

Course-Section: MATH 100 0101
 Title INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH
 Instructor: SEIDMAN, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1018
 JUL 2, 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	1	6	2	8	3.55	1427/1576	3.44	4.29	4.30	4.11	3.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	4	4	7	3.55	1380/1576	3.59	4.31	4.27	4.18	3.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	5	9	4.10	938/1342	4.05	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	3	5	4	4	3.41	1396/1520	3.62	4.18	4.25	4.09	3.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	1	4	2	4	3.58	1214/1465	3.57	3.96	4.12	4.02	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	1	4	2	5	3.50	1204/1434	3.71	4.27	4.14	3.94	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	5	4	8	3.80	1219/1547	3.79	4.38	4.19	4.10	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1574	4.83	4.78	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	5	7	3	3.65	1240/1554	3.71	3.99	4.10	4.01	3.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	6	4	5	3.56	1382/1488	3.92	4.47	4.47	4.41	3.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	582/1493	4.60	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	3	3	4	6	3.50	1330/1486	3.73	4.17	4.32	4.26	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	3	3	7	3.56	1305/1489	3.80	4.27	4.32	4.22	3.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	963/1277	3.63	3.71	4.03	3.91	3.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	4	4	5	3.47	1076/1279	3.47	3.63	4.17	3.96	3.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	2	5	4	5	3.59	1119/1270	3.59	3.84	4.35	4.09	3.59	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	3	5	3	5	3.63	1079/1269	3.63	3.97	4.35	4.09	3.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	12	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	283/ 878	4.40	3.91	4.05	3.91	4.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 234	****	2.67	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	3	0	0	1	2	2.83	237/ 240	2.83	3.61	4.35	4.29	2.83	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	2	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 229	****	3.50	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	1	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	3	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 85	****	4.50	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	1	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	0	1	5	0	1	3.14	270/ 375	3.14	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.14	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	0	0	8	0	1	3.22	219/ 326	3.22	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.22	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	1	0	7	0	0	2.75	379/ 382	3.19	3.44	4.08	3.86	2.75	

Course-Section: MATH 100 0101
 Title INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH
 Instructor: SEIDMAN, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1018
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	6	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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	3				
				?	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	2	3	7	9	3	3.33	1494/1576	3.44	4.29	4.30	4.11	3.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	6	8	6	3.63	1360/1576	3.59	4.31	4.27	4.18	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	7	9	7	4.00	972/1342	4.05	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	1	4	10	3	3.83	1212/1520	3.62	4.18	4.25	4.09	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	2	2	3	3	6	3.56	1221/1465	3.57	3.96	4.12	4.02	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	8	0	2	1	6	4	3.92	978/1434	3.71	4.27	4.14	3.94	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	6	6	8	3.78	1227/1547	3.79	4.38	4.19	4.10	3.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	4	18	4.65	927/1574	4.83	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	1	5	3	4	3.77	1159/1554	3.71	3.99	4.10	4.01	3.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	1087/1488	3.92	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	1337/1493	4.60	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.30	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	2	4	7	7	3.95	1149/1486	3.73	4.17	4.32	4.26	3.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	3	6	9	4.05	1091/1489	3.80	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	13	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	****/1277	3.63	3.71	4.03	3.91	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/1279	3.47	3.63	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1270	3.59	3.84	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/1269	3.63	3.97	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 878	4.40	3.91	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	13	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	5	0	1	3.33	****/ 375	3.14	3.27	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	8	0	1	3.22	219/ 326	3.22	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.22	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	5	1	2	3.63	206/ 382	3.19	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.63	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	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	2				
				?	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	0	3	5	7	8	3.87	1274/1576	4.21	4.29	4.30	4.11	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	4	14	4.30	891/1576	4.40	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	13	4.22	865/1342	4.46	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	880/1520	4.35	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1043/1465	4.15	3.96	4.12	4.02	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	1057/1434	4.36	4.27	4.14	3.94	3.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	4	16	4.55	480/1547	4.27	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	9	4.41	1202/1574	4.61	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.41	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	794/1554	4.14	3.99	4.10	4.01	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	708/1488	4.54	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	683/1493	4.67	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	2	3	14	4.38	841/1486	4.51	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	1	17	4.52	672/1489	4.62	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	18	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1277	3.85	3.71	4.03	3.91	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	1	2	3	4	3.50	1064/1279	4.01	3.63	4.17	3.96	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	1	0	4	5	3.75	1054/1270	4.22	3.84	4.35	4.09	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	3	1	3	4	3.50	1116/1269	4.30	3.97	4.35	4.09	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	10	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 878	4.50	3.91	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	2.67	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.29	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	2	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	208/ 379	4.12	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.10	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.08	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	8	0	1	3.22	219/ 326	3.24	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.22	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	10	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.49	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	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	2	1	2	3	5	3.62	1405/1576	4.21	4.29	4.30	4.11	3.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	1	5	3.38	1445/1576	4.40	4.31	4.27	4.18	3.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	1093/1342	4.46	4.28	4.32	4.19	3.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1041/1520	4.35	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	1	0	5	3.88	1012/1465	4.15	3.96	4.12	4.02	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	797/1434	4.36	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	6	1	2	3	3.17	1432/1547	4.27	4.38	4.19	4.10	3.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	1434/1574	4.61	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	4	2	1	2	2.73	1509/1554	4.14	3.99	4.10	4.01	2.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	1	2	2	4	3.25	1428/1488	4.54	4.47	4.47	4.41	3.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	3	2	5	3.75	1454/1493	4.67	4.73	4.73	4.65	3.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	4	1	5	3.46	1342/1486	4.51	4.17	4.32	4.26	3.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	0	3	5	3.82	1231/1489	4.62	4.27	4.32	4.22	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1277	3.85	3.71	4.03	3.91	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	0	1	3	3	3.09	1174/1279	4.01	3.63	4.17	3.96	3.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	1030/1270	4.22	3.84	4.35	4.09	3.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	2	1	2	5	3.73	1047/1269	4.30	3.97	4.35	4.09	3.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	4.50	3.91	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.29	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	186/ 379	4.12	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.17	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	1	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	265/ 375	3.08	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.17	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.11	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	1	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	180/ 326	3.24	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.50	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.44	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	1	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	219/ 382	3.49	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 1		

Course-Section: MATH 106 1201
 Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC
 Instructor: RILEY, SAMANTHA
 Enrollment: 51
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1022
 JUL 2, 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	0	1	0	9	4.80	243/1576	4.21	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	152/1576	4.40	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	369/1342	4.46	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	768/1520	4.35	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	758/1465	4.15	3.96	4.12	4.02	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	682/1434	4.36	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	303/1547	4.27	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	866/1574	4.61	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	316/1554	4.14	3.99	4.10	4.01	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	278/1488	4.54	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	607/1493	4.67	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	201/1486	4.51	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	217/1489	4.62	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1149/1277	3.85	3.71	4.03	3.91	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1279	4.01	3.63	4.17	3.96	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	636/1270	4.22	3.84	4.35	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	444/1269	4.30	3.97	4.35	4.09	4.75
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.12	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 375	3.08	3.27	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.24	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	203/ 382	3.49	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.67

Frequency Distribution

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

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	2	14	4.76	289/1576	4.21	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	91/1576	4.40	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	191/1342	4.46	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	239/1520	4.35	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	159/1465	4.15	3.96	4.12	4.02	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	110/1434	4.36	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	179/1547	4.27	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1574	4.61	4.78	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	180/1554	4.14	3.99	4.10	4.01	4.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1488	4.54	4.47	4.47	4.41	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	658/1493	4.67	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	137/1486	4.51	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	240/1489	4.62	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	533/1277	3.85	3.71	4.03	3.91	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	0	1	7	4.10	771/1279	4.01	3.63	4.17	3.96	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	736/1270	4.22	3.84	4.35	4.09	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	310/1269	4.30	3.97	4.35	4.09	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 878	4.50	3.91	4.05	3.91	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.12	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.08	3.27	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.24	3.38	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	4.68	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.49	3.44	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 106 1401
 Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC
 Instructor: RILEY, SAMANTHA
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1024
 JUL 2, 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	1	0	3	5	6	4.00	1148/1576	4.21	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	668/1576	4.40	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	406/1342	4.46	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	665/1520	4.35	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	1	1	8	4.08	808/1465	4.15	3.96	4.12	4.02	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	270/1434	4.36	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	939/1547	4.27	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	547/1574	4.61	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	518/1554	4.14	3.99	4.10	4.01	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	248/1488	4.54	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1493	4.67	4.73	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	172/1486	4.51	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1489	4.62	4.27	4.32	4.22	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	506/1277	3.85	3.71	4.03	3.91	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	365/1279	4.01	3.63	4.17	3.96	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	541/1270	4.22	3.84	4.35	4.09	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	567/1269	4.30	3.97	4.35	4.09	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	464/ 878	4.50	3.91	4.05	3.91	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 234	****	2.67	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 229	****	3.50	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	128/ 379	4.12	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.50	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 375	3.08	3.27	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	213/ 326	3.24	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.25	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	193/ 382	3.49	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.80	

Course-Section: MATH 106 1401
 Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC
 Instructor: RILEY, SAMANTHA
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1024
 JUL 2, 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	5	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 106Y 0101
 Title ALGEBRA AND ELEM. FUNC
 Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1025
 JUL 2, 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	0	1	3.67	1383/1576	3.67	4.29	4.30	4.11	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	851/1576	4.33	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	850/1465	4.00	3.96	4.12	4.02	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	924/1554	4.00	3.99	4.10	4.01	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	666/1488	4.67	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1053/1493	4.67	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	891/1486	4.33	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1149/1277	3.00	3.71	4.03	3.91	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	802/1279	4.00	3.63	4.17	3.96	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	3.84	4.35	4.09	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	535/1269	4.67	3.97	4.35	4.09	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	3.91	4.05	3.91	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	231/ 234	2.67	2.67	4.23	4.08	2.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	198/ 240	4.00	3.61	4.35	4.29	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	222/ 229	3.50	3.50	4.51	4.43	3.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 232	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.27	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 379	5.00	4.10	4.20	4.15	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	61/ 85	4.50	4.50	4.72	4.52	4.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	57/ 79	4.50	4.50	4.69	4.52	4.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.43	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.83	4.61	4.55	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	3.27	4.01	3.78	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	46/ 52	3.00	3.00	4.48	4.20	3.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	43/ 48	3.00	3.00	4.40	4.11	3.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	5.00	4.73	4.71	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.72	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	3.38	4.03	3.64	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	38/ 40	3.00	3.00	4.60	4.44	3.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	21/ 24	4.50	4.50	4.83	4.71	4.50	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	32/ 35	4.00	4.00	4.67	4.68	4.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	21/ 28	4.50	4.50	4.78	4.65	4.50	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	3.44	4.08	3.86	5.00	

