	4.11	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	1	3	6	22	4.23	931/1648	4.12	4.21	4.23	4.16	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	6	6	19	4.09	922/1375	4.18	4.26	4.27	4.10	4.09	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	3	1	5	6	8	3.65	1341/1595	3.89	4.05	4.20	4.03	3.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	14	4	2	2	4	9	3.57	1200/1533	3.78	3.79	4.04	3.87	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	2	1	4	3	6	3.63	1191/1512	3.92	4.04	4.10	3.86	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	4	7	20	4.26	803/1623	4.37	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	33	5.00	1/1646	4.80	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	3	1	5	7	14	3.93	1016/1621	3.93	3.95	4.06	3.96	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	27	4.74	498/1568	4.56	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	30	4.83	790/1572	4.65	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	3	4	6	20	4.11	1073/1564	4.04	4.09	4.28	4.20	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	3	5	2	23	4.26	959/1559	4.19	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	25	1	1	3	1	4	3.60	1002/1352	3.78	3.67	3.98	3.86	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	5	6	7	10	3.36	1143/1384	3.39	3.50	4.08	3.86	3.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	10	5	8	5	5	2.70	1352/1382	3.26	3.60	4.29	4.03	2.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	10	4	3	7	9	3.03	1285/1368	3.53	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.03	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	26	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	****/ 948	3.72	3.50	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 221	****	3.93	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 243	****	3.60	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 212	****	3.71	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 209	****	4.07	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 88	****	3.90	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	3.40	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 52	****	2.81	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 48	****	3.73	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 39	****	4.27	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 53	****	3.40	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	3.89	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 41	****	3.60	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	3.13	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 110	****	2.78	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: MATH 152 0401
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY
 Instructor: KAPOOR, JAGMOHA
 Enrollment: 63
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1080
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	9	General	3	Under-grad	36	Non-major	36
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	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	28				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	1	9	9	3	3.32	1543/1649	3.98	4.13	4.28	4.11	3.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	7	11	3	3.44	1508/1648	4.12	4.21	4.23	4.16	3.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	4	10	8	3.84	1065/1375	4.18	4.26	4.27	4.10	3.84	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	2	2	4	8	2	3.33	1470/1595	3.89	4.05	4.20	4.03	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	2	6	10	2	3.48	1269/1533	3.78	3.79	4.04	3.87	3.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	1	0	3	8	3	3.80	1089/1512	3.92	4.04	4.10	3.86	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	15	6	4.00	1029/1623	4.37	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	697/1646	4.80	4.83	4.69	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	1	3	14	2	3.59	1306/1621	3.93	3.95	4.06	3.96	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	2	3	7	10	4.00	1279/1568	4.56	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	3	5	13	4.22	1412/1572	4.65	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.22	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	3	2	3	8	7	3.61	1360/1564	4.04	4.09	4.28	4.20	3.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	4	7	9	3.83	1236/1559	4.19	4.16	4.29	4.20	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	13	1	1	2	4	1	3.33	1130/1352	3.78	3.67	3.98	3.86	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	10	5	6	4	0	2.16	1361/1384	3.39	3.50	4.08	3.86	2.16	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	8	4	6	4	3	2.60	1356/1382	3.26	3.60	4.29	4.03	2.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	6	5	3	7	4	2.92	1307/1368	3.53	3.63	4.30	4.01	2.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	20	2	1	0	2	0	2.40	****/ 948	3.72	3.50	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 221	****	3.93	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 243	****	3.60	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	3.71	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	4.07	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 88	****	3.90	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.40	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	2.81	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	3.73	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 39	****	4.27	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.40	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	3.89	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	3.60	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	3.13	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	2.78	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: MATH 152 0501
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY
 Instructor: HORTA, ARNALDO
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1081
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 10	General 0	Under-grad 26 Non-major 26
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 2		

Course-Section: MATH 152H 0101
 Title: CALC/ANALY GEOM II-HON
 Instructor: ZWECK, JOHN
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1082
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	13	4.81	265/1649	4.81	4.13	4.28	4.11	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	209/1648	4.81	4.21	4.23	4.16	4.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	496/1375	4.56	4.26	4.27	4.10	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	890/1595	4.20	4.05	4.20	4.03	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	815/1533	4.00	3.79	4.04	3.87	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	6	5	3	3.44	1303/1512	3.44	4.04	4.10	3.86	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	894/1623	4.19	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	595/1621	4.33	3.95	4.06	3.96	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	171/1568	4.94	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.66	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	342/1564	4.75	4.09	4.28	4.20	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	561/1559	4.63	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1002/1352	3.60	3.67	3.98	3.86	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	2	4	2	3	2.87	1305/1384	2.87	3.50	4.08	3.86	2.87	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	3	7	1	4	3.40	1233/1382	3.40	3.60	4.29	4.03	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	1	3	5	4	3.53	1169/1368	3.53	3.63	4.30	4.01	3.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	9	0	1	1	4	0	3.50	699/ 948	3.50	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 221	****	3.93	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 243	****	3.60	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	3.71	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	4.07	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	3.90	4.54	4.31	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	2.81	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.73	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.27	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.38	4.37	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.40	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.89	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.60	4.43	4.27	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	15	
?	0			