Course-Section: MATH 106Y 0101
 Title ALGEBRA AND ELEM. FUNC
 Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1025
 JUL 2, 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	0	A	0	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 115 0101
 Title FINITE MATHEMATICS
 Instructor: KOGAN, JACOB
 Enrollment: 58
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1026
 JUL 2, 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	2	7	6	3	3.19	1510/1576	3.19	4.29	4.30	4.11	3.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	4	5	2	6	3.10	1515/1576	3.10	4.31	4.27	4.18	3.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	5	5	5	6	3.57	1191/1342	3.57	4.28	4.32	4.19	3.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	4	4	4	3	3.12	1461/1520	3.12	4.18	4.25	4.09	3.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	2	3	1	4	2	3.08	1372/1465	3.08	3.96	4.12	4.02	3.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	2	1	6	0	3	3.08	1364/1434	3.08	4.27	4.14	3.94	3.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	5	3	8	3.52	1338/1547	3.52	4.38	4.19	4.10	3.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	739/1574	4.76	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	2	2	8	3	0	2.80	1501/1554	2.80	3.99	4.10	4.01	2.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	2	2	7	6	3.68	1365/1488	3.68	4.47	4.47	4.41	3.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	3	6	9	4.16	1387/1493	4.16	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.16	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	4	3	5	4	1	2.71	1458/1486	2.71	4.17	4.32	4.26	2.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	4	5	6	3	3.44	1332/1489	3.44	4.27	4.32	4.22	3.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	3	1	4	0	0	2.13	1264/1277	2.13	3.71	4.03	3.91	2.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	2	5	1	4	3.07	1178/1279	3.07	3.63	4.17	3.96	3.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	2	2	3	6	3.60	1116/1270	3.60	3.84	4.35	4.09	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	915/1269	4.07	3.97	4.35	4.09	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	10	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 878	****	3.91	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	2.67	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 229	****	3.50	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	1	0	0	10	1	3.83	341/ 379	3.83	4.10	4.20	4.15	3.83	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.50	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 375	****	3.27	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	0	4	0	3	3.86	162/ 326	3.86	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.86	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	8	1	2	3.45	227/ 382	3.45	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.45	

Course-Section: MATH 115 0101
 Title FINITE MATHEMATICS
 Instructor: KOGAN, JACOB
 Enrollment: 58
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1026
 JUL 2, 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	0	A	2	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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	8				
				?	2						

Course-Section: MATH 132 0101
 Title MATH FOR ELEM TCHRS II
 Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1027
 JUL 2, 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	3	9	4.75	301/1576	4.75	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	201/1576	4.83	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	197/1520	4.80	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	498/1465	4.42	3.96	4.12	4.02	4.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	193/1434	4.75	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	110/1547	4.92	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	422/1574	4.92	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	215/1554	4.73	3.99	4.10	4.01	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	501/1493	4.92	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	812/1277	3.89	3.71	4.03	3.91	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1279	****	3.63	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1270	****	3.84	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1269	****	3.97	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.91	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	200/ 379	4.13	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.13	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	209/ 375	3.50	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.50	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Non-major 12
				P 0	Electives 0
				I 0	Other 9
				? 0	#### - 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	1	0	1	3	9	12	24	4.12	1073/1576	3.98	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.12	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	4	14	28	4.33	864/1576	4.11	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	2	2	5	8	30	4.32	788/1342	4.20	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.32	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	1	2	6	8	20	4.19	929/1520	3.94	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	20	5	4	5	5	10	3.38	1302/1465	3.57	3.96	4.12	4.02	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	27	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	383/1434	4.07	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	7	10	29	4.31	784/1547	4.22	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	2	11	35	4.69	881/1574	4.39	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	1	2	9	12	10	3.82	1117/1554	3.84	3.99	4.10	4.01	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	10	35	4.61	736/1488	4.51	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	5	43	4.82	784/1493	4.50	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	3	3	15	24	4.19	1003/1486	4.07	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	6	8	31	4.31	921/1489	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	19	4	2	11	4	5	3.15	1131/1277	3.36	3.71	4.03	3.91	3.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	5	3	8	9	17	3.71	981/1279	3.62	3.63	4.17	3.96	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	8	2	5	13	14	3.55	1127/1270	3.43	3.84	4.35	4.09	3.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	7	2	7	12	13	3.54	1107/1269	3.44	3.97	4.35	4.09	3.54	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	31	2	1	2	2	3	3.30	****/ 878	****	3.91	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	3	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	****/ 234	****	2.67	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	3	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	****/ 229	****	3.50	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	3	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	7	0	0	0	17	2	4.11	208/ 379	4.09	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.11	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.50	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	12	0	5	3.59	205/ 375	3.49	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.59	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	47	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	42	1	0	0	6	0	1	3.29	****/ 326	3.41	3.38	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	48	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	0	8	0	5	3.77	195/ 382	3.59	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.77	

Course-Section: MATH 150 0101
 Title PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC
 Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL
 Enrollment: 119
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1028
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	50	Non-major	49
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	29				
				?	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	5	23	38	27	3.84	1291/1576	3.98	4.29	4.30	4.11	3.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	8	16	35	33	3.89	1248/1576	4.11	4.31	4.27	4.18	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	3	17	25	46	4.08	944/1342	4.20	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	45	2	7	14	10	18	3.69	1290/1520	3.94	4.18	4.25	4.09	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	40	5	2	12	19	18	3.77	1095/1465	3.57	3.96	4.12	4.02	3.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	64	2	3	11	5	11	3.63	1162/1434	4.07	4.27	4.14	3.94	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	7	14	25	47	4.14	947/1547	4.22	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	2	82	11	4.09	1427/1574	4.39	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.09	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	3	2	15	43	17	3.86	1088/1554	3.84	3.99	4.10	4.01	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	2	10	21	57	4.40	995/1488	4.51	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	3	2	11	34	41	4.19	1379/1493	4.50	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.19	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	6	4	16	28	37	3.95	1158/1486	4.07	4.17	4.32	4.26	3.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	2	5	4	10	31	40	4.08	1080/1489	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	62	5	2	5	4	12	3.57	987/1277	3.36	3.71	4.03	3.91	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	8	10	16	11	26	3.52	1055/1279	3.62	3.63	4.17	3.96	3.52	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	10	11	17	13	20	3.31	1175/1270	3.43	3.84	4.35	4.09	3.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	10	4	25	14	17	3.34	1160/1269	3.44	3.97	4.35	4.09	3.34	
4. Were special techniques successful	25	51	3	2	8	3	4	3.15	****/ 878	****	3.91	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	90	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 234	****	2.67	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	91	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	91	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 229	****	3.50	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	91	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	3	0	0	2	38	5	4.07	216/ 379	4.09	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.07	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	92	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 85	****	4.50	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	93	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	93	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	93	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	0	0	0	33	5	6	3.39	225/ 375	3.49	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.39	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	92	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	93	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	93	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	93	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	1	1	0	28	2	8	3.41	191/ 326	3.41	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.41	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	93	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	93	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	93	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	93	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	0	0	0	32	3	7	3.40	235/ 382	3.59	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.40	

Course-Section: MATH 150 0201
 Title PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC
 Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI
 Enrollment: 212
 Questionnaires: 96

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1029
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	43	0.00-0.99	1	A	18	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	1	B	33						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	15	C	20	General	1	Under-grad	95	Non-major	95
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	19	D	6						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	18	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	58				
				?	5						

Course-Section: MATH 151 0101
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY I
 Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI
 Enrollment: 54
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1030
 JUL 2, 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	2	3	11	10	4.00	1148/1576	4.30	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	7	17	4.44	698/1576	4.48	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	1	12	10	4.08	948/1342	4.25	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	10	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	1012/1520	3.93	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	2	1	4	6	6	3.68	1152/1465	3.71	3.96	4.12	4.02	3.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	878/1434	3.91	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	4	6	15	4.19	908/1547	4.36	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	927/1574	4.71	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	11	9	4.22	752/1554	4.17	3.99	4.10	4.01	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	5	19	4.58	786/1488	4.70	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	8	17	4.54	1184/1493	4.71	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	6	16	4.44	763/1486	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	1	7	15	4.50	696/1489	4.49	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	18	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/1277	3.67	3.71	4.03	3.91	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	5	1	5	4	6	3.24	1148/1279	3.38	3.63	4.17	3.96	3.24	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	5	3	5	1	6	3.00	1208/1270	3.37	3.84	4.35	4.09	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	5	3	4	1	7	3.10	1207/1269	3.58	3.97	4.35	4.09	3.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	15	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	****/ 878	3.10	3.91	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	10	1	4.09	210/ 379	3.96	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.09	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	12	0	1	3.15	268/ 375	3.25	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.15	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.18	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	8	1	1	3.30	257/ 382	3.45	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.30	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 151 0201
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY I
 Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI
 Enrollment: 58
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1031
 JUL 2, 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	1	3	13	12	4.24	964/1576	4.30	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	19	4.62	448/1576	4.48	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	18	4.52	572/1342	4.25	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	1	1	4	1	9	4.00	1041/1520	3.93	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	2	10	7	4.26	637/1465	3.71	3.96	4.12	4.02	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	21	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	1162/1434	3.91	4.27	4.14	3.94	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	7	19	4.55	469/1547	4.36	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	488/1574	4.71	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	16	5	4.08	881/1554	4.17	3.99	4.10	4.01	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	20	4.68	652/1488	4.70	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	6	19	4.57	1150/1493	4.71	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	8	17	4.38	851/1486	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	21	4.59	602/1489	4.49	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	24	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1277	3.67	3.71	4.03	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	1	4	7	9	3.75	962/1279	3.38	3.63	4.17	3.96	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	1	4	11	6	3.75	1054/1270	3.37	3.84	4.35	4.09	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	2	5	5	9	3.74	1043/1269	3.58	3.97	4.35	4.09	3.74
4. Were special techniques successful	6	19	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	****/ 878	3.10	3.91	4.05	3.91	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	1	0	10	0	3.82	346/ 379	3.96	4.10	4.20	4.15	3.82
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	9	1	0	3.10	282/ 375	3.25	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.10
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	8	0	1	3.22	219/ 326	3.18	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.22
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	11	0	3	3.43	231/ 382	3.45	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.43

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	28
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	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	1	0	0	0	6	8	22	4.44	727/1576	4.30	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	7	24	4.53	581/1576	4.48	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	7	25	4.53	562/1342	4.25	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	2	2	7	12	4.26	848/1520	3.93	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	13	1	3	7	8	4	3.48	1257/1465	3.71	3.96	4.12	4.02	3.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	23	1	0	2	2	8	4.23	704/1434	3.91	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	9	23	4.54	480/1547	4.36	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	33	4.94	281/1574	4.71	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	5	9	14	4.24	722/1554	4.17	3.99	4.10	4.01	4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	8	27	4.72	568/1488	4.70	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	7	28	4.75	908/1493	4.71	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	9	23	4.50	678/1486	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	8	25	4.58	602/1489	4.49	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	28	0	1	3	0	4	3.88	****/1277	3.67	3.71	4.03	3.91	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	5	8	9	9	3.47	1076/1279	3.38	3.63	4.17	3.96	3.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	6	2	4	9	13	3.62	1111/1270	3.37	3.84	4.35	4.09	3.62	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	2	8	8	12	3.81	1015/1269	3.58	3.97	4.35	4.09	3.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	24	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	****/ 878	3.10	3.91	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.29	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	14	0	4.00	229/ 379	3.96	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	8	1	0	3.11	****/ 375	3.25	3.27	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	0	0	5	1	1	3.43	****/ 326	3.18	3.38	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	12	1	1	3.21	278/ 382	3.45	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.21	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	11	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 9	General 1	Under-grad 37 Non-major 37
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 29	
			? 1		

Course-Section: MATH 151 0401
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY I
 Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI
 Enrollment: 62
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1033
 JUL 2, 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	6	8	13	4.26	952/1576	4.30	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	9	16	4.48	638/1576	4.48	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	0	11	13	4.22	857/1342	4.25	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	0	3	7	5	3.94	1128/1520	3.93	4.18	4.25	4.09	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	3	6	5	7	3.64	1187/1465	3.71	3.96	4.12	4.02	3.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	2	3	3	5	3.85	1039/1434	3.91	4.27	4.14	3.94	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	0	6	17	4.33	755/1547	4.36	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	24	3	4.11	1417/1574	4.71	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	2	10	9	4.33	623/1554	4.17	3.99	4.10	4.01	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	526/1488	4.70	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	1065/1493	4.71	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	7	15	4.42	792/1486	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	6	19	4.65	513/1489	4.49	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	16	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	692/1277	3.67	3.71	4.03	3.91	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	12	1	5	4	5	2.59	1240/1279	3.38	3.63	4.17	3.96	2.59	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	8	2	6	3	8	3.04	1205/1270	3.37	3.84	4.35	4.09	3.04	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	6	1	7	1	12	3.44	1131/1269	3.58	3.97	4.35	4.09	3.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	17	1	2	3	2	2	3.20	780/ 878	3.10	3.91	4.05	3.91	3.20	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	1	0	0	13	0	3.79	349/ 379	3.96	4.10	4.20	4.15	3.79	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	0	0	14	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.25	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.18	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	9	0	1	3.20	281/ 382	3.45	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	7	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	2						
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	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	1	2	7	15	4.19	1027/1576	4.30	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	12	10	4.04	1119/1576	4.48	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.04	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	5	9	8	3.63	1178/1342	4.25	4.28	4.32	4.19	3.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	6	5	5	3	3.15	1456/1520	3.93	4.18	4.25	4.09	3.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	3	2	6	3	3	3.06	1377/1465	3.71	3.96	4.12	4.02	3.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	2	2	1	2	4	3.36	1278/1434	3.91	4.27	4.14	3.94	3.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	8	15	4.33	755/1547	4.36	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	6	19	4.69	866/1574	4.71	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	3	0	5	11	6	3.68	1214/1554	4.17	3.99	4.10	4.01	3.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	6	19	4.56	810/1488	4.70	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	1	24	4.78	868/1493	4.71	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	1	1	12	10	3.93	1177/1486	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.26	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	0	8	15	4.15	1035/1489	4.49	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	16	3	1	1	2	3	3.10	1143/1277	3.67	3.71	4.03	3.91	3.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	3	8	7	3	3.17	1161/1279	3.38	3.63	4.17	3.96	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	3	3	7	4	7	3.38	1161/1270	3.37	3.84	4.35	4.09	3.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	3	3	5	8	5	3.38	1151/1269	3.58	3.97	4.35	4.09	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	15	3	2	0	2	1	2.50	849/ 878	3.10	3.91	4.05	3.91	2.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 234	****	2.67	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 229	****	3.50	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 379	3.96	4.10	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	9	0	1	3.20	254/ 375	3.25	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.20	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	****/ 326	3.18	3.38	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	8	1	5	3.79	194/ 382	3.45	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.79	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	2	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	26
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
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	20						
				?	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	0	0	3	12	4.80	243/1576	4.30	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	476/1576	4.48	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	709/1342	4.25	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	683/1520	3.93	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	537/1465	3.71	3.96	4.12	4.02	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	270/1434	3.91	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	492/1547	4.36	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	665/1574	4.71	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	331/1554	4.17	3.99	4.10	4.01	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	324/1488	4.70	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	683/1493	4.71	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	499/1486	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	526/1489	4.49	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	560/1277	3.67	3.71	4.03	3.91	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	780/1279	3.38	3.63	4.17	3.96	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	3	3	3	4	3.62	1111/1270	3.37	3.84	4.35	4.09	3.62	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	830/1269	3.58	3.97	4.35	4.09	4.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	8	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	688/ 878	3.10	3.91	4.05	3.91	3.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	2.67	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	3.50	4.51	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 379	3.96	4.10	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.25	3.27	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	180/ 326	3.18	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.50	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	4.71	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	6	1	0	3.14	297/ 382	3.45	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.14	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
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	12				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	3	9	14	4.14	1065/1576	4.30	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	22	4.66	406/1576	4.48	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.66	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	6	18	4.34	761/1342	4.25	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.34	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	3	3	4	7	3.72	1271/1520	3.93	4.18	4.25	4.09	3.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	3	4	5	6	3.50	1242/1465	3.71	3.96	4.12	4.02	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	1157/1434	3.91	4.27	4.14	3.94	3.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	2	7	14	4.04	1020/1547	4.36	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.04	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	488/1574	4.71	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	5	10	9	4.08	881/1554	4.17	3.99	4.10	4.01	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	4	24	4.76	505/1488	4.70	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	3	25	4.79	829/1493	4.71	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	2	5	20	4.45	763/1486	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	9	16	4.31	910/1489	4.49	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	16	1	2	2	4	2	3.36	1077/1277	3.67	3.71	4.03	3.91	3.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	5	2	2	4	8	3.38	1112/1279	3.38	3.63	4.17	3.96	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	6	0	5	4	6	3.19	1188/1270	3.37	3.84	4.35	4.09	3.19	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	3	2	6	6	3.33	1163/1269	3.58	3.97	4.35	4.09	3.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	14	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	****/ 878	3.10	3.91	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	2.67	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	3.50	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	2	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	200/ 379	3.96	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.13	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.50	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	5	1	3	3.78	198/ 375	3.25	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.78	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	0	9	0	1	3.20	223/ 326	3.18	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.20	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	6	1	7	4.07	184/ 382	3.45	3.44	4.08	3.86	4.07	

Course-Section: MATH 151 0701
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I
 Instructor: KAPOOR, JAGMOHA
 Enrollment: 58
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1036
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	2	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	11	36	4.55	582/1576	4.44	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	13	35	4.57	528/1576	4.48	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	10	37	4.55	541/1342	4.30	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	20	2	1	4	6	20	4.24	869/1520	4.32	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	23	0	2	4	6	18	4.33	571/1465	3.93	3.96	4.12	4.02	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	33	1	2	3	3	11	4.05	857/1434	4.16	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	7	46	4.87	148/1547	4.49	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.87	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	5	12	36	4.58	1018/1574	4.66	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	2	3	20	18	4.26	712/1554	4.28	3.99	4.10	4.01	4.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	52	4.96	99/1488	4.65	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.96	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	6	45	4.81	784/1493	4.74	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	14	36	4.63	514/1486	4.31	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	13	38	4.64	526/1489	4.39	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	36	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	600/1277	3.94	3.71	4.03	3.91	4.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	9	4	13	14	10	3.24	1147/1279	3.86	3.63	4.17	3.96	3.24	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	14	10	11	5	10	2.74	1238/1270	3.53	3.84	4.35	4.09	2.74	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	6	8	15	10	10	3.20	1188/1269	3.77	3.97	4.35	4.09	3.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	43	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/ 878	3.71	3.91	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	6	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 234	****	2.67	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 229	****	3.50	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	2	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	4	0	0	0	14	4	4.22	165/ 379	4.17	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.22	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.50	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	2	0	0	13	1	2	3.31	235/ 375	3.20	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.31	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	50	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	50	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	50	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	3	0	0	16	0	5	3.48	183/ 326	3.25	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.48	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	1	0	0	19	2	8	3.62	206/ 382	3.36	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.62	

Course-Section: MATH 152 0101
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY
 Instructor: SONG, YOON J
 Enrollment: 68
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1037
 JUL 2, 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	0	A	29	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	18	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	53	Non-major	49
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	26	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	40				
				?	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	0	2	2	8	41	4.66	415/1576	4.44	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.66	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	44	4.79	233/1576	4.48	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	7	42	4.68	393/1342	4.30	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	2	3	10	23	4.42	648/1520	4.32	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	18	6	4	6	8	11	3.40	1292/1465	3.93	3.96	4.12	4.02	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	30	1	1	6	4	11	4.00	878/1434	4.16	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	7	11	35	4.53	503/1547	4.49	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	41	4.77	720/1574	4.66	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	2	8	33	4.72	215/1554	4.28	3.99	4.10	4.01	4.72	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	8	42	4.72	589/1488	4.65	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	47	4.88	607/1493	4.74	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	13	34	4.52	666/1486	4.31	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	47	4.85	263/1489	4.39	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	37	1	0	3	1	9	4.21	569/1277	3.94	3.71	4.03	3.91	4.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	4	5	9	11	11	3.50	1064/1279	3.86	3.63	4.17	3.96	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	3	5	9	10	13	3.63	1107/1270	3.53	3.84	4.35	4.09	3.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	5	4	10	6	14	3.51	1113/1269	3.77	3.97	4.35	4.09	3.51	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	28	1	2	1	1	6	3.82	****/ 878	3.71	3.91	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	0	0	0	14	6	4.30	139/ 379	4.17	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.30	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	18	2	3	3.35	231/ 375	3.20	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.35	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	0	0	0	12	3	2	3.41	191/ 326	3.25	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.41	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	0	0	0	11	5	3	3.58	211/ 382	3.36	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.58	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	1	A	17	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	11	General	0	Under-grad	53	Non-major	51
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	2	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	42				
				?	3						