Course-Section: MATH 155 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY CALCULUS
 Instructor: VANCEA, ADRIAN
 Enrollment: 58
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1083
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	4	6	8	11	4	3.15	1583/1649	3.90	4.13	4.28	4.11	3.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	3	11	12	3	3.21	1569/1648	4.02	4.21	4.23	4.16	3.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	2	9	13	7	3.81	1087/1375	4.07	4.26	4.27	4.10	3.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	8	2	4	6	8	3	3.26	1488/1595	3.75	4.05	4.20	4.03	3.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	6	3	3	7	8	3	3.21	1385/1533	3.48	3.79	4.04	3.87	3.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	12	0	2	6	3	6	3.76	1113/1512	3.94	4.04	4.10	3.86	3.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	5	6	5	6	8	3.20	1496/1623	4.01	4.33	4.16	4.08	3.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	1	2	24	3	3.97	1568/1646	4.61	4.83	4.69	4.67	3.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	2	2	12	7	1	3.13	1483/1621	3.95	3.95	4.06	3.96	3.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	3	4	6	10	3	3.23	1497/1568	4.02	4.47	4.43	4.39	3.23	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	2	2	4	10	8	3.77	1516/1572	4.48	4.66	4.70	4.64	3.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	4	4	8	7	2	2.96	1505/1564	3.81	4.09	4.28	4.20	2.96	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	1	3	6	3	8	4	3.17	1456/1559	3.99	4.16	4.29	4.20	3.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	16	0	2	4	1	1	3.13	****/1352	3.66	3.67	3.98	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	6	1	4	1	3	2.60	1341/1384	3.55	3.50	4.08	3.86	2.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	4	2	3	4	2	2.87	1346/1382	3.70	3.60	4.29	4.03	2.87	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	5	2	2	2	3	2.71	1335/1368	3.83	3.63	4.30	4.01	2.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	10	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	****/ 948	3.60	3.50	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 221	4.00	3.93	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 243	4.29	3.60	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 212	****	3.71	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	4.07	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.14	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	34	Non-major	34
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 155 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY CALCULUS
 Instructor: KELLY, BRIAN W
 Enrollment: 56
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1084
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	2	9	4.20	1027/1649	3.90	4.13	4.28	4.11	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	521/1648	4.02	4.21	4.23	4.16	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	7	6	4.13	895/1375	4.07	4.26	4.27	4.10	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1067/1595	3.75	4.05	4.20	4.03	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	3	1	4	1	3.33	1338/1533	3.48	3.79	4.04	3.87	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	2	0	4	4	4.00	883/1512	3.94	4.04	4.10	3.86	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	261/1623	4.01	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1646	4.61	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	288/1621	3.95	3.95	4.06	3.96	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	588/1568	4.02	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1572	4.48	4.66	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	580/1564	3.81	4.09	4.28	4.20	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	618/1559	3.99	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	2	3	1	4	3.70	950/1352	3.66	3.67	3.98	3.86	3.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	418/1384	3.55	3.50	4.08	3.86	4.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	656/1382	3.70	3.60	4.29	4.03	4.46	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	493/1368	3.83	3.63	4.30	4.01	4.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	624/ 948	3.60	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.70	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	129/ 221	4.00	3.93	4.16	4.05	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	121/ 243	4.29	3.60	4.12	4.08	4.29	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 212	****	3.71	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 209	****	4.07	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	3.90	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.40	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	2.81	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	3.73	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 39	****	4.27	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 53	****	3.40	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.89	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 41	****	3.60	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	3.13	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	2.78	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: MATH 155 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY CALCULUS
 Instructor: KELLY, BRIAN W
 Enrollment: 56
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1084
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 155 0301
 Title ELEMENTARY CALCULUS
 Instructor: MUSCEDERE, MICH
 Enrollment: 54
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1085
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	11	10	4.35	857/1649	3.90	4.13	4.28	4.11	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	12	9	4.30	839/1648	4.02	4.21	4.23	4.16	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	10	10	4.26	797/1375	4.07	4.26	4.27	4.10	4.26	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	5	7	7	4.00	1067/1595	3.75	4.05	4.20	4.03	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	5	10	5	3.90	915/1533	3.48	3.79	4.04	3.87	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	854/1512	3.94	4.04	4.10	3.86	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	9	9	4.13	947/1623	4.01	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	731/1646	4.61	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	2	8	6	4.12	847/1621	3.95	3.95	4.06	3.96	4.12	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	10	8	4.14	1213/1568	4.02	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	1046/1572	4.48	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	4	9	7	3.91	1219/1564	3.81	4.09	4.28	4.20	3.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	8	10	4.23	987/1559	3.99	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	2	4	7	4	3.61	996/1352	3.66	3.67	3.98	3.86	3.61	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	1	3	4	4	3.50	1081/1384	3.55	3.50	4.08	3.86	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	6	2	5	3.79	1080/1382	3.70	3.60	4.29	4.03	3.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	928/1368	3.83	3.63	4.30	4.01	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	8	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	699/ 948	3.60	3.50	3.95	3.75	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	2	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 221	4.00	3.93	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/ 243	4.29	3.60	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 212	****	3.71	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 209	****	4.07	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	3.90	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.40	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	2.81	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.73	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.27	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.40	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	1	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 30	****	3.89	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	3.60	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 24	****	3.13	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 110	****	2.78	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: MATH 155 0301
 Title ELEMENTARY CALCULUS
 Instructor: MUSCEDERE, MICH
 Enrollment: 54
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1085
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	2						

Course-Section: MATH 215 0101
 Title FINITE MATH FOR INFO S
 Instructor: KAPOOR, JAGMOHA
 Enrollment: 55
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1086
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	9	23	4.72	372/1649	4.72	4.13	4.28	4.29	4.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	25	4.75	263/1648	4.75	4.21	4.23	4.25	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	27	4.84	206/1375	4.84	4.26	4.27	4.37	4.84	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	3	6	16	4.42	608/1595	4.42	4.05	4.20	4.22	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	280/1533	4.62	3.79	4.04	4.04	4.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	248/1512	4.68	4.04	4.10	4.14	4.68	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	6	24	4.63	370/1623	4.63	4.33	4.16	4.21	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	266/1646	4.97	4.83	4.69	4.63	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	0	7	17	4.71	198/1621	4.71	3.95	4.06	4.01	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	0	29	4.93	171/1568	4.93	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	27	4.87	690/1572	4.87	4.66	4.70	4.73	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	118/1564	4.93	4.09	4.28	4.27	4.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	250/1559	4.87	4.16	4.29	4.33	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	15	0	3	3	2	7	3.87	842/1352	3.87	3.67	3.98	4.07	3.87	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	2	7	11	4.29	655/1384	4.29	3.50	4.08	3.99	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	1	3	6	10	4.10	925/1382	4.10	3.60	4.29	4.19	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	7	6	7	4.00	948/1368	4.00	3.63	4.30	4.21	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	13	2	1	0	1	3	3.29	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	5	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 221	****	3.93	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	****/ 243	****	3.60	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 212	****	3.71	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.07	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	3.90	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.40	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 52	****	2.81	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 48	****	3.73	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.27	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 53	****	3.40	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 30	****	3.89	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.60	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 24	****	3.13	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 110	****	2.78	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: MATH 215 0101
 Title FINITE MATH FOR INFO S
 Instructor: KAPOOR, JAGMOHA
 Enrollment: 55
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1086
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	33	Non-major	33
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 221 0101
 Title INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR
 Instructor: LYNN, YEN-MOW
 Enrollment: 52
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1087
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	0	2	13	5	6	3.58	1479/1649	4.06	4.13	4.28	4.29	3.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	8	5	7	3.42	1517/1648	4.01	4.21	4.23	4.25	3.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	5	4	7	10	3.85	1065/1375	4.09	4.26	4.27	4.37	3.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	1	3	3	2	4	3.38	1452/1595	3.98	4.05	4.20	4.22	3.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	4	6	4	6	3.60	1180/1533	3.98	3.79	4.04	4.04	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	2	4	4	6	3.88	1042/1512	4.29	4.04	4.10	4.14	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	5	8	9	3.85	1216/1623	4.39	4.33	4.16	4.21	3.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	697/1646	4.90	4.83	4.69	4.63	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	3	5	10	2	3	2.87	1543/1621	3.71	3.95	4.06	4.01	2.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	6	5	13	4.08	1248/1568	4.38	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	2	5	6	11	3.85	1504/1572	4.44	4.66	4.70	4.73	3.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	7	4	7	6	3.31	1448/1564	3.93	4.09	4.28	4.27	3.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	8	3	6	2	7	2.88	1505/1559	3.75	4.16	4.29	4.33	2.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	23	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1352	3.75	3.67	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	6	0	3	0	0	1.67	1375/1384	2.46	3.50	4.08	3.99	1.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	5	1	3	0	0	1.78	1377/1382	2.59	3.60	4.29	4.19	1.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	4	1	3	1	0	2.11	1355/1368	3.06	3.63	4.30	4.21	2.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	7	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 221	****	3.93	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	3.60	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 212	****	3.71	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 209	****	4.07	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 88	****	3.90	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	3.40	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	2.81	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.73	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.27	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.40	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	3.89	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	3.60	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	3.13	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	2.78	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: MATH 221 0101
 Title INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR
 Instructor: LYNN, YEN-MOW
 Enrollment: 52
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1087
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	23
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 221 0201
 Title INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR
 Instructor: SHEN, JINGLAI
 Enrollment: 56
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1088
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	19	4.56	577/1649	4.06	4.13	4.28	4.29	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	19	4.63	414/1648	4.01	4.21	4.23	4.25	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	24	4.78	271/1375	4.09	4.26	4.27	4.37	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	0	4	15	4.60	383/1595	3.98	4.05	4.20	4.22	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	6	5	13	4.20	680/1533	3.98	3.79	4.04	4.04	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	240/1512	4.29	4.04	4.10	4.14	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	23	4.78	199/1623	4.39	4.33	4.16	4.21	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	21	4.78	881/1646	4.90	4.83	4.69	4.63	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	3	13	9	4.24	709/1621	3.71	3.95	4.06	4.01	4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1568	4.38	4.47	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	840/1572	4.44	4.66	4.70	4.73	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	8	16	4.54	620/1564	3.93	4.09	4.28	4.27	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	10	13	4.35	891/1559	3.75	4.16	4.29	4.33	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	16	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	914/1352	3.75	3.67	3.98	4.07	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	1	5	2	2	3.08	1249/1384	2.46	3.50	4.08	3.99	3.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	2	3	1	3	3.09	1310/1382	2.59	3.60	4.29	4.19	3.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1071/1368	3.06	3.63	4.30	4.21	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	10	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	3.60	4.12	4.47	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	27	Non-major	24
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	6	5	11	11	3.66	1436/1649	4.06	4.13	4.28	4.29	3.66	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	2	9	12	6	3.29	1558/1648	4.01	4.21	4.23	4.25	3.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	8	3	6	13	5	3.11	1317/1375	4.09	4.26	4.27	4.37	3.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	3	2	4	5	5	3.37	1459/1595	3.98	4.05	4.20	4.22	3.37	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	3	1	8	6	10	3.68	1133/1533	3.98	3.79	4.04	4.04	3.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	1	5	8	8	4.05	863/1512	4.29	4.04	4.10	4.14	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	5	10	16	4.03	1019/1623	4.39	4.33	4.16	4.21	4.03	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	34	4.97	199/1646	4.90	4.83	4.69	4.63	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	1	6	10	7	7	3.42	1399/1621	3.71	3.95	4.06	4.01	3.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	3	9	11	9	3.65	1431/1568	4.38	4.47	4.43	4.39	3.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	4	11	16	4.21	1412/1572	4.44	4.66	4.70	4.73	4.21	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	5	5	5	7	10	3.38	1433/1564	3.93	4.09	4.28	4.27	3.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	6	6	10	7	3.38	1415/1559	3.75	4.16	4.29	4.33	3.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	25	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	****/1352	3.75	3.67	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	4	1	2	3	1	2.64	1338/1384	2.46	3.50	4.08	3.99	2.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	3	1	3	2	2	2.91	1344/1382	2.59	3.60	4.29	4.19	2.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	3	1	0	4	3	3.27	1247/1368	3.06	3.63	4.30	4.21	3.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	24	9	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 221	****	3.93	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 243	****	3.60	4.12	4.47	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	4.07	4.35	4.64	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	2.81	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.73	4.09	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors	1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 4	General	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 1	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	28

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MATH 221 0401
 Title INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR
 Instructor: PEERCY, BRAD
 Enrollment: 58
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1090
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	9	19	4.47	696/1649	4.06	4.13	4.28	4.29	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	24	4.72	300/1648	4.01	4.21	4.23	4.25	4.72	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	22	4.63	443/1375	4.09	4.26	4.27	4.37	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	440/1595	3.98	4.05	4.20	4.22	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	1	10	11	4.45	421/1533	3.98	3.79	4.04	4.04	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	3	3	14	4.55	345/1512	4.29	4.04	4.10	4.14	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	29	4.91	121/1623	4.39	4.33	4.16	4.21	4.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	266/1646	4.90	4.83	4.69	4.63	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	13	11	4.30	643/1621	3.71	3.95	4.06	4.01	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	26	4.81	387/1568	4.38	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	29	4.90	591/1572	4.44	4.66	4.70	4.73	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	12	17	4.48	676/1564	3.93	4.09	4.28	4.27	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	6	7	18	4.39	851/1559	3.75	4.16	4.29	4.33	4.39	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	23	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/1352	3.75	3.67	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	****/1384	2.46	3.50	4.08	3.99	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	****/1382	2.59	3.60	4.29	4.19	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	****/1368	3.06	3.63	4.30	4.21	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	26	4	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	3.60	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	3.71	4.40	4.62	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 1	C 7	General 3	Under-grad 33 Non-major 28
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 0	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 14	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 26	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MATH 225 0101
 Title INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT
 Instructor: ROSTAMIAN, ROUB
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1091
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	383/1649	4.58	4.13	4.28	4.29	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	599/1648	4.32	4.21	4.23	4.25	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	480/1375	4.66	4.26	4.27	4.37	4.59		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	722/1595	4.36	4.05	4.20	4.22	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	1	4	5	4	3.86	966/1533	4.03	3.79	4.04	4.04	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	451/1512	4.36	4.04	4.10	4.14	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	164/1623	4.69	4.33	4.16	4.21	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	816/1646	4.93	4.83	4.69	4.63	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	7	8	4.31	619/1621	4.16	3.95	4.06	4.01	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	358/1568	4.59	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	640/1572	4.75	4.66	4.70	4.73	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	422/1564	4.26	4.09	4.28	4.27	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1559	4.51	4.16	4.29	4.33	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	1	2	6	3	3.69	955/1352	3.55	3.67	3.98	4.07	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	795/1384	4.00	3.50	4.08	3.99	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	342/1382	4.80	3.60	4.29	4.19	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.21	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.59	****	