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	335/1576	4.44	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	166/1576	4.48	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	275/1342	4.30	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	249/1520	4.32	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	975/1465	3.93	3.96	4.12	4.02	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	1033/1434	4.16	4.27	4.14	3.94	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	228/1547	4.49	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	813/1574	4.66	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	124/1554	4.28	3.99	4.10	4.01	4.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1488	4.65	4.47	4.47	4.41	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	334/1493	4.74	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	241/1486	4.31	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	16	4.78	350/1489	4.39	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	283/1277	3.94	3.71	4.03	3.91	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	4	8	3.94	860/1279	3.86	3.63	4.17	3.96	3.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	1	3	2	9	3.88	1011/1270	3.53	3.84	4.35	4.09	3.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	2	2	12	4.41	719/1269	3.77	3.97	4.35	4.09	4.41	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	10	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	322/ 878	3.71	3.91	4.05	3.91	4.33	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 379	4.17	4.10	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 375	3.20	3.27	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	223/ 326	3.25	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.20	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	8	1	1	3.30	257/ 382	3.36	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.30	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	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	0	1	5	4	10	4.15	1050/1576	4.44	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	5	7	3.85	1264/1576	4.48	4.31	4.27	4.18	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	4	5	3	5	3.15	1283/1342	4.30	4.28	4.32	4.19	3.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	1251/1520	4.32	4.18	4.25	4.09	3.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	758/1465	3.93	3.96	4.12	4.02	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	659/1434	4.16	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	6	10	4.10	971/1547	4.49	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	866/1574	4.66	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	4	6	4	3.75	1166/1554	4.28	3.99	4.10	4.01	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	1142/1488	4.65	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	1089/1493	4.74	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	3	2	6	6	3.58	1313/1486	4.31	4.17	4.32	4.26	3.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	4	4	7	3.58	1302/1489	4.39	4.27	4.32	4.22	3.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	812/1277	3.94	3.71	4.03	3.91	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	335/1279	3.86	3.63	4.17	3.96	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	1	7	5	4.00	928/1270	3.53	3.84	4.35	4.09	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	915/1269	3.77	3.97	4.35	4.09	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	8	0	2	0	3	2	3.71	654/ 878	3.71	3.91	4.05	3.91	3.71	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	2.67	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	3.50	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.17	4.10	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	6	1	0	3.14	270/ 375	3.20	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.14	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	6	1	0	3.14	237/ 326	3.25	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.14	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.36	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	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	0	5	17	23	4.40	787/1576	4.44	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	18	24	4.47	668/1576	4.48	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	15	25	4.42	683/1342	4.30	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	2	15	12	4.34	756/1520	4.32	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.34	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	14	1	1	7	12	10	3.94	947/1465	3.93	3.96	4.12	4.02	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	22	0	1	2	9	9	4.24	704/1434	4.16	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	4	14	26	4.50	527/1547	4.49	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	33	11	4.25	1324/1574	4.66	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	0	2	1	17	14	4.26	702/1554	4.28	3.99	4.10	4.01	4.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	17	25	4.49	895/1488	4.65	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.49	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	13	30	4.62	1101/1493	4.74	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	3	16	23	4.31	911/1486	4.31	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	12	27	4.45	754/1489	4.39	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	23	3	2	5	5	4	3.26	1104/1277	3.94	3.71	4.03	3.91	3.26	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	2	12	8	13	3.76	962/1279	3.86	3.63	4.17	3.96	3.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	6	4	6	12	9	3.38	1161/1270	3.53	3.84	4.35	4.09	3.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	4	10	10	11	3.72	1047/1269	3.77	3.97	4.35	4.09	3.72	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	23	1	2	2	4	4	3.62	685/ 878	3.71	3.91	4.05	3.91	3.62	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.29	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	2	0	0	0	10	1	4.09	****/ 379	4.17	4.10	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	43	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	1	0	0	9	1	0	3.10	****/ 375	3.20	3.27	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	1	1	0	16	1	1	3.05	249/ 326	3.25	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.05	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	1	0	0	12	0	2	3.29	261/ 382	3.36	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.29	

Course-Section: MATH 152 0501
 Title: CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY
 Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI
 Enrollment: 66
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1041
 JUL 2, 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	1	A	16	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	16	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	8	C	7	General	2	Under-grad	45	Non-major	45
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	34				
				?	3						

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	0	0	5	12	10	4.19	1027/1576	4.44	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	8	14	4.30	900/1576	4.48	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	11	12	4.25	835/1342	4.30	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	683/1520	4.32	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	1	4	7	4	3.88	1012/1465	3.93	3.96	4.12	4.02	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	360/1434	4.16	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	9	14	4.18	916/1547	4.49	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	375/1574	4.66	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	7	10	5	3.83	1117/1554	4.28	3.99	4.10	4.01	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	7	17	4.52	858/1488	4.65	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	10	16	4.56	1167/1493	4.74	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	5	8	11	4.00	1101/1486	4.31	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	8	7	11	4.04	1102/1489	4.39	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.04	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	18	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	987/1277	3.94	3.71	4.03	3.91	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	6	8	10	4.08	777/1279	3.86	3.63	4.17	3.96	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	4	8	4	8	3.56	1123/1270	3.53	3.84	4.35	4.09	3.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	3	6	6	8	3.71	1055/1269	3.77	3.97	4.35	4.09	3.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	2	3	4	6	2	3.18	784/ 878	3.71	3.91	4.05	3.91	3.18	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.29	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	3	0	0	0	13	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.17	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.00	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	0	0	11	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.20	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	7	2	0	3.22	219/ 326	3.25	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.22	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	5	0	1	3.33	****/ 382	3.36	3.44	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	2	Under-grad	28	Non-major	27
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 155 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY CALCULUS
 Instructor: KELLY, BRIAN W
 Enrollment: 58
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1043
 JUL 2, 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	3	9	16	4.38	818/1576	4.14	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	11	15	4.38	798/1576	4.31	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	19	4.59	500/1342	4.47	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	6	4	14	4.33	768/1520	4.15	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	1	5	4	10	4.00	850/1465	3.91	3.96	4.12	4.02	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	4	8	8	4.20	748/1434	4.09	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	6	20	4.52	515/1547	4.50	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	375/1574	4.91	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	623/1554	3.91	3.99	4.10	4.01	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	442/1488	4.63	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	683/1493	4.78	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	20	4.64	499/1486	4.20	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	8	18	4.59	590/1489	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	5	1	0	3	6	3.27	1104/1277	3.24	3.71	4.03	3.91	3.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	2	5	15	4.33	603/1279	4.12	3.63	4.17	3.96	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	3	9	12	4.38	756/1270	3.96	3.84	4.35	4.09	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	4	8	12	4.33	773/1269	3.78	3.97	4.35	4.09	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	15	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	383/ 878	3.61	3.91	4.05	3.91	4.22	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 234	****	2.67	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	1	0	3	5	4.00	198/ 240	4.00	3.61	4.35	4.29	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 229	****	3.50	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	7	0	0	0	10	1	4.09	210/ 379	4.09	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.09	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.50	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	2	0	0	6	1	2	3.56	207/ 375	3.37	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.56	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	2	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	4	0	0	7	1	0	3.13	242/ 326	3.36	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.13	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	2	0	0	7	0	3	3.60	208/ 382	3.70	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.60	

Course-Section: MATH 155 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY CALCULUS
 Instructor: KELLY, BRIAN W
 Enrollment: 58
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1043
 JUL 2, 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	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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	25				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 155 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY CALCULUS
 Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1044
 JUL 2, 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	6	6	9	4.05	1124/1576	4.14	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	13	4.41	759/1576	4.31	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	583/1342	4.47	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	1041/1520	4.15	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	5	6	4	3.93	947/1465	3.91	3.96	4.12	4.02	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	5	3	4	3.92	991/1434	4.09	4.27	4.14	3.94	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	2	14	4.43	657/1547	4.50	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	235/1574	4.91	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	2	1	4	5	4	3.50	1303/1554	3.91	3.99	4.10	4.01	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	2	14	4.53	846/1488	4.63	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	0	17	4.65	1065/1493	4.78	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	8	7	4.05	1085/1486	4.20	4.17	4.32	4.26	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	4	5	9	4.05	1091/1489	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	13	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	1219/1277	3.24	3.71	4.03	3.91	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	2	3	4	5	3.67	1000/1279	4.12	3.63	4.17	3.96	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	2	7	1	3	3.21	1185/1270	3.96	3.84	4.35	4.09	3.21	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	3	4	3	2	3.15	1197/1269	3.78	3.97	4.35	4.09	3.15	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	7	0	3	2	1	1	3.00	799/ 878	3.61	3.91	4.05	3.91	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 234	****	2.67	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 240	4.00	3.61	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 229	****	3.50	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	1	0	8	1	3.90	325/ 379	4.09	4.10	4.20	4.15	3.90	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.50	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	1	5	1	1	3.25	245/ 375	3.37	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	7	0	3	3.60	176/ 326	3.36	3.38	4.03	3.64	3.60	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	6	0	5	3.91	192/ 382	3.70	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.91	

Course-Section: MATH 155 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY CALCULUS
 Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1044
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	11				
				?	0						

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	2	1	5	6	13	4.00	1148/1576	4.14	4.29	4.30	4.11	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	5	15	4.15	1040/1576	4.31	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	17	4.33	770/1342	4.47	4.28	4.32	4.19	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	3	2	7	11	4.13	969/1520	4.15	4.18	4.25	4.09	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	2	3	3	9	3.79	1081/1465	3.91	3.96	4.12	4.02	3.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	2	3	3	10	4.17	777/1434	4.09	4.27	4.14	3.94	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	19	4.56	469/1547	4.50	4.38	4.19	4.10	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	24	4.85	567/1574	4.91	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	2	11	5	3.90	1060/1554	3.91	3.99	4.10	4.01	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	1	4	17	4.57	798/1488	4.63	4.47	4.47	4.41	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	759/1493	4.78	4.73	4.73	4.65	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	0	7	3	11	3.91	1187/1486	4.20	4.17	4.32	4.26	3.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	5	3	13	4.17	1012/1489	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.22	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	14	1	1	2	0	5	3.78	876/1277	3.24	3.71	4.03	3.91	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	589/1279	4.12	3.63	4.17	3.96	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	814/1270	3.96	3.84	4.35	4.09	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	2	1	2	0	8	3.85	1007/1269	3.78	3.97	4.35	4.09	3.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	7	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/ 878	3.61	3.91	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 234	****	2.67	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 240	4.00	3.61	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 229	****	3.50	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	145/ 379	4.09	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.29	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.50	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	8	1	1	3.30	237/ 375	3.37	3.27	4.01	3.78	3.30	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	5	0	1	3.33	****/ 326	3.36	3.38	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	0	0	7	0	3	3.60	208/ 382	3.70	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.60	

Course-Section: MATH 155 0301
 Title ELEMENTARY CALCULUS
 Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL
 Enrollment: 59
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1045
 JUL 2, 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	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	D	1						
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	20				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 215 0101
 Title FINITE MATH FOR INFO S
 Instructor: KAPOOR, JAGMOHA
 Enrollment: 52
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1046
 JUL 2, 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	1	3	12	11	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.29	4.30	4.35	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	9	19	4.55	542/1576	4.55	4.31	4.27	4.32	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	22	4.72	333/1342	4.72	4.28	4.32	4.41	4.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	376/1520	4.63	4.18	4.25	4.26	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	468/1465	4.44	3.96	4.12	4.09	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	338/1434	4.58	4.27	4.14	4.06	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	7	17	4.38	718/1547	4.38	4.38	4.19	4.22	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	758/1574	4.76	4.78	4.64	4.62	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	6	8	8	4.09	876/1554	4.09	3.99	4.10	4.05	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	5	21	4.59	774/1488	4.59	4.47	4.47	4.44	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	4	3	21	4.52	1201/1493	4.52	4.73	4.73	4.75	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	6	19	4.48	706/1486	4.48	4.17	4.32	4.29	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	8	19	4.52	684/1489	4.52	4.27	4.32	4.31	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	22	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	****/1277	****	3.71	4.03	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	0	1	1	5	3.78	952/1279	3.78	3.63	4.17	4.14	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	3	2	1	1	2	2.67	1243/1270	2.67	3.84	4.35	4.30	2.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	1	1	4	1	2	3.22	1184/1269	3.22	3.97	4.35	4.29	3.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	6	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 878	****	3.91	4.05	3.92	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	10	1	4.09	210/ 379	4.09	4.10	4.20	4.29	4.09	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	9	1	0	3.10	282/ 375	3.10	3.27	4.01	4.21	3.10	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	13	0	1	3.14	237/ 326	3.14	3.38	4.03	4.43	3.14	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	6	0	3	3.67	203/ 382	3.67	3.44	4.08	4.39	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	8	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	24				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 221 0101
 Title INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR
 Instructor: SHEN, JINGLAI
 Enrollment: 53
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1047
 JUL 2, 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	5	15	4.75	301/1576	4.26	4.29	4.30	4.35	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	91/1576	4.31	4.31	4.27	4.32	4.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	107/1342	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.41	4.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	476/1520	3.90	4.18	4.25	4.26	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	316/1465	4.05	3.96	4.12	4.09	4.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	243/1434	4.19	4.27	4.14	4.06	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	123/1547	4.54	4.38	4.19	4.22	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	281/1574	4.88	4.78	4.64	4.62	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	11	8	4.35	597/1554	3.67	3.99	4.10	4.05	4.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	149/1488	4.34	4.47	4.47	4.44	4.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	810/1493	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.75	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	422/1486	4.01	4.17	4.32	4.29	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	309/1489	3.98	4.27	4.32	4.31	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	16	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1277	3.42	3.71	4.03	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1279	3.08	3.63	4.17	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1270	3.72	3.84	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1269	3.65	3.97	4.35	4.29	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	14	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.10	4.20	4.29	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.05	3.27	4.01	4.21	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.64	3.38	4.03	4.43	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.26	3.44	4.08	4.39	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 1		

Course-Section: MATH 221 0201
 Title INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR
 Instructor: ZWECK, JOHN
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1048
 JUL 2, 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	10	16	4.50	637/1576	4.26	4.29	4.30	4.35	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	12	16	4.57	515/1576	4.31	4.31	4.27	4.32	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	14	14	4.50	583/1342	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.41	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	1	0	1	8	9	4.26	848/1520	3.90	4.18	4.25	4.26	4.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	4	7	14	4.22	678/1465	4.05	3.96	4.12	4.09	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	345/1434	4.19	4.27	4.14	4.06	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	7	18	4.50	527/1547	4.54	4.38	4.19	4.22	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	375/1574	4.88	4.78	4.64	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	10	10	4.36	584/1554	3.67	3.99	4.10	4.05	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	23	4.75	505/1488	4.34	4.47	4.47	4.44	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	582/1493	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.75	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	9	16	4.52	666/1486	4.01	4.17	4.32	4.29	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	9	16	4.39	823/1489	3.98	4.27	4.32	4.31	4.39	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	19	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	812/1277	3.42	3.71	4.03	4.01	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	1	2	1	2	3.00	1186/1279	3.08	3.63	4.17	4.14	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	1054/1270	3.72	3.84	4.35	4.30	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1079/1269	3.65	3.97	4.35	4.29	3.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	5	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 878	****	3.91	4.05	3.92	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.10	4.20	4.29	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	9	0	1	3.20	254/ 375	3.05	3.27	4.01	4.21	3.20	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	5	0	1	3.33	****/ 326	3.64	3.38	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	8	0	3	3.55	214/ 382	3.26	3.44	4.08	4.39	3.55	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	23
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	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	1	2	5	14	7	3.83	1308/1576	4.26	4.29	4.30	4.35	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	14	8	3.93	1207/1576	4.31	4.31	4.27	4.32	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	9	11	3.97	1010/1342	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.41	3.97	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	2	2	9	4	3.88	1179/1520	3.90	4.18	4.25	4.26	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	5	8	10	4.04	829/1465	4.05	3.96	4.12	4.09	4.04	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	2	1	12	3	3.89	1015/1434	4.19	4.27	4.14	4.06	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	11	15	4.41	673/1547	4.54	4.38	4.19	4.22	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	188/1574	4.88	4.78	4.64	4.62	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	3	3	7	8	0	2.95	1466/1554	3.67	3.99	4.10	4.05	2.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	8	12	5	3.81	1343/1488	4.34	4.47	4.47	4.44	3.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	22	4.71	986/1493	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.75	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	5	5	12	4	3.48	1336/1486	4.01	4.17	4.32	4.29	3.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	5	9	6	6	3.41	1345/1489	3.98	4.27	4.32	4.31	3.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	21	1	2	1	2	0	2.67	****/1277	3.42	3.71	4.03	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/1279	3.08	3.63	4.17	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1270	3.72	3.84	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1269	3.65	3.97	4.35	4.29	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.47	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	2	0	0	0	10	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.10	4.20	4.29	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.50	4.72	4.78	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	1	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.05	3.27	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.74	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.71	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	1	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 326	3.64	3.38	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	8	0	1	3.22	276/ 382	3.26	3.44	4.08	4.39	3.22	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	29	Non-major	25
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	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	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	1106/1576	4.26	4.29	4.30	4.35	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	1217/1576	4.31	4.31	4.27	4.32	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	948/1342	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.41	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1449/1520	3.90	4.18	4.25	4.26	3.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	2	4	3	3.73	1123/1465	4.05	3.96	4.12	4.09	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1045/1434	4.19	4.27	4.14	4.06	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	399/1547	4.54	4.38	4.19	4.22	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	739/1574	4.88	4.78	4.64	4.62	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	7	3	0	3.18	1410/1554	3.67	3.99	4.10	4.05	3.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	1126/1488	4.34	4.47	4.47	4.44	4.23	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	1113/1493	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.75	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	7	2	3	3.54	1323/1486	4.01	4.17	4.32	4.29	3.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	7	3	1	3.23	1385/1489	3.98	4.27	4.32	4.31	3.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	1	4	2	0	2.88	1196/1277	3.42	3.71	4.03	4.01	2.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1279	3.08	3.63	4.17	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1270	3.72	3.84	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1269	3.65	3.97	4.35	4.29	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.10	4.20	4.29	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	1	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.05	3.27	4.01	4.21	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	155/ 326	3.64	3.38	4.03	4.43	4.20	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.26	3.44	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
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	10				
				?	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	0	2	7	8	4.17	1042/1576	4.26	4.29	4.30	4.35	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	5	9	4.17	1023/1576	4.31	4.31	4.27	4.32	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	7	5	3.83	1097/1342	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.41	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	5	4	3	3.62	1325/1520	3.90	4.18	4.25	4.26	3.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	4	8	2	3.67	1166/1465	4.05	3.96	4.12	4.09	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	5	6	4	3.93	966/1434	4.19	4.27	4.14	4.06	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	2	11	4.28	816/1547	4.54	4.38	4.19	4.22	4.28	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	720/1574	4.88	4.78	4.64	4.62	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	7	6	2	3.50	1303/1554	3.67	3.99	4.10	4.05	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	5	8	4	3.94	1282/1488	4.34	4.47	4.47	4.44	3.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	1006/1493	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.75	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	5	5	5	3.81	1229/1486	4.01	4.17	4.32	4.29	3.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	4	8	4.06	1091/1489	3.98	4.27	4.32	4.31	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	2	5	5	2	3.50	1020/1277	3.42	3.71	4.03	4.01	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	3	6	3	1	3.15	1163/1279	3.08	3.63	4.17	4.14	3.15	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	5	4	3	3.69	1079/1270	3.72	3.84	4.35	4.30	3.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	4	5	2	3.67	1067/1269	3.65	3.97	4.35	4.29	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	11	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	****	3.91	4.05	3.92	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	2.67	4.23	4.44	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	3.50	4.51	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	1	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.10	4.20	4.29	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.50	4.72	4.78	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	2	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.05	3.27	4.01	4.21	3.00	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.69	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.64	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	165/ 326	3.64	3.38	4.03	4.43	3.71	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.26	3.44	4.08	4.39	****	

Course-Section: MATH 221 0501
 Title INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR
 Instructor: MUSCEDERE, MICH
 Enrollment: 51
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1051
 JUL 2, 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	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 225 0101
 Title INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT
 Instructor: LO, JAMES T
 Enrollment: 57
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1052
 JUL 2, 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	5	4	13	13	3.97	1175/1576	4.33	4.29	4.30	4.35	3.97	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	9	8	15	4.00	1138/1576	4.24	4.31	4.27	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	4	11	19	4.44	658/1342	4.33	4.28	4.32	4.41	4.44		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	23	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	665/1520	4.40	4.18	4.25	4.26	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	2	1	2	9	11	4.04	829/1465	3.91	3.96	4.12	4.09	4.04	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	1	0	3	8	10	4.18	758/1434	4.32	4.27	4.14	4.06	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	6	23	4.46	608/1547	4.46	4.38	4.19	4.22	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1574	4.83	4.78	4.64	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	4	3	11	7	3	3.07	1436/1554	3.66	3.99	4.10	4.05	3.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	6	4	7	11	7	3.26	1428/1488	4.10	4.47	4.47	4.44	3.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	5	8	21	4.47	1232/1493	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.75	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	5	10	9	6	5	2.89	1445/1486	3.69	4.17	4.32	4.29	2.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	9	6	5	7	7	2.91	1437/1489	3.80	4.27	4.32	4.31	2.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	30	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	****/1277	3.40	3.71	4.03	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	****/1279	****	3.63	4.17	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	****/1270	****	3.84	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/1269	****	3.97	4.35	4.29	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.18	4.10	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	13	0	2	3.27	243/ 375	3.13	3.27	4.01	4.21	3.27	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	6	1	0	3.14	****/ 326	3.48	3.38	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	6	0	4	3.80	193/ 382	3.53	3.44	4.08	4.39	3.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	15	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	35	Non-major	31
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 225 0201
 Title INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT
 Instructor: BELL, JONATHAN
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1053
 JUL 2, 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	6	7	4.43	757/1576	4.33	4.29	4.30	4.35	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	978/1576	4.24	4.31	4.27	4.32	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	865/1342	4.33	4.28	4.32	4.41	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	648/1520	4.40	4.18	4.25	4.26	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	3	4	2	3.55	1228/1465	3.91	3.96	4.12	4.09	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	398/1434	4.32	4.27	4.14	4.06	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	805/1547	4.46	4.38	4.19	4.22	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	832/1574	4.83	4.78	4.64	4.62	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	6	1	3.64	1247/1554	3.66	3.99	4.10	4.05	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	970/1488	4.10	4.47	4.47	4.44	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	445/1493	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.75	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	8	2	3.85	1218/1486	3.69	4.17	4.32	4.29	3.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	934/1489	3.80	4.27	4.32	4.31	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	2	1	4	2	2	3.09	1143/1277	3.40	3.71	4.03	4.01	3.09	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 379	4.18	4.10	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.13	3.27	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	180/ 326	3.48	3.38	4.03	4.43	3.50	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 382	3.53	3.44	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	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	0	0	3	9	24	4.58	527/1576	4.33	4.29	4.30	4.35	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	10	22	4.50	608/1576	4.24	4.31	4.27	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	12	19	4.33	770/1342	4.33	4.28	4.32	4.41	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	1	0	3	2	13	4.37	731/1520	4.40	4.18	4.25	4.26	4.37	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	5	9	11	4.15	748/1465	3.91	3.96	4.12	4.09	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	22	0	2	1	2	9	4.29	647/1434	4.32	4.27	4.14	4.06	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	8	26	4.64	375/1547	4.46	4.38	4.19	4.22	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	5	30	4.78	720/1574	4.83	4.78	4.64	4.62	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	14	14	4.27	692/1554	3.66	3.99	4.10	4.05	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	9	24	4.60	750/1488	4.10	4.47	4.47	4.44	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	30	4.86	683/1493	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.75	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	6	11	17	4.32	901/1486	3.69	4.17	4.32	4.29	4.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	2	8	20	4.21	990/1489	3.80	4.27	4.32	4.31	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	17	1	1	5	5	5	3.71	923/1277	3.40	3.71	4.03	4.01	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	****/1279	****	3.63	4.17	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/1270	****	3.84	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1269	****	3.97	4.35	4.29	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	30	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	****	3.91	4.05	3.92	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 234	****	2.67	4.23	4.44	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.47	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	1	0	0	0	14	3	4.18	182/ 379	4.18	4.10	4.20	4.29	4.18	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	15	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.13	3.27	4.01	4.21	3.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.74	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.71	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.69	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.64	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	0	8	4	1	3.46	185/ 326	3.48	3.38	4.03	4.43	3.46	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	14	0	2	3.25	269/ 382	3.53	3.44	4.08	4.39	3.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 16	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 9
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	7	C 8	General 0	Under-grad 36	Non-major 27
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	29	
?	1			