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	0	Major	4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	10	16	4.52	630/1649	4.58	4.13	4.28	4.29	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	10	14	4.37	743/1648	4.32	4.21	4.23	4.25	4.37	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	20	4.74	309/1375	4.66	4.26	4.27	4.37	4.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	2	0	4	8	4.29	782/1595	4.36	4.05	4.20	4.22	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	1	3	10	6	4.05	781/1533	4.03	3.79	4.04	4.04	4.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	782/1512	4.36	4.04	4.10	4.14	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	241/1623	4.69	4.33	4.16	4.21	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1646	4.93	4.83	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	10	10	4.43	483/1621	4.16	3.95	4.06	4.01	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	480/1568	4.59	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	858/1572	4.75	4.66	4.70	4.73	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	12	9	4.25	939/1564	4.26	4.09	4.28	4.27	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	7	15	4.54	651/1559	4.51	4.16	4.29	4.33	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	12	3	3	1	1	3	2.82	1268/1352	3.55	3.67	3.98	4.07	2.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	4.00	3.50	4.08	3.99	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	4.80	3.60	4.29	4.19	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.21	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.40	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.89	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.60	4.43	3.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 20	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 6
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	3	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 27	Non-major 21
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	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 25		
				? 1			

Course-Section: MATH 225 0301
 Title INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT
 Instructor: GOBBERT, MATTHI
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1093
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	5	21	4.52	630/1649	4.58	4.13	4.28	4.29	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	1	11	15	4.13	1043/1648	4.32	4.21	4.23	4.25	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	24	4.65	422/1375	4.66	4.26	4.27	4.37	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	580/1595	4.36	4.05	4.20	4.22	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	5	4	8	4.18	695/1533	4.03	3.79	4.04	4.04	4.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	422/1512	4.36	4.04	4.10	4.14	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	10	19	4.52	491/1623	4.69	4.33	4.16	4.21	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	266/1646	4.93	4.83	4.69	4.63	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	3	4	13	6	3.74	1200/1621	4.16	3.95	4.06	4.01	3.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	6	8	14	4.21	1162/1568	4.59	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	8	19	4.59	1165/1572	4.75	4.66	4.70	4.73	4.59	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	0	6	10	10	3.83	1262/1564	4.26	4.09	4.28	4.27	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	3	9	13	4.00	1121/1559	4.51	4.16	4.29	4.33	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	2	0	1	9	10	4.14	607/1352	3.55	3.67	3.98	4.07	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	2	1	1	2	1	2.86	****/1384	4.00	3.50	4.08	3.99	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	2	0	2	0	3	3.29	****/1382	4.80	3.60	4.29	4.19	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.21	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	25	1	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	3.60	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 212	****	3.71	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 209	****	4.07	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	1	3	2	0	0	2.17	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	3.90	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.40	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	2.81	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.73	4.09	4.05	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	3.40	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	3.89	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.60	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	3.13	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	2.78	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: MATH 225 0301
 Title INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT
 Instructor: GOBBERT, MATTHI
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1093
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	28
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	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	29				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 251 0101
 Title MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS
 Instructor: SONG, YOON J
 Enrollment: 61
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1094
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	3	10	25	4.45	723/1649	4.43	4.13	4.28	4.29	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	15	18	4.20	966/1648	4.36	4.21	4.23	4.25	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	12	22	4.35	714/1375	4.25	4.26	4.27	4.37	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	1	4	8	10	4.17	916/1595	3.99	4.05	4.20	4.22	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	15	0	4	5	6	8	3.78	1036/1533	4.12	3.79	4.04	4.04	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	16	0	0	3	8	11	4.36	564/1512	4.26	4.04	4.10	4.14	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	8	25	4.50	502/1623	4.58	4.33	4.16	4.21	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	0	37	4.89	680/1646	4.90	4.83	4.69	4.63	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	3	19	16	4.28	654/1621	4.05	3.95	4.06	4.01	4.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	7	30	4.76	461/1568	4.60	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	9	26	4.61	1146/1572	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.73	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	15	18	4.32	876/1564	4.30	4.09	4.28	4.27	4.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	4	11	20	4.26	959/1559	4.30	4.16	4.29	4.33	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	27	1	1	0	4	4	3.90	818/1352	3.82	3.67	3.98	4.07	3.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	1	2	4	0	3.43	****/1384	3.81	3.50	4.08	3.99	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	34	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/1382	4.02	3.60	4.29	4.19	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	34	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/1368	3.73	3.63	4.30	4.21	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	33	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 948	3.80	3.50	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	0	0	5	1	0	0	2.17	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	1	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 2	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 6	C 12	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 5	D 1		Under-grad 40
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	30

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	0	5	26	4.64	471/1649	4.43	4.13	4.28	4.29	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	4	24	4.52	544/1648	4.36	4.21	4.23	4.25	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	7	17	4.12	901/1375	4.25	4.26	4.27	4.27	4.12	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	2	2	3	8	9	3.83	1242/1595	3.99	4.05	4.20	4.22	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	0	4	11	11	4.04	794/1533	4.12	3.79	4.04	4.04	4.04	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	2	1	1	5	13	4.18	764/1512	4.26	4.04	4.10	4.14	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	7	20	4.36	683/1623	4.58	4.33	4.16	4.21	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	5.00	1/1646	4.90	4.83	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	5	12	10	4.07	875/1621	4.05	3.95	4.06	4.01	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	5	24	4.59	743/1568	4.60	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	28	4.88	665/1572	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.73	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	5	11	14	4.23	971/1564	4.30	4.09	4.28	4.27	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	10	18	4.28	945/1559	4.30	4.16	4.29	4.33	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	3	0	5	11	5	3.63	991/1352	3.82	3.67	3.98	4.07	3.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	3	0	0	3	3	3.33	1159/1384	3.81	3.50	4.08	3.99	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	774/1382	4.02	3.60	4.29	4.19	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1039/1368	3.73	3.63	4.30	4.21	3.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	9	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 948	3.80	3.50	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	2.81	4.06	3.93	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	3.40	4.30	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	B	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	33	Non-major	24
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	28				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 251 0301
 Title MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS
 Instructor: ROSTAMIAN, ROUB
 Enrollment: 52
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1096
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	2	2	11	19	4.29	933/1649	4.43	4.13	4.28	4.29	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	5	12	16	4.20	966/1648	4.36	4.21	4.23	4.25	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	7	12	15	4.14	888/1375	4.25	4.26	4.27	4.37	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	17	2	1	3	4	8	3.83	1242/1595	3.99	4.05	4.20	4.22	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	11	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	485/1533	4.12	3.79	4.04	4.04	4.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	19	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	883/1512	4.26	4.04	4.10	4.14	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	7	27	4.74	230/1623	4.58	4.33	4.16	4.21	4.74	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	1	0	7	26	4.71	993/1646	4.90	4.83	4.69	4.63	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	9	15	10	4.03	903/1621	4.05	3.95	4.06	4.01	4.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	4	12	16	4.30	1080/1568	4.60	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	8	25	4.71	1022/1572	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.73	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	18	12	4.27	918/1564	4.30	4.09	4.28	4.27	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	2	5	9	16	4.12	1060/1559	4.30	4.16	4.29	4.33	4.12	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	1	1	7	5	12	4.00	690/1352	3.82	3.67	3.98	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/1384	3.81	3.50	4.08	3.99	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	32	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/1382	4.02	3.60	4.29	4.19	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	32	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/1368	3.73	3.63	4.30	4.21	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	31	3	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 948	3.80	3.50	3.95	3.89	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	2	0	4	0	3.33	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	8	C	13	General	1	Under-grad	37	Non-major	34
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	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	31				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 251 0401
 Title MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS
 Instructor: MOLDOVAN, MELAN
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1097
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	871/1649	4.43	4.13	4.28	4.29	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	521/1648	4.36	4.21	4.23	4.25	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	665/1375	4.25	4.26	4.27	4.37	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	996/1595	3.99	4.05	4.20	4.22	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	604/1533	4.12	3.79	4.04	4.04	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	380/1512	4.26	4.04	4.10	4.14	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	13	4.73	241/1623	4.58	4.33	4.16	4.21	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1646	4.90	4.83	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	3	4	4	3.83	1123/1621	4.05	3.95	4.06	4.01	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	517/1568	4.60	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	1273/1572	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.73	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	780/1564	4.30	4.09	4.28	4.27	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	11	4.53	662/1559	4.30	4.16	4.29	4.33	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	914/1352	3.82	3.67	3.98	4.07	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	655/1384	3.81	3.50	4.08	3.99	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	1122/1382	4.02	3.60	4.29	4.19	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	1154/1368	3.73	3.63	4.30	4.21	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	578/ 948	3.80	3.50	3.95	3.89	3.80	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	3.60	4.12	4.47	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.33	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.59	****	

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	2	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 0		

Course-Section: MATH 251H 0101
 Title MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS
 Instructor: GOWDA, MUDDAPPA
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1098
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	11	4.79	295/1649	4.79	4.13	4.28	4.29	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	234/1648	4.79	4.21	4.23	4.25	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	422/1375	4.64	4.26	4.27	4.37	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.05	4.20	4.22	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1338/1533	3.33	3.79	4.04	4.04	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	263/1512	4.67	4.04	4.10	4.14	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	145/1623	4.86	4.33	4.16	4.21	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	279/1621	4.62	3.95	4.06	4.01	4.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	196/1568	4.93	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	473/1572	4.93	4.66	4.70	4.73	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	406/1564	4.71	4.09	4.28	4.27	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	164/1559	4.93	4.16	4.29	4.33	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	208/1352	4.67	3.67	3.98	4.07	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1192/1384	3.25	3.50	4.08	3.99	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1275/1382	3.25	3.60	4.29	4.19	3.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1286/1368	3.00	3.63	4.30	4.21	3.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 301 0101
 Title INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I
 Instructor: RATHINAM, MURUH
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1099
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	5	1	12	4.26	954/1649	4.34	4.13	4.28	4.27	4.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	5	8	4.11	1065/1648	4.09	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	840/1375	4.39	4.26	4.27	4.22	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	818/1595	4.28	4.05	4.20	4.21	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	6	5	5	3.67	1139/1533	3.83	3.79	4.04	4.05	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	493/1512	4.41	4.04	4.10	4.11	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	683/1623	4.20	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	398/1646	4.87	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	8	5	4.00	914/1621	3.99	3.95	4.06	4.02	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	767/1568	4.79	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	1108/1572	4.70	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	7	9	4.21	981/1564	3.95	4.09	4.28	4.25	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	0	5	11	4.26	959/1559	3.74	4.16	4.29	4.23	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	556/1352	4.20	3.67	3.98	3.97	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1384	****	3.50	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1382	****	3.60	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 555	2.33	2.65	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	3	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 288	2.00	3.25	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	****/ 312	3.50	3.09	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	2.78	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 301 0201
 Title INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I
 Instructor: ARMSTRONG, THOM
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1100
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1183/1649	4.34	4.13	4.28	4.27	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	1527/1648	4.09	4.21	4.23	4.18	3.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	855/1375	4.39	4.26	4.27	4.22	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1067/1595	4.28	4.05	4.20	4.21	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1338/1533	3.83	3.79	4.04	4.05	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	883/1512	4.41	4.04	4.10	4.11	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1347/1623	4.20	4.33	4.16	4.08	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	833/1646	4.87	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1405/1621	3.99	3.95	4.06	4.02	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	387/1568	4.79	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	1146/1572	4.70	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	0	3	0	3.00	1496/1564	3.95	4.09	4.28	4.25	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	2.20	1542/1559	3.74	4.16	4.29	4.23	2.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1352	4.20	3.67	3.98	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	516/ 555	2.33	2.65	4.29	4.22	2.33	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	281/ 288	2.00	3.25	3.68	3.58	1.50	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	3.50	3.09	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 301 0301
 Title INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I
 Instructor: SHEN, JINGLAI
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1101
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	328/1649	4.34	4.13	4.28	4.27	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	263/1648	4.09	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	296/1375	4.39	4.26	4.27	4.22	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	383/1595	4.28	4.05	4.20	4.21	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	366/1533	3.83	3.79	4.04	4.05	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	156/1512	4.41	4.04	4.10	4.11	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	370/1623	4.20	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	714/1646	4.87	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	313/1621	3.99	3.95	4.06	4.02	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1568	4.79	4.47	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	665/1572	4.70	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	524/1564	3.95	4.09	4.28	4.25	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	390/1559	3.74	4.16	4.29	4.23	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1352	4.20	3.67	3.98	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	2.33	2.65	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	253/ 288	2.00	3.25	3.68	3.58	2.50	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	217/ 312	3.50	3.09	3.68	3.60	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 302 0101
 Title INTRO MATH ANALYSIS II
 Instructor: SEIDMAN, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1102
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	4	6	7	2	3.05	1599/1649	3.05	4.13	4.28	4.27	3.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	7	7	3	0	2.36	1641/1648	2.36	4.21	4.23	4.18	2.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	7	3	6	1	2.59	1365/1375	2.59	4.26	4.27	4.22	2.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	6	1	6	3	2	1	2.69	1574/1595	2.69	4.05	4.20	4.21	2.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	1	6	2	7	3.61	1173/1533	3.61	3.79	4.04	4.05	3.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	1	3	5	3	3.62	1196/1512	3.62	4.04	4.10	4.11	3.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	3	6	7	0	2.64	1593/1623	2.64	4.33	4.16	4.08	2.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	7	4	5	5	0	2.38	1598/1621	2.38	3.95	4.06	4.02	2.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	8	3	6	4	1	2.41	1558/1568	2.41	4.47	4.43	4.39	2.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	5	3	13	4.27	1393/1572	4.27	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.27	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	9	4	6	1	1	2.10	1558/1564	2.10	4.09	4.28	4.25	2.10	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	10	6	2	3	1	2.05	1548/1559	2.05	4.16	4.29	4.23	2.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	17	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1352	****	3.67	3.98	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	4	3	0	0	2.11	1363/1384	2.11	3.50	4.08	4.11	2.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	0	2	4	2	3.40	1233/1382	3.40	3.60	4.29	4.37	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1043/1368	3.88	3.63	4.30	4.39	3.88	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	4	2	0	0	1	1.86	531/ 555	1.86	2.65	4.29	4.22	1.86	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	2	0	0	3	0	2.80	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	2.78	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 2
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 10	General	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	18
			? 1		