Course-Section: MATH 251 0101
 Title MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS
 Instructor: SONG, YOON J
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1055
 JUL 2, 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	2	6	7	29	4.43	742/1576	4.20	4.29	4.30	4.35	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	13	27	4.49	638/1576	4.09	4.31	4.27	4.32	4.49	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	16	27	4.56	531/1342	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.41	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	1	4	6	18	4.41	665/1520	3.79	4.18	4.25	4.26	4.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	1	4	4	10	13	3.94	947/1465	3.91	3.96	4.12	4.09	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	1	6	7	16	4.27	670/1434	4.07	4.27	4.14	4.06	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	12	30	4.60	411/1547	4.10	4.38	4.19	4.22	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	40	4.89	508/1574	4.73	4.78	4.64	4.62	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	17	18	4.39	545/1554	3.54	3.99	4.10	4.05	4.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	10	33	4.77	484/1488	3.96	4.47	4.47	4.44	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	37	4.84	734/1493	4.47	4.73	4.73	4.75	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	5	13	23	4.44	778/1486	3.55	4.17	4.32	4.29	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	7	30	4.57	614/1489	3.60	4.27	4.32	4.31	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	25	3	1	2	5	6	3.59	983/1277	3.59	3.71	4.03	4.01	3.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	39	0	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	****/1279	****	3.63	4.17	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	39	0	1	1	3	1	0	2.67	****/1270	****	3.84	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	39	0	2	1	1	2	0	2.50	****/1269	****	3.97	4.35	4.29	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	39	4	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 878	****	3.91	4.05	3.92	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	1	0	0	12	0	3.77	350/ 379	3.99	4.10	4.20	4.29	3.77	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	21	0	1	3.09	282/ 375	3.32	3.27	4.01	4.21	3.09	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	19	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.07	3.38	4.03	4.43	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	14	0	4	3.44	228/ 382	3.32	3.44	4.08	4.39	3.44	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 0
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B 20	Graduate 0
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	4	C 13	General 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D 0	Under-grad 45
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	18	F 0	Major 8
				P 0	Non-major 37
				I 0	Electives 2
				? 0	Other 42
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MATH 251 0201
 Title MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS
 Instructor: LYNN, YEN-MOW
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1056
 JUL 2, 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	8	5	4.20	1019/1576	4.20	4.29	4.30	4.35	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	1100/1576	4.09	4.31	4.27	4.32	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	770/1342	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.41	4.33		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	0	4	3	3.89	1179/1520	3.79	4.18	4.25	4.26	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	647/1465	3.91	3.96	4.12	4.09	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	594/1434	4.07	4.27	4.14	4.06	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	339/1547	4.10	4.38	4.19	4.22	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	328/1574	4.73	4.78	4.64	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	2	7	0	2	3.00	1448/1554	3.54	3.99	4.10	4.05	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	1155/1488	3.96	4.47	4.47	4.44	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	1286/1493	4.47	4.73	4.73	4.75	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	4	5	1	3	2.93	1437/1486	3.55	4.17	4.32	4.29	2.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	4	4	2	2	2.86	1445/1489	3.60	4.27	4.32	4.31	2.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1277	3.59	3.71	4.03	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1279	****	3.63	4.17	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1270	****	3.84	4.35	4.30	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	229/ 379	3.99	4.10	4.20	4.29	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	209/ 375	3.32	3.27	4.01	4.21	3.50	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	3.07	3.38	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	291/ 382	3.32	3.44	4.08	4.39	3.17	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 251 0301
 Title MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS
 Instructor: GOWARD, RUSSELL
 Enrollment: 51
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1057
 JUL 2, 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	6	10	8	3.96	1185/1576	4.20	4.29	4.30	4.35	3.96	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	8	9	6	3.72	1322/1576	4.09	4.31	4.27	4.32	3.72	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	10	8	3.92	1048/1342	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.41	3.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	2	3	5	2	3	3.07	1464/1520	3.79	4.18	4.25	4.26	3.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	4	3	3	6	3.53	1235/1465	3.91	3.96	4.12	4.09	3.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	2	4	4	3	3.62	1167/1434	4.07	4.27	4.14	4.06	3.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	4	9	5	3	3.04	1455/1547	4.10	4.38	4.19	4.22	3.04	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	9	4.36	1236/1574	4.73	4.78	4.64	4.62	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	10	5	1	3.22	1399/1554	3.54	3.99	4.10	4.05	3.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	4	15	2	2	2.92	1460/1488	3.96	4.47	4.47	4.44	2.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	4	10	10	4.16	1384/1493	4.47	4.73	4.73	4.75	4.16	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	4	11	5	4	3.28	1383/1486	3.55	4.17	4.32	4.29	3.28	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	7	6	6	3.36	1355/1489	3.60	4.27	4.32	4.31	3.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	18	1	2	2	1	0	2.50	****/1277	3.59	3.71	4.03	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1279	****	3.63	4.17	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1270	****	3.84	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1269	****	3.97	4.35	4.29	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	175/ 379	3.99	4.10	4.20	4.29	4.20	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	6	1	1	3.38	227/ 375	3.32	3.27	4.01	4.21	3.38	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	6	1	0	3.14	237/ 326	3.07	3.38	4.03	4.43	3.14	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	8	2	1	3.36	243/ 382	3.32	3.44	4.08	4.39	3.36	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 301 0101
 Title INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I
 Instructor: KOGAN, JACOB
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1058
 JUL 2, 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	4	4.38	818/1576	4.60	4.29	4.30	4.30	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	2	1	3.50	1392/1576	4.06	4.31	4.27	4.28	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	2	1	3.25	1269/1342	3.91	4.28	4.32	4.30	3.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1212/1520	4.13	4.18	4.25	4.25	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	3.63	1194/1465	3.76	3.96	4.12	4.09	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	878/1434	4.56	4.27	4.14	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1239/1547	4.27	4.38	4.19	4.21	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.78	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	924/1554	4.05	3.99	4.10	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1018/1488	4.71	4.47	4.47	4.47	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1493	4.73	4.73	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	1253/1486	4.04	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1050/1489	4.31	4.27	4.32	4.34	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1020/1277	3.50	3.71	4.03	4.11	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	802/1279	3.50	3.63	4.17	4.20	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	412/1270	4.54	3.84	4.35	4.42	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	4.67	3.97	4.35	4.41	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	155/ 379	4.13	4.10	4.20	4.17	4.25	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.28	3.27	4.01	4.12	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.14	3.38	4.03	4.23	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.61	3.44	4.08	4.24	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 301 0201
 Title INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I
 Instructor: DRAGANESCU, AND
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1059
 JUL 2, 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	5	17	4.77	277/1576	4.60	4.29	4.30	4.30	4.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	608/1576	4.06	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	381/1342	3.91	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.68		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	464/1520	4.13	4.18	4.25	4.55		
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	3	4	2	7	3.65	1180/1465	3.76	3.96	4.12	4.09	3.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	270/1434	4.56	4.27	4.14	4.15	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	445/1547	4.27	4.38	4.19	4.21	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.78	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	518/1554	4.05	3.99	4.10	4.09	4.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	505/1488	4.71	4.47	4.47	4.47	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	683/1493	4.73	4.73	4.73	4.70	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	861/1486	4.04	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	513/1489	4.31	4.27	4.32	4.34	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1277	3.50	3.71	4.03	4.11	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1279	3.50	3.63	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1270	4.54	3.84	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1269	4.67	3.97	4.35	4.41	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	9	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.13	4.10	4.20	4.17	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	196/ 375	3.28	3.27	4.01	4.12	3.83	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	6	0	1	3.29	207/ 326	3.14	3.38	4.03	4.23	3.29	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	219/ 382	3.61	3.44	4.08	4.24	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 301 0301
 Title INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I
 Instructor: SHEN, JINGLAI
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1060
 JUL 2, 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	415/1576	4.60	4.29	4.30	4.30	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1023/1576	4.06	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1110/1342	3.91	4.28	4.32	4.30	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1041/1520	4.13	4.18	4.25	4.25	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	850/1465	3.76	3.96	4.12	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1434	4.56	4.27	4.14	4.15	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	527/1547	4.27	4.38	4.19	4.21	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.78	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1166/1554	4.05	3.99	4.10	4.09	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1488	4.71	4.47	4.47	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1321/1493	4.73	4.73	4.73	4.70	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1101/1486	4.04	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	1020/1489	4.31	4.27	4.32	4.34	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	3.50	3.71	4.03	4.11	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1186/1279	3.50	3.63	4.17	4.20	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	784/1270	4.54	3.84	4.35	4.42	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	773/1269	4.67	3.97	4.35	4.41	4.33	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.28	3.27	4.01	4.12	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.14	3.38	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	181/ 382	3.61	3.44	4.08	4.24	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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	5				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 302 0101
 Title INTRO MATH ANALYSIS II
 Instructor: ARMSTRONG, THOM
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1061
 JUL 2, 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	0	8	4.23	976/1576	4.23	4.29	4.30	4.30	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	3	6	3.77	1307/1576	3.77	4.31	4.27	4.28	3.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	1093/1342	3.85	4.28	4.32	4.30	3.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1276/1520	3.71	4.18	4.25	4.25	3.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	758/1465	4.14	3.96	4.12	4.09	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.27	4.14	4.15	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	399/1547	4.62	4.38	4.19	4.21	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.78	4.64	4.61	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	3	1	5	2	3.33	1367/1554	3.33	3.99	4.10	4.09	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	1209/1488	4.08	4.47	4.47	4.47	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	1053/1493	4.67	4.73	4.73	4.70	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	3	5	1	3.17	1400/1486	3.17	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	2	2	3	2.92	1437/1489	2.92	4.27	4.32	4.34	2.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1128/1277	3.17	3.71	4.03	4.11	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1279	****	3.63	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1270	****	3.84	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1269	****	3.97	4.35	4.41	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	193/ 379	4.14	4.10	4.20	4.17	4.14	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	7	2	0	3.22	250/ 375	3.22	3.27	4.01	4.12	3.22	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	7	1	1	3.33	200/ 326	3.33	3.38	4.03	4.23	3.33	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.44	4.08	4.24	3.00	