Course-Section: MATH 381 0101
 Title LIN. METH/OPER RESEARC
 Instructor: GULER, OSMAN
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1103
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	5	3	3	3.67	1429/1649	3.67	4.13	4.28	4.27	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	1	4	3	3.42	1522/1648	3.42	4.21	4.23	4.18	3.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.26	4.27	4.22	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	3	4	3.75	1285/1595	3.75	4.05	4.20	4.21	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	945/1533	3.88	3.79	4.04	4.05	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1107/1512	3.78	4.04	4.10	4.11	3.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	6	0	5	3.75	1270/1623	3.75	4.33	4.16	4.08	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	597/1646	4.92	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	3	2	5	0	3.00	1504/1621	3.00	3.95	4.06	4.02	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	4	2	3	3	3.42	1478/1568	3.42	4.47	4.43	4.39	3.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1451/1572	4.08	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.08	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	3	3	2	2	2.92	1517/1564	2.92	4.09	4.28	4.25	2.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	4	2	2	3.27	1436/1559	3.27	4.16	4.29	4.23	3.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	1330/1352	2.20	3.67	3.98	3.97	2.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1384	****	3.50	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	1353/1382	2.67	3.60	4.29	4.37	2.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.39	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	6	Under-grad	12	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	2						

Course-Section: MATH 404 0101
 Title INTRO PART DIFF EQ I
 Instructor: BELL, JONATHAN
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1104
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	9	15	4.52	617/1649	4.52	4.13	4.28	4.50	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	9	12	4.32	811/1648	4.32	4.21	4.23	4.36	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	9	11	4.24	823/1375	4.24	4.26	4.27	4.48	4.24	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	3	8	7	4.11	1010/1595	4.11	4.05	4.20	4.36	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	1	8	6	5	3.39	1320/1533	3.39	3.79	4.04	4.14	3.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	3	10	4	4.06	859/1512	4.06	4.04	4.10	4.26	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	6	6	12	4.12	957/1623	4.12	4.33	4.16	4.27	4.12	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	6	9	6	4.00	914/1621	4.00	3.95	4.06	4.24	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	7	15	4.48	878/1568	4.48	4.47	4.43	4.54	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	19	4.76	912/1572	4.76	4.66	4.70	4.79	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	11	6	5	3.58	1365/1564	3.58	4.09	4.28	4.40	3.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	12	8	4.12	1060/1559	4.12	4.16	4.29	4.41	4.12	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	4	2	10	5	1	2.86	1262/1352	2.86	3.67	3.98	4.07	2.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	1	1	4	1	3.11	1244/1384	3.11	3.50	4.08	4.35	3.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	1	1	4	1	3.11	1308/1382	3.11	3.60	4.29	4.56	3.11	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	1	0	4	3	3.78	1085/1368	3.78	3.63	4.30	4.58	3.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	7	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	2.81	4.06	4.86	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.40	4.30	4.64	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.89	4.16	4.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.60	4.43	4.84	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 14		Graduate 8
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 0		

Course-Section: MATH 407 0101
 Title MODERN ALGEBRA & NO.TH
 Instructor: TOLL, CHARLES
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1105
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.13	4.28	4.50	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	702/1648	4.40	4.21	4.23	4.36	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.26	4.27	4.48	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	818/1595	4.25	4.05	4.20	4.36	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	733/1533	4.13	3.79	4.04	4.14	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	380/1512	4.50	4.04	4.10	4.26	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	169/1623	4.80	4.33	4.16	4.27	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1287/1646	4.40	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	1060/1621	3.90	3.95	4.06	4.24	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	588/1568	4.70	4.47	4.43	4.54	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	840/1572	4.80	4.66	4.70	4.79	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1001/1564	4.20	4.09	4.28	4.40	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	931/1559	4.30	4.16	4.29	4.41	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1352	****	3.67	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1384	****	3.50	4.08	4.35	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1382	****	3.60	4.29	4.56	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.58	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	215/ 288	3.25	3.25	3.68	3.71	3.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	10	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	361/1649	4.72	4.13	4.28	4.50	4.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	362/1648	4.67	4.21	4.23	4.36	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	14	4.67	401/1375	4.67	4.26	4.27	4.48	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	342/1595	4.64	4.05	4.20	4.36	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	3	1	2	2	3.38	1326/1533	3.38	3.79	4.04	4.14	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	380/1512	4.50	4.04	4.10	4.26	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	448/1623	4.56	4.33	4.16	4.27	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	109/1621	4.87	3.95	4.06	4.24	4.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	147/1568	4.94	4.47	4.43	4.54	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	640/1572	4.89	4.66	4.70	4.79	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	310/1564	4.78	4.09	4.28	4.40	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	123/1559	4.94	4.16	4.29	4.41	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1352	****	3.67	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1384	****	3.50	4.08	4.35	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1382	****	3.60	4.29	4.56	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.58	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	3.60	4.12	4.61	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	2.81	4.06	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.73	4.09	4.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.27	4.47	4.52	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.38	4.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	3.40	4.30	4.64	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	3.89	4.16	4.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.60	4.43	4.84	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	3.13	4.42	4.85	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	2.78	3.99	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 1	Major 13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General 6	Under-grad 17	Non-major 5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			