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	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 4		

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	6	7	1	3.44	1470/1576	3.44	4.29	4.30	4.30	4.30	3.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	6	1	3.25	1484/1576	3.25	4.31	4.27	4.27	4.28	3.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	4	4	4	3.38	1252/1342	3.38	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.30	3.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	2	2	2	4	1	3.00	1466/1520	3.00	4.18	4.25	4.25	3.00	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	2	5	4	3.64	1180/1465	3.64	3.96	4.12	4.09	3.64	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	2	1	3	0	2.86	1397/1434	2.86	4.27	4.14	4.15	2.86	2.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	4	3	6	3.63	1294/1547	3.63	4.38	4.19	4.21	3.63	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	758/1574	4.75	4.78	4.64	4.61	4.75	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	3	3	4	3	1	2.71	1510/1554	2.71	3.99	4.10	4.09	2.71	2.71
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	1215/1488	4.06	4.47	4.47	4.47	4.06	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	5	6	4	3.75	1454/1493	3.75	4.73	4.73	4.70	3.75	3.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	10	2	3.75	1253/1486	3.75	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.75	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	0	2	5	5	3.44	1335/1489	3.44	4.27	4.32	4.34	3.44	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1020/1277	3.50	3.71	4.03	4.11	3.50	3.50
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1022/1279	3.60	3.63	4.17	4.20	3.60	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1033/1270	3.80	3.84	4.35	4.42	3.80	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	852/1269	4.20	3.97	4.35	4.41	4.20	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 878	****	3.91	4.05	4.09	****	****
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.32	****	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.10	4.20	4.17	4.00	4.00
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.69	4.69	****	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	1	0	0	5	1	1	3.43	220/ 375	3.43	3.27	4.01	4.12	3.43	3.43
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.37	****	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	3.92	****	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.63	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.50	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	1	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.38	4.03	4.23	****	****
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.83	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	4.89	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	5.00	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.44	4.08	4.24	3.00	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 3	General 5	Under-grad 16	Non-major 2
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	11	
?	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	0	1	4	9	12	4.23	976/1576	4.23	4.29	4.30	4.30	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	5	16	4.38	785/1576	4.38	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	4	19	4.58	510/1342	4.58	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	848/1520	4.27	4.18	4.25	4.25	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	3	3	2	0	4	2.92	1413/1465	2.92	3.96	4.12	4.09	2.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	594/1434	4.33	4.27	4.14	4.15	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	21	4.70	291/1547	4.70	4.38	4.19	4.21	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	188/1574	4.96	4.78	4.64	4.61	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	6	6	11	4.22	752/1554	4.22	3.99	4.10	4.09	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	1	22	4.73	547/1488	4.73	4.47	4.47	4.47	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	708/1493	4.85	4.73	4.73	4.70	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	2	7	15	4.31	922/1486	4.31	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	0	2	20	4.52	672/1489	4.52	4.27	4.32	4.34	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	1	4	6	10	4.19	585/1277	4.19	3.71	4.03	4.11	4.19	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	2	0	2	1	4	3.56	1043/1279	3.56	3.63	4.17	4.20	3.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	3	0	2	3	3.33	1169/1270	3.33	3.84	4.35	4.42	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	1	0	1	5	4.00	928/1269	4.00	3.97	4.35	4.41	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	6	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 878	****	3.91	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.32	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	145/ 379	4.29	4.10	4.20	4.17	4.29	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	5	1	2	3.63	204/ 375	3.63	3.27	4.01	4.12	3.63	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	7	1	1	3.33	200/ 326	3.33	3.38	4.03	4.23	3.33	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	10	3	2	3.47	225/ 382	3.47	3.44	4.08	4.24	3.47	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	2
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	10	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
			Required for Majors	0	Graduate
			General	11	Under-grad
			Electives	0	27
			Other	14	Non-major
					10
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: MATH 401 0101
 Title MATHEMATICAL ANALYSIS
 Instructor: ARMSTRONG, THOM
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1064
 JUL 2, 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	637/1576	4.50	4.29	4.30	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.31	4.27	4.35	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.28	4.32	4.46	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.18	4.25	4.38	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1465	5.00	3.96	4.12	4.22	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.27	4.14	4.30	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.38	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.78	4.64	4.69	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	395/1554	4.50	3.99	4.10	4.24	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.47	4.47	4.55	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.73	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.17	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.27	4.32	4.38	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1249/1279	2.50	3.63	4.17	4.31	2.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	3.84	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	3.97	4.35	4.55	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.27	4.01	3.90	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 404 0101
 Title INTRO PART DIFF EQ I
 Instructor: BELL, JONATHAN
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1065
 JUL 2, 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	5	16	4.68	387/1576	4.68	4.29	4.30	4.46	4.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	555/1576	4.55	4.31	4.27	4.35	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	381/1342	4.68	4.28	4.32	4.46	4.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	291/1520	4.71	4.18	4.25	4.38	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	3	3	3	3	5	3.24	1341/1465	3.24	3.96	4.12	4.22	3.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	544/1434	4.38	4.27	4.14	4.30	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	3	13	4.38	708/1547	4.38	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	832/1574	4.71	4.78	4.64	4.69	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	1	10	5	4.12	860/1554	4.12	3.99	4.10	4.24	4.12	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	0	19	4.81	401/1488	4.81	4.47	4.47	4.55	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	658/1493	4.86	4.73	4.73	4.80	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	3	6	11	4.09	1072/1486	4.09	4.17	4.32	4.41	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	14	4.41	813/1489	4.41	4.27	4.32	4.38	4.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	3	0	3	5	1	3.08	1144/1277	3.08	3.71	4.03	4.04	3.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	4	0	0	3	1	2.63	1238/1279	2.63	3.63	4.17	4.31	2.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1177/1270	3.29	3.84	4.35	4.53	3.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	3	0	0	0	4	3.29	1175/1269	3.29	3.97	4.35	4.55	3.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	****	3.91	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.45	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	2	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	200/ 379	4.13	4.10	4.20	4.19	4.13	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.27	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	****/ 326	****	3.38	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.50	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	6	0	1	3.29	261/ 382	3.29	3.44	4.08	3.88	3.29	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	4	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	6	Under-grad	18	Non-major	14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	10	
?	2			

Course-Section: MATH 407 0101
 Title MODERN ALGEBRA & NO.TH
 Instructor: ARMSTRONG, THOM
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1066
 JUL 2, 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	3	1	7	4.17	1042/1576	4.17	4.29	4.30	4.46	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	1023/1576	4.17	4.31	4.27	4.35	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	835/1342	4.25	4.28	4.32	4.46	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	768/1520	4.33	4.18	4.25	4.38	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	454/1465	4.44	3.96	4.12	4.22	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	816/1434	4.13	4.27	4.14	4.30	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	270/1547	4.73	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	813/1574	4.73	4.78	4.64	4.69	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	4	6	0	3.45	1326/1554	3.45	3.99	4.10	4.24	3.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	2	1	7	4.08	1209/1488	4.08	4.47	4.47	4.55	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1053/1493	4.67	4.73	4.73	4.80	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	5	3	2	3.33	1375/1486	3.33	4.17	4.32	4.41	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	6	0	0	5	3.17	1398/1489	3.17	4.27	4.32	4.38	3.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	3.71	4.03	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	1267/1279	2.25	3.63	4.17	4.31	2.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1054/1270	3.75	3.84	4.35	4.53	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	773/1269	4.33	3.97	4.35	4.55	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.91	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.10	4.20	4.19	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.27	4.01	3.90	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	200/ 326	3.33	3.38	4.03	3.97	3.33	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.44	4.08	3.88	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 408 0101
 Title INTRO ABSTRACT ALGEBR
 Instructor: TOLL, CHARLES
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1067
 JUL 2, 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	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.29	4.30	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.31	4.27	4.35	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1520	4.67	4.18	4.25	4.38	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	366/1465	4.50	3.96	4.12	4.22	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.27	4.14	4.30	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.38	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.78	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	194/1554	4.75	3.99	4.10	4.24	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.47	4.47	4.55	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.73	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	339/1486	4.75	4.17	4.32	4.41	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	378/1489	4.75	4.27	4.32	4.38	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1279	4.50	3.63	4.17	4.31	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	3.84	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1269	4.50	3.97	4.35	4.55	4.50	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	77/ 379	4.50	4.10	4.20	4.19	4.50	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.27	4.01	3.90	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	180/ 326	3.50	3.38	4.03	3.97	3.50	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	185/ 382	4.00	3.44	4.08	3.88	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 411 0101
 Title LINEAR ALGEBRA
 Instructor: PITTINGER, ARTH
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1068
 JUL 2, 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	2	7	4.45	712/1576	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.46	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	215/1576	4.82	4.31	4.27	4.35	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	179/1342	4.90	4.28	4.32	4.46	4.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	429/1520	4.57	4.18	4.25	4.38	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	366/1465	4.50	3.96	4.12	4.22	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.27	4.14	4.30	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	0	6	4.10	971/1547	4.10	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.78	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	623/1554	4.33	3.99	4.10	4.24	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.47	4.47	4.55	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	810/1493	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.80	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.17	4.32	4.41	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	552/1489	4.63	4.27	4.32	4.38	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1277	****	3.71	4.03	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1279	****	3.63	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1270	****	3.84	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1269	****	3.97	4.35	4.55	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.10	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 375	****	3.27	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	232/ 326	3.17	3.38	4.03	3.97	3.17	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.44	4.08	3.88	3.00	

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	1	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 2		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		