I	0	Other	10
?	1		

Course-Section: MATH 426 0101
 Title INTO MATH PKGS:MATLAB
 Instructor: WU, YUKUN
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1107
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1183/1649	4.00	4.13	4.28	4.50	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.21	4.23	4.36	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1375	****	4.26	4.27	4.48	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.05	4.20	4.36	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.04	4.10	4.26	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	220/1623	4.75	4.33	4.16	4.27	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	1504/1621	3.00	3.95	4.06	4.24	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.47	4.43	4.54	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1538/1572	3.50	4.66	4.70	4.79	3.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1496/1564	3.00	4.09	4.28	4.40	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1277/1559	3.75	4.16	4.29	4.41	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	970/1352	3.67	3.67	3.98	4.07	3.67
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.41	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.25	3.68	3.71	4.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 430 0101
 Title MATRIX ANALYSIS
 Instructor: ZWECK, JOHN
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1108
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	497/1649	4.62	4.13	4.28	4.50	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	687/1648	4.42	4.21	4.23	4.36	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	763/1375	4.31	4.26	4.27	4.48	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	1254/1595	3.82	4.05	4.20	4.36	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	366/1533	4.50	3.79	4.04	4.14	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	663/1512	4.27	4.04	4.10	4.26	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	555/1623	4.46	4.33	4.16	4.27	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	870/1621	4.08	3.95	4.06	4.24	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.47	4.43	4.54	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	740/1572	4.85	4.66	4.70	4.79	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	620/1564	4.54	4.09	4.28	4.40	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	573/1559	4.62	4.16	4.29	4.41	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	690/1352	4.00	3.67	3.98	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1384	****	3.50	4.08	4.35	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	946/1382	4.00	3.60	4.29	4.56	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1071/1368	3.80	3.63	4.30	4.58	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	2	1	1	3	0	2.71	272/ 312	2.71	3.09	3.68	3.95	2.71	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.40	4.30	4.64	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	3.89	4.16	4.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.60	4.43	4.84	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 3	General 3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 10
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Non-major 3
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Electives 1
					Other 8

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MATH 441 0101
 Title INTRO NUMERICAL ANALYS
 Instructor: MINKOFF, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1109
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.13	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.21	4.23	4.36	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	641/1375	4.43	4.26	4.27	4.48	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	956/1595	4.14	4.05	4.20	4.36	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	1	0	2	3.17	1400/1533	3.17	3.79	4.04	4.14	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	595/1512	4.33	4.04	4.10	4.26	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	936/1623	4.14	4.33	4.16	4.27	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	595/1621	4.33	3.95	4.06	4.24	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.47	4.43	4.54	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.66	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	908/1564	4.29	4.09	4.28	4.40	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	618/1559	4.57	4.16	4.29	4.41	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1301/1352	2.50	3.67	3.98	4.07	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.50	4.08	4.35	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	5.00	3.60	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	654/1368	4.50	3.63	4.30	4.58	4.50	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	534/ 555	1.75	2.65	4.29	4.41	1.75	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.25	3.68	3.71	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	2.78	3.99	4.22	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 475 0101
 Title COMBINATORICS/GRAPH TH
 Instructor: ARMSTRONG, THOM
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1110
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	372/1649	4.71	4.13	4.28	4.50	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	300/1648	4.71	4.21	4.23	4.36	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	199/1375	4.86	4.26	4.27	4.48	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	405/1595	4.58	4.05	4.20	4.36	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	288/1533	4.60	3.79	4.04	4.14	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	217/1512	4.73	4.04	4.10	4.26	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	284/1623	4.69	4.33	4.16	4.27	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	597/1646	4.92	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	914/1621	4.00	3.95	4.06	4.24	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	815/1568	4.54	4.47	4.43	4.54	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	1133/1572	4.62	4.66	4.70	4.79	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	1256/1564	3.83	4.09	4.28	4.40	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	4	0	5	3	3.58	1349/1559	3.58	4.16	4.29	4.41	3.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1352	****	3.67	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/1384	****	3.50	4.08	4.35	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1382	****	3.60	4.29	4.56	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.58	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	2.78	3.99	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 1
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: MATH 479 0101
 Title MATH PROBLEM SOLVING S
 Instructor: ARMSTRONG, THOM
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1111
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1027/1649	4.20	4.13	4.28	4.50	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	441/1648	4.60	4.21	4.23	4.36	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	233/1375	4.80	4.26	4.27	4.48	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	174/1595	4.83	4.05	4.20	4.36	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1533	4.67	3.79	4.04	4.14	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	225/1512	4.71	4.04	4.10	4.26	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	199/1623	4.78	4.33	4.16	4.27	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	288/1621	4.60	3.95	4.06	4.24	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1169/1568	4.20	4.47	4.43	4.54	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.66	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	550/1564	4.60	4.09	4.28	4.40	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1009/1559	4.20	4.16	4.29	4.41	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1352	****	3.67	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	3.50	4.08	4.35	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	****	3.60	4.29	4.56	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.58	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	388/ 555	4.00	2.65	4.29	4.41	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	3.90	4.54	4.66	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	3.40	4.35	4.44	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	37/ 288	4.50	3.25	3.68	3.71	4.50	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.95	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 490 0101
 Title SPECIAL TOPICS IN MATH
 Instructor: RATHINAM, MURUH
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1112
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	433/1649	4.67	4.13	4.28	4.50	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	999/1648	4.17	4.21	4.23	4.36	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	733/1375	4.33	4.26	4.27	4.48	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.05	4.20	4.36	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1511/1533	2.50	3.79	4.04	4.14	2.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	687/1512	4.25	4.04	4.10	4.26	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.33	4.16	4.27	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1037/1646	4.67	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	754/1621	4.20	3.95	4.06	4.24	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1050/1568	4.33	4.47	4.43	4.54	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1071/1572	4.67	4.66	4.70	4.79	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1256/1564	3.83	4.09	4.28	4.40	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	695/1559	4.50	4.16	4.29	4.41	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1335/1352	2.00	3.67	3.98	4.07	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1384	****	3.50	4.08	4.35	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1382	****	3.60	4.29	4.56	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.58	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	482/ 555	3.33	2.65	4.29	4.41	3.33	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.95	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 601 0101
 Title MEASURE THEORY
 Instructor: GULER, OSMAN
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1113
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	0	4.00	1183/1649	4.00	4.13	4.28	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.21	4.23	4.34	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.26	4.27	4.44	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1397/1595	3.50	4.05	4.20	4.35	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1249/1533	3.50	3.79	4.04	4.28	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.04	4.10	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.33	4.16	4.29	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1345/1621	3.50	3.95	4.06	4.20	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1279/1568	4.00	4.47	4.43	4.52	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.66	4.70	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1388/1564	3.50	4.09	4.28	4.41	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1370/1559	3.50	4.16	4.29	4.41	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1254/1384	3.00	3.50	4.08	4.30	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1316/1382	3.00	3.60	4.29	4.52	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	948/1368	4.00	3.63	4.30	4.56	4.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	110/ 110	1.00	2.78	3.99	3.92	1.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 617 0101
 Title INDUSTRIAL MATHEMATICS
 Instructor: BELL, JONATHAN
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1114
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	550/1649	4.57	4.13	4.28	4.46	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	862/1648	4.29	4.21	4.23	4.34	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.26	4.27	4.44	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	636/1595	4.40	4.05	4.20	4.35	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	288/1533	4.60	3.79	4.04	4.28	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	493/1512	4.43	4.04	4.10	4.35	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	608/1623	4.43	4.33	4.16	4.29	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	789/1621	4.17	3.95	4.06	4.20	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.47	4.43	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	715/1572	4.86	4.66	4.70	4.83	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	406/1564	4.71	4.09	4.28	4.41	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	618/1559	4.57	4.16	4.29	4.41	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	457/1352	4.33	3.67	3.98	4.10	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1384	****	3.50	4.08	4.30	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	****	3.60	4.29	4.52	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1368	****	3.63	4.30	4.56	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	229/ 288	3.00	3.25	3.68	3.87	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 620 0101
 Title NUMERICAL ANALYSIS I
 Instructor: GOBBERT, MATTHI
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1115
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	536/1649	4.58	4.13	4.28	4.46	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	362/1648	4.67	4.21	4.23	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	806/1375	4.25	4.26	4.27	4.44	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	566/1595	4.45	4.05	4.20	4.35	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	6	1	3.70	1113/1533	3.70	3.79	4.04	4.28	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	217/1512	4.73	4.04	4.10	4.35	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	720/1623	4.33	4.33	4.16	4.29	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	597/1646	4.92	4.83	4.69	4.81	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	511/1621	4.40	3.95	4.06	4.20	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	220/1568	4.92	4.47	4.43	4.52	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	532/1572	4.92	4.66	4.70	4.83	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.09	4.28	4.41	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	284/1559	4.83	4.16	4.29	4.41	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	690/1352	4.00	3.67	3.98	4.10	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	795/1384	4.00	3.50	4.08	4.30	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	740/1382	4.38	3.60	4.29	4.52	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1043/1368	3.88	3.63	4.30	4.56	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	844/ 948	3.00	3.50	3.95	4.03	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	3.93	4.16	4.27	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	3.60	4.12	4.61	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	3.71	4.40	4.73	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	4.07	4.35	4.80	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	3.90	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.47	4.50	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.40	4.35	4.42	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	2.81	4.06	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.73	4.09	4.47	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.27	4.47	4.58	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.38	4.44	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 312	****	3.09	3.68	3.83	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.40	4.30	4.37	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.89	4.16	4.49	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.60	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	3.13	4.42	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	2.78	3.99	3.92	****	