Course-Section: MATH 413 0101
 Title NUMBER THEORY
 Instructor: CAMPBELL, ROBER
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1069
 JUL 2, 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	4	4.80	243/1576	4.80	4.29	4.30	4.46	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	476/1576	4.60	4.31	4.27	4.35	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	709/1342	4.40	4.28	4.32	4.46	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	395/1520	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.38	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	850/1465	4.00	3.96	4.12	4.22	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	524/1434	4.40	4.27	4.14	4.30	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	186/1547	4.80	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	665/1574	4.80	4.78	4.64	4.69	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	316/1554	4.60	3.99	4.10	4.24	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.47	4.47	4.55	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.73	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	271/1486	4.80	4.17	4.32	4.41	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	309/1489	4.80	4.27	4.32	4.38	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	258/1277	4.60	3.71	4.03	4.04	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	****	3.63	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1270	****	3.84	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	3.97	4.35	4.55	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.10	4.20	4.19	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.38	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	182/ 382	4.25	3.44	4.08	3.88	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 432 0101
 Title HISTORY OF MATHEMATICS
 Instructor: SEIDMAN, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1070
 JUL 2, 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	2	4	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.29	4.30	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.31	4.27	4.35	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	480/1342	4.60	4.28	4.32	4.46	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	339/1520	4.67	4.18	4.25	4.38	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	850/1465	4.00	3.96	4.12	4.22	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.27	4.14	4.30	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.78	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1132/1554	3.80	3.99	4.10	4.24	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.47	4.47	4.55	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.73	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	891/1486	4.33	4.17	4.32	4.41	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.27	4.32	4.38	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1149/1277	3.00	3.71	4.03	4.04	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1279	****	3.63	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1270	****	3.84	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	3.97	4.35	4.55	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	****	3.91	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.10	4.20	4.19	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	232/ 375	3.33	3.27	4.01	3.90	3.33	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	170/ 326	3.67	3.38	4.03	3.97	3.67	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.44	4.08	3.88	****	

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 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 6	Non-major 1
84-150	3	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 1			
				I 0	Other 3		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MATH 479 0101
 Title MATH PROBLEM SOLVING S
 Instructor: ARMSTRONG, THOM
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1071
 JUL 2, 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	2	6	4.44	727/1576	4.44	4.29	4.30	4.46	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	698/1576	4.44	4.31	4.27	4.35	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1342	****	4.28	4.32	4.46	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	197/1520	4.80	4.18	4.25	4.38	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1465	4.67	3.96	4.12	4.22	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	138/1434	4.83	4.27	4.14	4.30	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	690/1547	4.40	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.78	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	827/1554	4.14	3.99	4.10	4.24	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.47	4.47	4.55	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.73	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.17	4.32	4.41	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	888/1489	4.33	4.27	4.32	4.38	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	665/1279	4.25	3.63	4.17	4.31	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	3.84	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	3.97	4.35	4.55	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.10	4.20	4.19	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.50	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	40/ 80	4.67	4.83	4.61	4.52	4.67	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 375	****	3.27	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	200/ 326	3.33	3.38	4.03	3.97	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 481 0101
 Title MATH MODELING
 Instructor: ROSTAMIAN, ROUB
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1072
 JUL 2, 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	3	6	8	4.17	1042/1576	4.17	4.29	4.30	4.46	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	1	5	8	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.31	4.27	4.35	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1342	****	4.28	4.32	4.46	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	7	8	4.24	880/1520	4.24	4.18	4.25	4.38	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	4	2	7	3.69	1152/1465	3.69	3.96	4.12	4.22	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.27	4.14	4.30	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	4	3	7	3.67	1276/1547	3.67	4.38	4.19	4.24	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	813/1574	4.72	4.78	4.64	4.69	4.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	1	6	5	3.93	1032/1554	3.93	3.99	4.10	4.24	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	1095/1488	4.28	4.47	4.47	4.55	4.28	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	966/1493	4.72	4.73	4.73	4.80	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	0	7	8	4.18	1017/1486	4.18	4.17	4.32	4.41	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	5	10	4.28	941/1489	4.28	4.27	4.32	4.38	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	243/1277	4.63	3.71	4.03	4.04	4.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/1279	****	3.63	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1270	****	3.84	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1269	****	3.97	4.35	4.55	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 234	****	2.67	4.23	4.28	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.45	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 229	****	3.50	4.51	4.70	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	186/ 379	4.17	4.10	4.20	4.19	4.17	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.64	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.27	4.01	3.90	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 326	****	3.38	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.44	4.08	3.88	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	6
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9

Course-Section: MATH 611 0101
 Title APPLIED ANALYSIS
 Instructor: ZWECK, JOHN
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1073
 JUL 2, 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	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.29	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.31	4.27	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	770/1342	4.33	4.28	4.32	4.38	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.18	4.25	4.36	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.27	4.14	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1547	4.67	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.78	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	3.99	4.10	4.18	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	666/1488	4.67	4.47	4.47	4.52	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.73	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	891/1486	4.33	4.17	4.32	4.37	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.27	4.32	4.38	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1279	4.50	3.63	4.17	4.34	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	636/1270	4.50	3.84	4.35	4.53	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	3.97	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	3.91	4.05	4.11	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.10	4.20	4.37	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.27	4.01	4.10	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	3.38	4.03	4.10	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	185/ 382	4.00	3.44	4.08	4.13	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	2	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 612 0101
 Title ORDINARY DIFFERENTIAL
 Instructor: HOFFMAN, KATHLE
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1074
 JUL 2, 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	2	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.29	4.30	4.43	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.31	4.27	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.28	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.18	4.25	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	571/1465	4.33	3.96	4.12	4.25	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.27	4.14	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.38	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.78	4.64	4.75	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	623/1554	4.33	3.99	4.10	4.18	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.47	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.73	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.17	4.32	4.37	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.27	4.32	4.38	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.71	4.03	4.08	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.10	4.20	4.37	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.27	4.01	4.10	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.44	4.08	4.13	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 2
Grad.	1	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 625 0101
 Title COMP MATH & C PROG
 Instructor: ROSTAMIAN, ROUB
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1075
 JUL 2, 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	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.29	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.31	4.27	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.28	4.32	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.18	4.25	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1465	****	3.96	4.12	4.25	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.27	4.14	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	838/1547	4.25	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.78	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	395/1554	4.50	3.99	4.10	4.18	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	505/1488	4.75	4.47	4.47	4.52	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.73	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	339/1486	4.75	4.17	4.32	4.37	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.27	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.71	4.03	4.08	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1279	4.50	3.63	4.17	4.34	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	636/1270	4.50	3.84	4.35	4.53	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1269	4.50	3.97	4.35	4.55	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	****	3.91	4.05	4.11	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.10	4.20	4.37	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.27	4.01	4.10	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.38	4.03	4.10	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.44	4.08	4.13	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 627 0101
 Title INTR PARALLEL COMP
 Instructor: GOBBERT, MATTHI
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1076
 JUL 2, 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	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.29	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.31	4.27	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.28	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	197/1520	4.80	4.18	4.25	4.36	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	175/1465	4.80	3.96	4.12	4.25	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.27	4.14	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	186/1547	4.80	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.78	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	316/1554	4.60	3.99	4.10	4.18	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.47	4.47	4.52	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.73	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	561/1486	4.60	4.17	4.32	4.37	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.27	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	132/1277	4.80	3.71	4.03	4.08	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	****	3.63	4.17	4.34	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1270	****	3.84	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	3.97	4.35	4.55	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.10	4.20	4.37	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	180/ 375	4.00	3.27	4.01	4.10	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.38	4.03	4.10	3.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	4.33	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.44	4.08	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 630 0101
 Title MATRIX ANALYSIS
 Instructor: MINKOFF, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1077
 JUL 2, 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	9	4.90	163/1576	4.90	4.29	4.30	4.43	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	350/1576	4.70	4.31	4.27	4.32	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	797/1342	4.30	4.28	4.32	4.38	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	985/1520	4.11	4.18	4.25	4.36	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	616/1465	4.29	3.96	4.12	4.25	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	473/1434	4.44	4.27	4.14	4.35	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.38	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.78	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	623/1554	4.33	3.99	4.10	4.18	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	248/1488	4.90	4.47	4.47	4.52	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	557/1493	4.90	4.73	4.73	4.80	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	172/1486	4.90	4.17	4.32	4.37	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	194/1489	4.90	4.27	4.32	4.38	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	812/1277	3.89	3.71	4.03	4.08	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	802/1279	4.00	3.63	4.17	4.34	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	505/1270	4.67	3.84	4.35	4.53	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	773/1269	4.33	3.97	4.35	4.55	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 878	****	3.91	4.05	4.11	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 240	****	3.61	4.35	4.37	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.10	4.20	4.37	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	2	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.27	4.01	4.10	3.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.76	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.88	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	1	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.38	4.03	4.10	3.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.50	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	1	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.44	4.08	4.13	3.00	

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

Course-Section: MATH 650 0101
 Title FOUNDTNS OF OPTIMIZATI
 Instructor: GULER, OSMAN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1078
 JUL 2, 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	1	2	2	4	3.45	1463/1576	3.45	4.29	4.30	4.43	3.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	0	5	1	2	2.91	1545/1576	2.91	4.31	4.27	4.32	2.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	3	4	3.55	1199/1342	3.55	4.28	4.32	4.38	3.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	0	2	3	2	3.33	1418/1520	3.33	4.18	4.25	4.36	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1004/1465	3.89	3.96	4.12	4.25	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1142/1434	3.67	4.27	4.14	4.35	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1211/1547	3.82	4.38	4.19	4.24	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	645/1574	4.82	4.78	4.64	4.75	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	4	0	2	2	0	2.25	1542/1554	2.25	3.99	4.10	4.18	2.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	3	3	2	3.18	1435/1488	3.18	4.47	4.47	4.52	3.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	784/1493	4.82	4.73	4.73	4.80	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	4	1	2	3	3.18	1396/1486	3.18	4.17	4.32	4.37	3.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	1	2	3	2.91	1440/1489	2.91	4.27	4.32	4.38	2.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	0	3	0	0	2.00	1270/1279	2.00	3.63	4.17	4.34	2.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	0	4	0	0	2.33	1255/1270	2.33	3.84	4.35	4.53	2.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1210/1269	3.00	3.97	4.35	4.55	3.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	105/ 379	4.40	4.10	4.20	4.37	4.40	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	203/ 375	3.67	3.27	4.01	4.10	3.67	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.38	4.03	4.10	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	219/ 382	3.50	3.44	4.08	4.13	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 710A 0101
 Title MULTISCALE OPTIMIZATIO
 Instructor: POTRA, FLORIAN
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1079
 JUL 2, 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	1	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.29	4.30	4.43	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	939/1576	4.25	4.31	4.27	4.32	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.28	4.32	4.38	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.18	4.25	4.36	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	366/1465	4.50	3.96	4.12	4.25	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.27	4.14	4.35	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	238/1547	4.75	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.78	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	623/1554	4.33	3.99	4.10	4.18	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1111/1488	4.25	4.47	4.47	4.52	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.73	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.17	4.32	4.37	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	955/1489	4.25	4.27	4.32	4.38	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.71	4.03	4.08	4.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	55/ 379	4.67	4.10	4.20	4.37	4.67	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.27	4.01	4.10	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	170/ 326	3.67	3.38	4.03	4.10	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

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