Course-Section: MATH 620 0101
 Title NUMERICAL ANALYSIS I
 Instructor: GOBBERT, MATTHI
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1115
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	9	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	3	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 635 0101
 Title FINITE ELEMENTS
 Instructor: SURI, MANIL
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1116
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.13	4.28	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.21	4.23	4.34	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.05	4.20	4.35	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1533	5.00	3.79	4.04	4.28	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.04	4.10	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.33	4.16	4.29	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.83	4.69	4.81	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1621	5.00	3.95	4.06	4.20	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.47	4.43	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.66	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.09	4.28	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	695/1559	4.50	4.16	4.29	4.41	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	3.67	3.98	4.10	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	795/1384	4.00	3.50	4.08	4.30	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	3.60	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	5.00	3.63	4.30	4.56	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 710A 0101
 Title ALGORITHMS/OPTIMIZ PRO
 Instructor: POTRA, FLORIAN
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1117
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	4	2	3.86	1311/1649	3.86	4.13	4.28	4.46	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	1021/1648	4.14	4.21	4.23	4.34	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.26	4.27	4.44	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	636/1595	4.40	4.05	4.20	4.35	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	703/1533	4.17	3.79	4.04	4.28	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.04	4.10	4.35	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	261/1623	4.71	4.33	4.16	4.29	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	1302/1621	3.60	3.95	4.06	4.20	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	1096/1568	4.29	4.47	4.43	4.52	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	1003/1572	4.71	4.66	4.70	4.83	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	754/1564	4.43	4.09	4.28	4.41	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1121/1559	4.00	4.16	4.29	4.41	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	263/1352	4.57	3.67	3.98	4.10	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.50	4.08	4.30	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	5.00	3.60	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	654/1368	4.50	3.63	4.30	4.56	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.50	3.95	4.03	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	2.65	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	256/ 312	3.00	3.09	3.68	3.83	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 710B 0101
 Title ITERATIVE METHODS
 Instructor: DRAGANESCU, AND
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1118
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	510/1649	4.60	4.13	4.28	4.46	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	216/1648	4.80	4.21	4.23	4.34	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.26	4.27	4.44	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	383/1595	4.60	4.05	4.20	4.35	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	476/1533	4.40	3.79	4.04	4.28	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	156/1512	4.80	4.04	4.10	4.35	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	395/1623	4.60	4.33	4.16	4.29	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	288/1621	4.60	3.95	4.06	4.20	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.47	4.43	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.66	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.09	4.28	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	586/1559	4.60	4.16	4.29	4.41	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	247/1352	4.60	3.67	3.98	4.10	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1384	4.50	3.50	4.08	4.30	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	483/1382	4.67	3.60	4.29	4.52	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	796/1368	4.33	3.63	4.30	4.56	4.33	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	553/ 555	1.00	2.65	4.29	4.66	1.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.25	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	279/ 312	2.50	3.09	3.68	3.83	2.50	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	2.78	3.99	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant