

Course-Section: MATH 100 0101  
 Title INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH  
 Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 977  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	1	6	5	5	11	3.68	1299/1504	3.38	4.19	4.27	4.13	3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	3	8	13	4.07	1008/1503	3.69	4.23	4.20	4.16	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	20	4.54	478/1290	4.20	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	563/1453	3.95	4.19	4.21	4.11	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	4	6	12	4.04	718/1421	3.58	3.88	4.00	3.91	4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	18	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	988/1365	3.78	4.13	4.08	3.96	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	3	19	4.48	482/1485	4.18	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1504	4.97	4.85	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	2	1	9	7	3.95	919/1483	3.61	4.05	4.06	3.97	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	9	15	4.44	853/1425	4.18	4.45	4.41	4.36	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	1	6	19	4.50	1128/1426	4.36	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	6	18	4.43	682/1418	3.82	4.13	4.25	4.20	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	2	7	15	4.26	871/1416	3.87	4.18	4.26	4.21	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	17	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	519/1199	3.71	3.63	3.97	3.82	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	716/1312	3.65	3.65	4.00	3.69	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	910/1303	3.83	3.95	4.24	3.93	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	922/1299	3.72	3.88	4.25	3.94	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	20	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 758	****	3.68	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	B	16						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 100 0201  
 Title INTRO TO CONTEMP MATH  
 Instructor: WILSON, MARY C  
 Enrollment: 54  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 978  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	4	7	12	6	6	3.09	1443/1504	3.38	4.19	4.27	4.13	3.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	8	7	9	8	3.31	1369/1503	3.69	4.23	4.20	4.16	3.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	11	5	15	3.86	1042/1290	4.20	4.37	4.28	4.19	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	2	1	6	3	5	3.47	1297/1453	3.95	4.19	4.21	4.11	3.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	2	6	8	5	4	3.12	1283/1421	3.58	3.88	4.00	3.91	3.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	27	2	2	1	1	1	2.57	****/1365	3.78	4.13	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	7	5	17	3.89	1098/1485	4.18	4.32	4.16	4.13	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	32	4.94	394/1504	4.97	4.85	4.69	4.66	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	2	3	8	5	4	3.27	1321/1483	3.61	4.05	4.06	3.97	3.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	10	11	11	3.91	1217/1425	4.18	4.45	4.41	4.36	3.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	5	10	16	4.21	1284/1426	4.36	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.21
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	5	4	12	3	9	3.21	1312/1418	3.82	4.13	4.25	4.20	3.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	7	8	5	11	3.48	1252/1416	3.87	4.18	4.26	4.21	3.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	20	2	0	4	2	2	3.20	1018/1199	3.71	3.63	3.97	3.82	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	5	5	6	5	3.30	1079/1312	3.65	3.65	4.00	3.69	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	3	7	4	8	3.65	1079/1303	3.83	3.95	4.24	3.93	3.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	3	3	5	5	7	3.43	1129/1299	3.72	3.88	4.25	3.94	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	12	22	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	3.68	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 244	****	3.89	4.09	4.07	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	9	General	2	Under-grad	35	Non-major	35
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	2						

Course-Section: MATH 106 0101  
 Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC  
 Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL  
 Enrollment: 48  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 979  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	9	5	8	3.52	1349/1504	3.72	4.19	4.27	4.13	3.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	9	12	4.19	919/1503	4.35	4.23	4.20	4.16	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	15	4.37	671/1290	4.60	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	3	1	5	6	3.93	1073/1453	4.23	4.19	4.21	4.11	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	2	1	6	5	6	3.60	1056/1421	3.29	3.88	4.00	3.91	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	1	2	2	3	5	3.69	1046/1365	3.58	4.13	4.08	3.96	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	2	20	4.58	380/1485	4.45	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	891/1504	4.84	4.85	4.69	4.66	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	3	10	6	4.05	821/1483	4.05	4.05	4.06	3.97	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	0	22	4.65	587/1425	4.61	4.45	4.41	4.36	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	1	22	4.80	738/1426	4.87	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	5	18	4.54	539/1418	4.47	4.13	4.25	4.20	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	3	19	4.50	623/1416	4.43	4.18	4.26	4.21	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	2	1	5	2	3	3.23	1011/1199	2.93	3.63	3.97	3.82	3.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	6	3	10	3.90	814/1312	3.65	3.65	4.00	3.69	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	3	4	12	4.24	808/1303	4.02	3.95	4.24	3.93	4.24
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	2	2	3	11	3.95	959/1299	3.63	3.88	4.25	3.94	3.95
4. Were special techniques successful	6	12	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	600/ 758	3.44	3.68	4.01	3.80	3.44
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	8	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	2	0	2	0	3	3.29	218/ 244	3.29	3.89	4.09	4.07	3.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	2	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 70	****	4.63	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 67	****	4.50	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.44	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 73	****	3.89	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: MATH 106 0101  
 Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC  
 Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL  
 Enrollment: 48  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 979  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	2	A	7	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 106 0201  
 Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC  
 Instructor: BARADWAJ, RAJAL  
 Enrollment: 49  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 980  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	1	7	4	9	3.42	1384/1504	3.72	4.19	4.27	4.13	3.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	0	8	13	4.08	1008/1503	4.35	4.23	4.20	4.16	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	19	4.58	440/1290	4.60	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	2	0	2	2	7	3.92	1083/1453	4.23	4.19	4.21	4.11	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	4	3	1	2	4	2.93	1330/1421	3.29	3.88	4.00	3.91	2.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	4	0	0	2	2	2.75	1329/1365	3.58	4.13	4.08	3.96	2.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	4	16	4.27	750/1485	4.45	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	691/1504	4.84	4.85	4.69	4.66	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	2	6	9	6	3.71	1153/1483	4.05	4.05	4.06	3.97	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	5	17	4.56	712/1425	4.61	4.45	4.41	4.36	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	0	24	4.88	549/1426	4.87	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	9	10	4.22	887/1418	4.47	4.13	4.25	4.20	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	3	1	15	4.09	1001/1416	4.43	4.18	4.26	4.21	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	16	3	0	3	1	1	2.63	1130/1199	2.93	3.63	3.97	3.82	2.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	4	4	4	2	6	3.10	1131/1312	3.65	3.65	4.00	3.69	3.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	4	3	5	1	7	3.20	1177/1303	4.02	3.95	4.24	3.93	3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	5	2	7	1	4	2.84	1221/1299	3.63	3.88	4.25	3.94	2.84
4. Were special techniques successful	6	15	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/ 758	3.44	3.68	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	5	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	3	2	0	1	0	1.83	****/ 244	3.29	3.89	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.61	4.64	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned      Cum. GPA      Expected Grades      Reasons      Type      Majors

Grade	Count	Score Range	Count	Category	Count	Level	Count	Level	Count
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11			Major	0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	9	General	2	Under-grad	26
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	1			Non-major	26
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P	0				
				I	0	Other	9		
				?	0				

Course-Section: MATH 106 0301  
 Title ALGEBRA & ELEMENT FUNC  
 Instructor: RILEY, SAMANTHA  
 Enrollment: 54  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 981  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	12	10	4.23	914/1504	3.72	4.19	4.27	4.13	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	200/1503	4.35	4.23	4.20	4.16	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	24	4.85	166/1290	4.60	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	135/1453	4.23	4.19	4.21	4.11	4.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	2	2	5	1	5	3.33	1207/1421	3.29	3.88	4.00	3.91	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	547/1365	3.58	4.13	4.08	3.96	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	7	17	4.52	444/1485	4.45	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	691/1504	4.84	4.85	4.69	4.66	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	12	10	4.39	469/1483	4.05	4.05	4.06	3.97	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	665/1425	4.61	4.45	4.41	4.36	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	451/1426	4.87	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	390/1418	4.47	4.13	4.25	4.20	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	407/1416	4.43	4.18	4.26	4.21	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	18	2	0	3	0	0	2.20	****/1199	2.93	3.63	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	1	0	4	10	3.94	774/1312	3.65	3.65	4.00	3.69	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	497/1303	4.02	3.95	4.24	3.93	4.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	3	6	8	4.11	890/1299	3.63	3.88	4.25	3.94	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	10	14	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 758	3.44	3.68	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	3.29	3.89	4.09	4.07	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						



Course-Section: MATH 115 0101  
 Title FINITE MATHEMATICS  
 Instructor: WANG, DAN  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 982  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	7	5	4.00	1092/1504	3.89	4.19	4.27	4.13	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	3	3.93	1110/1503	3.94	4.23	4.20	4.16	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	412/1290	4.49	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	775/1453	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.11	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	479/1421	3.94	3.88	4.00	3.91	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	614/1365	3.88	4.13	4.08	3.96	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	380/1485	4.48	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	460/1504	4.97	4.85	4.69	4.66	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	4	7	0	3.64	1183/1483	3.51	4.05	4.06	3.97	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1425	4.77	4.45	4.41	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	1065/1426	4.69	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	475/1418	4.09	4.13	4.25	4.20	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	0	1	9	4.42	740/1416	4.19	4.18	4.26	4.21	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	177/1199	3.93	3.63	3.97	3.82	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	364/1312	3.88	3.65	4.00	3.69	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	0	1	2	5	3.80	1032/1303	3.73	3.95	4.24	3.93	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	1	1	0	5	3.56	1099/1299	3.56	3.88	4.25	3.94	3.56
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	154/ 758	4.60	3.68	4.01	3.80	4.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	83/ 244	4.50	3.89	4.09	4.07	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.63	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.50	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.44	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	3.89	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: MATH 115 0101  
 Title FINITE MATHEMATICS  
 Instructor: WANG, DAN  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 982  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	5	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 115 0201  
 Title FINITE MATHEMATICS  
 Instructor: LAI, CHEN K  
 Enrollment: 54  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 983  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	7	13	9	3.79	1253/1504	3.89	4.19	4.27	4.13	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	9	11	11	3.94	1110/1503	3.94	4.23	4.20	4.16	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	10	18	4.38	671/1290	4.49	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	1	4	7	8	4.10	947/1453	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.11	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	2	3	8	2	9	3.54	1090/1421	3.94	3.88	4.00	3.91	3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	3	0	3	1	6	3.54	1138/1365	3.88	4.13	4.08	3.96	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	8	20	4.39	602/1485	4.48	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	5.00	1/1504	4.97	4.85	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	1	13	9	2	3.38	1283/1483	3.51	4.05	4.06	3.97	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	7	20	4.53	748/1425	4.77	4.45	4.41	4.36	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	6	24	4.80	738/1426	4.69	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	6	7	6	10	3.60	1225/1418	4.09	4.13	4.25	4.20	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	4	6	15	3.97	1057/1416	4.19	4.18	4.26	4.21	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	19	2	3	0	1	4	3.20	1018/1199	3.93	3.63	3.97	3.82	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	5	2	5	6	6	3.25	1093/1312	3.88	3.65	4.00	3.69	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	3	3	4	2	11	3.65	1079/1303	3.73	3.95	4.24	3.93	3.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	3	2	7	1	10	3.57	1097/1299	3.56	3.88	4.25	3.94	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	12	18	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 758	4.60	3.68	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 244	4.50	3.89	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	3	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 70	****	4.63	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 67	****	4.50	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.44	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 73	****	3.89	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	1	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: MATH 115 0201  
 Title FINITE MATHEMATICS  
 Instructor: LAI, CHEN K  
 Enrollment: 54  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 983  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	13	General	1	Under-grad	33	Non-major	33
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 132 0101  
 Title MATH FOR ELEM TCHRS II  
 Instructor: Gleger, Mariann  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 984  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	1000/1504	4.15	4.19	4.27	4.13	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	3	3	3.67	1247/1503	3.67	4.23	4.20	4.16	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	2	5	3.69	1098/1290	3.69	4.37	4.28	4.19	3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	2	0	1	4	3.63	1245/1453	3.63	4.19	4.21	4.11	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	3	4	1	3	3.36	1193/1421	3.36	3.88	4.00	3.91	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	1104/1365	3.60	4.13	4.08	3.96	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	4	2	3.38	1317/1485	3.38	4.32	4.16	4.13	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	760/1504	4.85	4.85	4.69	4.66	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	7	4	0	3.36	1291/1483	3.36	4.05	4.06	3.97	3.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	888/1425	4.42	4.45	4.41	4.36	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	667/1426	4.83	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	4	1	2	5	3.67	1201/1418	3.67	4.13	4.25	4.20	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	1	6	3.92	1092/1416	3.92	4.18	4.26	4.21	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	636/1199	4.00	3.63	3.97	3.82	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	716/1312	4.00	3.65	4.00	3.69	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	796/1303	4.25	3.95	4.24	3.93	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1008/1299	3.88	3.88	4.25	3.94	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	354/ 758	4.14	3.68	4.01	3.80	4.14
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	3.89	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 70	****	4.63	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	4.50	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	4.44	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 73	****	3.89	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****



Course-Section: MATH 132 0101  
 Title MATH FOR ELEM TCHRS II  
 Instructor: Gleger, Mariann  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 984  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	13
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		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	14	13	21	3.98	1112/1504	4.19	4.19	4.27	4.13	3.98
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	12	31	4.41	633/1503	4.52	4.23	4.20	4.16	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	16	29	4.45	574/1290	4.53	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	28	2	1	7	5	8	3.70	1217/1453	4.00	4.19	4.21	4.11	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	20	4	2	9	5	9	3.45	1150/1421	3.73	3.88	4.00	3.91	3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	34	1	1	6	3	4	3.53	1138/1365	3.53	4.13	4.08	3.96	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	7	6	34	4.47	509/1485	4.63	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	4	44	4.92	591/1504	4.92	4.85	4.69	4.66	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	2	5	12	19	4.26	624/1483	4.38	4.05	4.06	3.97	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	9	38	4.70	525/1425	4.77	4.45	4.41	4.36	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	44	4.88	549/1426	4.94	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	9	11	27	4.29	818/1418	4.54	4.13	4.25	4.20	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	5	10	33	4.51	613/1416	4.65	4.18	4.26	4.21	4.51
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	22	3	1	5	5	11	3.80	795/1199	4.23	3.63	3.97	3.82	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	6	2	13	7	14	3.50	1011/1312	3.30	3.65	4.00	3.69	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	3	4	8	9	17	3.80	1032/1303	3.57	3.95	4.24	3.93	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	6	0	13	7	15	3.61	1092/1299	3.57	3.88	4.25	3.94	3.61
4. Were special techniques successful	10	25	5	2	3	2	4	2.88	713/ 758	2.77	3.68	4.01	3.80	2.88
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	2	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	3	0	0	1	2	2.83	****/ 244	****	3.89	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	49	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	49	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	49	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	11	General	1	Under-grad	51	Non-major	51
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	D	3						
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	26				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 150 0201  
 Title PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC  
 Instructor: STARK, BETSY  
 Enrollment: 178  
 Questionnaires: 74

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 986  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	7	1	21	45	4.41	700/1504	4.19	4.19	4.27	4.13	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	19	51	4.64	346/1503	4.52	4.23	4.20	4.16	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	3	5	9	55	4.61	400/1290	4.53	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	37	1	2	4	7	22	4.31	718/1453	4.00	4.19	4.21	4.11	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	24	0	6	7	14	20	4.02	731/1421	3.73	3.88	4.00	3.91	4.02
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	54	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	****/1365	3.53	4.13	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	8	62	4.79	160/1485	4.63	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	6	66	4.92	591/1504	4.92	4.85	4.69	4.66	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	2	2	0	1	16	33	4.50	338/1483	4.38	4.05	4.06	3.97	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	3	67	4.84	285/1425	4.77	4.45	4.41	4.36	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	73	5.00	1/1426	4.94	4.72	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	10	59	4.80	191/1418	4.54	4.13	4.25	4.20	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	9	61	4.78	282/1416	4.65	4.18	4.26	4.21	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	28	1	0	1	8	31	4.66	183/1199	4.23	3.63	3.97	3.82	4.66
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	16	8	12	12	17	3.09	1132/1312	3.30	3.65	4.00	3.69	3.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	11	8	13	11	20	3.33	1153/1303	3.57	3.95	4.24	3.93	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	8	5	16	11	21	3.52	1103/1299	3.57	3.88	4.25	3.94	3.52
4. Were special techniques successful	12	38	10	2	4	2	6	2.67	728/ 758	2.77	3.68	4.01	3.80	2.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	64	6	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	70	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 244	****	3.89	4.09	4.07	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	69	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	72	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	72	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.63	4.35	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	72	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	4.44	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	72	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	3.89	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	72	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	72	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	72	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	72	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	73	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	73	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	73	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	73	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	73	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: MATH 150 0201  
 Title PRECALCULUS MATHEMATIC  
 Instructor: STARK, BETSY  
 Enrollment: 178  
 Questionnaires: 74

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 986  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	24	0.00-0.99	0	A	24	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	9	C	18	General	2	Under-grad	74	Non-major	73
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	18	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	47				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 151 0101  
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY I  
 Instructor: KOROSTYSHEVSKIY  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 987  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	2	4	4.43	669/1504	4.37	4.19	4.27	4.13	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	618/1503	4.39	4.23	4.20	4.16	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1042/1290	4.39	4.37	4.28	4.19	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	844/1453	4.28	4.19	4.21	4.11	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	623/1421	4.00	3.88	4.00	3.91	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	114/1365	4.32	4.13	4.08	3.96	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	670/1485	4.55	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	743/1504	4.72	4.85	4.69	4.66	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1041/1483	4.40	4.05	4.06	3.97	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	876/1425	4.63	4.45	4.41	4.36	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1073/1426	4.70	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1013/1418	4.33	4.13	4.25	4.20	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	961/1416	4.47	4.18	4.26	4.21	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	429/1199	3.67	3.63	3.97	3.82	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	364/1312	3.90	3.65	4.00	3.69	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	563/1303	4.11	3.95	4.24	3.93	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	855/1299	4.04	3.88	4.25	3.94	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	680/ 758	3.41	3.68	4.01	3.80	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 151 0201  
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY I  
 Instructor: MANUKYAN, ZORAY  
 Enrollment: 76  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 988  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	8	10	6	3.70	1290/1504	4.37	4.19	4.27	4.13	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	6	10	7	4	3.33	1365/1503	4.39	4.23	4.20	4.16	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	12	6	5	3.41	1175/1290	4.39	4.37	4.28	4.19	3.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	3	8	8	4	3.57	1264/1453	4.28	4.19	4.21	4.11	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	3	5	3	7	3.63	1036/1421	4.00	3.88	4.00	3.91	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	0	8	4	5	3.67	1065/1365	4.32	4.13	4.08	3.96	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	6	9	9	3.89	1098/1485	4.55	4.32	4.16	4.13	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	525/1504	4.72	4.85	4.69	4.66	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	2	8	11	2	3.57	1211/1483	4.40	4.05	4.06	3.97	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	6	14	7	4.04	1154/1425	4.63	4.45	4.41	4.36	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	6	3	18	4.44	1169/1426	4.70	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	11	12	3	3.63	1217/1418	4.33	4.13	4.25	4.20	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	3	10	9	3.88	1108/1416	4.47	4.18	4.26	4.21	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	13	2	5	2	0	2	2.55	1136/1199	3.67	3.63	3.97	3.82	2.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	6	9	5	3.77	892/1312	3.90	3.65	4.00	3.69	3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	4	7	8	4.00	910/1303	4.11	3.95	4.24	3.93	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	5	8	8	4.05	912/1299	4.04	3.88	4.25	3.94	4.05
4. Were special techniques successful	5	12	3	0	1	4	2	3.20	659/ 758	3.41	3.68	4.01	3.80	3.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 244	****	3.89	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	2	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				P	0			
				I	0	Other	18	
				?	1			



Course-Section: MATH 151 0301  
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY I  
 Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI  
 Enrollment: 82  
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 989  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	1	6	14	28	4.21	940/1504	4.37	4.19	4.27	4.13	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	13	34	4.52	483/1503	4.39	4.23	4.20	4.16	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	17	30	4.44	588/1290	4.39	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	27	0	1	3	9	11	4.25	775/1453	4.28	4.19	4.21	4.11	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	23	0	4	8	8	9	3.76	967/1421	4.00	3.88	4.00	3.91	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	30	0	0	3	9	10	4.32	514/1365	4.32	4.13	4.08	3.96	4.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	7	43	4.77	190/1485	4.55	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	5	46	4.90	657/1504	4.72	4.85	4.69	4.66	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	5	8	28	4.56	290/1483	4.40	4.05	4.06	3.97	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	6	43	4.77	402/1425	4.63	4.45	4.41	4.36	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	2	12	37	4.62	1036/1426	4.70	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	5	11	35	4.54	539/1418	4.33	4.13	4.25	4.20	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	12	37	4.63	485/1416	4.47	4.18	4.26	4.21	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	38	3	1	3	0	6	3.38	970/1199	3.67	3.63	3.97	3.82	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	2	1	5	4	9	3.81	877/1312	3.90	3.65	4.00	3.69	3.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	33	0	1	0	8	3	7	3.79	1038/1303	4.11	3.95	4.24	3.93	3.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	34	0	1	2	7	1	7	3.61	1089/1299	4.04	3.88	4.25	3.94	3.61
4. Were special techniques successful	33	11	2	0	2	0	4	3.50	****/ 758	3.41	3.68	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	3.89	4.09	4.07	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	50	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	21	0.00-0.99 0	A 21	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99 1	B 20		Major 0

56-83	7	2.00-2.99	14	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	52	Non-major	52
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	46				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 151 0401  
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY I  
 Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI  
 Enrollment: 80  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 990  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	7	19	19	4.15	1010/1504	4.37	4.19	4.27	4.13	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	8	13	25	4.30	805/1503	4.39	4.23	4.20	4.16	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	9	31	4.47	561/1290	4.39	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	21	2	1	4	13	6	3.77	1186/1453	4.28	4.19	4.21	4.11	3.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	17	0	2	8	8	11	3.97	792/1421	4.00	3.88	4.00	3.91	3.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	20	1	0	9	7	9	3.88	915/1365	4.32	4.13	4.08	3.96	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	10	37	4.79	170/1485	4.55	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	40	4.87	726/1504	4.72	4.85	4.69	4.66	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	1	3	15	21	4.40	457/1483	4.40	4.05	4.06	3.97	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	7	36	4.66	587/1425	4.63	4.45	4.41	4.36	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	11	32	4.60	1057/1426	4.70	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	7	13	25	4.28	828/1418	4.33	4.13	4.25	4.20	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	6	6	31	4.32	821/1416	4.47	4.18	4.26	4.21	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	33	3	2	3	1	5	3.21	1015/1199	3.67	3.63	3.97	3.82	3.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	36	0	2	0	3	1	5	3.64	****/1312	3.90	3.65	4.00	3.69	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	36	0	1	2	2	1	5	3.64	****/1303	4.11	3.95	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	37	0	2	1	2	1	4	3.40	****/1299	4.04	3.88	4.25	3.94	****
4. Were special techniques successful	36	8	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 758	3.41	3.68	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 244	****	3.89	4.09	4.07	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 70	****	4.63	4.35	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	23	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	1	B 30			

56-83	1	2.00-2.99	12	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	46
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	18	D	2						
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	42				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 151 0501  
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMTRY I  
 Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY  
 Enrollment: 56  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 991  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	7	18	4.56	482/1504	4.37	4.19	4.27	4.13	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	4	19	4.52	483/1503	4.39	4.23	4.20	4.16	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	21	4.67	344/1290	4.39	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	270/1453	4.28	4.19	4.21	4.11	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	1	0	6	4	7	3.89	879/1421	4.00	3.88	4.00	3.91	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	1	0	2	1	13	4.47	333/1365	4.32	4.13	4.08	3.96	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	22	4.74	210/1485	4.55	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	14	4.52	1081/1504	4.72	4.85	4.69	4.66	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	234/1483	4.40	4.05	4.06	3.97	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	209/1425	4.63	4.45	4.41	4.36	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	201/1426	4.70	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	9	18	4.67	378/1418	4.33	4.13	4.25	4.20	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	198/1416	4.47	4.18	4.26	4.21	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	16	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	542/1199	3.67	3.63	3.97	3.82	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	4	3	13	4.33	530/1312	3.90	3.65	4.00	3.69	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	478/1303	4.11	3.95	4.24	3.93	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	556/1299	4.04	3.88	4.25	3.94	4.52
4. Were special techniques successful	6	11	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	376/ 758	3.41	3.68	4.01	3.80	4.09

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	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	21				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 151 0601  
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY I  
 Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 992  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	6	24	4.74	273/1504	4.37	4.19	4.27	4.13	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	25	4.81	171/1503	4.39	4.23	4.20	4.16	4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	53/1290	4.39	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	1	0	3	17	4.71	222/1453	4.28	4.19	4.21	4.11	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	0	0	5	5	13	4.35	469/1421	4.00	3.88	4.00	3.91	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	8	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	245/1365	4.32	4.13	4.08	3.96	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	5	24	4.83	139/1485	4.55	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	18	11	4.38	1193/1504	4.72	4.85	4.69	4.66	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	91/1483	4.40	4.05	4.06	3.97	4.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	72/1425	4.63	4.45	4.41	4.36	4.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	502/1426	4.70	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	27	4.87	145/1418	4.33	4.13	4.25	4.20	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	28	4.87	175/1416	4.47	4.18	4.26	4.21	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	17	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	412/1199	3.67	3.63	3.97	3.82	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	4	7	10	7	3.53	1000/1312	3.90	3.65	4.00	3.69	3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	1	8	9	9	3.76	1047/1303	4.11	3.95	4.24	3.93	3.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	2	8	7	12	3.90	996/1299	4.04	3.88	4.25	3.94	3.90
4. Were special techniques successful	2	15	1	2	6	3	3	3.33	630/ 758	3.41	3.68	4.01	3.80	3.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	11						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	7	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	32
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
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	29				
				?	2						

Course-Section: MATH 151 0601  
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY I  
 Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 993  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	6	24	4.74	273/1504	4.37	4.19	4.27	4.13	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	25	4.81	171/1503	4.39	4.23	4.20	4.16	4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	53/1290	4.39	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	1	0	3	17	4.71	222/1453	4.28	4.19	4.21	4.11	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	0	0	5	5	13	4.35	469/1421	4.00	3.88	4.00	3.91	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	8	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	245/1365	4.32	4.13	4.08	3.96	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	5	24	4.83	139/1485	4.55	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	18	11	4.38	1193/1504	4.72	4.85	4.69	4.66	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	119/1483	4.40	4.05	4.06	3.97	4.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	28	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1425	4.63	4.45	4.41	4.36	4.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	28	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1426	4.70	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1418	4.33	4.13	4.25	4.20	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1416	4.47	4.18	4.26	4.21	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	28	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1199	3.67	3.63	3.97	3.82	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	4	7	10	7	3.53	1000/1312	3.90	3.65	4.00	3.69	3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	1	8	9	9	3.76	1047/1303	4.11	3.95	4.24	3.93	3.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	2	8	7	12	3.90	996/1299	4.04	3.88	4.25	3.94	3.90
4. Were special techniques successful	2	15	1	2	6	3	3	3.33	630/ 758	3.41	3.68	4.01	3.80	3.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	11						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	7	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	32
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
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	29				
				?	2						

Course-Section: MATH 151 0701  
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY I  
 Instructor: WILSON, MARY C  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 994  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course		Dept		UMBC		Level		Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	654/1504	4.37	4.19	4.27	4.13	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	602/1503	4.39	4.23	4.20	4.16	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	671/1290	4.39	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	680/1453	4.28	4.19	4.21	4.11	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	887/1421	4.00	3.88	4.00	3.91	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	558/1365	4.32	4.13	4.08	3.96	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	761/1485	4.55	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	460/1504	4.72	4.85	4.69	4.66	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	3	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	338/1483	4.40	4.05	4.06	3.97	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	572/1425	4.63	4.45	4.41	4.36	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	738/1426	4.70	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	772/1418	4.33	4.13	4.25	4.20	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	525/1416	4.47	4.18	4.26	4.21	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1199	3.67	3.63	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	1	5	5	3.79	887/1312	3.90	3.65	4.00	3.69	3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	719/1303	4.11	3.95	4.24	3.93	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	0	3	7	4.17	855/1299	4.04	3.88	4.25	3.94	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	580/ 758	3.41	3.68	4.01	3.80	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						



Course-Section: MATH 152 0101  
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY  
 Instructor: ROSTAMIAN, ROUB  
 Enrollment: 81  
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 995  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	11	21	13	3.80	1244/1504	4.37	4.19	4.27	4.13	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	12	19	14	3.76	1202/1503	4.53	4.23	4.20	4.16	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	9	21	14	3.82	1054/1290	4.55	4.37	4.28	4.19	3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	27	2	2	5	7	5	3.52	1276/1453	4.31	4.19	4.21	4.11	3.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	14	3	4	11	10	8	3.44	1150/1421	3.88	3.88	4.00	3.91	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	31	0	4	3	6	5	3.67	1065/1365	4.25	4.13	4.08	3.96	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	8	15	26	4.32	682/1485	4.52	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	3	0	0	0	1	46	4.98	197/1504	4.57	4.85	4.69	4.66	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	2	3	11	21	6	3.60	1197/1483	4.33	4.05	4.06	3.97	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	7	20	19	4.10	1129/1425	4.59	4.45	4.41	4.36	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	3	10	35	4.61	1036/1426	4.66	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	7	8	19	13	3.69	1189/1418	4.46	4.13	4.25	4.20	3.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	5	7	16	17	3.81	1140/1416	4.49	4.18	4.26	4.21	3.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	8	4	14	13	7	3.15	1030/1199	3.63	3.63	3.97	3.82	3.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	26	6	7	1	1	1.66	1302/1312	2.84	3.65	4.00	3.69	1.66
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	16	8	14	1	2	2.15	1269/1303	3.26	3.95	4.24	3.93	2.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	15	5	17	3	1	2.27	1262/1299	3.07	3.88	4.25	3.94	2.27
4. Were special techniques successful	10	35	2	1	2	0	0	2.00	****/ 758	4.21	3.68	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 244	****	3.89	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	4.63	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	4.50	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.44	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	3.89	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: MATH 152 0101  
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY  
 Instructor: ROSTAMIAN, ROUB  
 Enrollment: 81  
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 995  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	19	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	7	C	15	General	0	Under-grad	50	Non-major	50
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	8	D	4						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	39				
				?	2						

Course-Section: MATH 152 0201  
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY  
 Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 996  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	13	34	4.55	495/1504	4.37	4.19	4.27	4.13	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	12	38	4.71	268/1503	4.53	4.23	4.20	4.16	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	43	4.80	201/1290	4.55	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	1	0	1	9	22	4.55	396/1453	4.31	4.19	4.21	4.11	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	16	1	1	6	6	20	4.26	540/1421	3.88	3.88	4.00	3.91	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	19	0	1	4	9	16	4.33	493/1365	4.25	4.13	4.08	3.96	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	8	41	4.80	150/1485	4.52	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	46	4.92	525/1504	4.57	4.85	4.69	4.66	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	8	36	4.65	226/1483	4.33	4.05	4.06	3.97	4.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	3	16	30	4.45	842/1425	4.59	4.45	4.41	4.36	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	8	41	4.76	808/1426	4.66	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	4	10	34	4.47	617/1418	4.46	4.13	4.25	4.20	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	6	41	4.65	472/1416	4.49	4.18	4.26	4.21	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	31	1	1	0	2	14	4.50	271/1199	3.63	3.63	3.97	3.82	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	5	5	9	12	14	3.56	993/1312	2.84	3.65	4.00	3.69	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	3	5	9	26	4.27	783/1303	3.26	3.95	4.24	3.93	4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	4	1	9	11	17	3.86	1017/1299	3.07	3.88	4.25	3.94	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	7	20	0	1	4	8	11	4.21	323/ 758	4.21	3.68	4.01	3.80	4.21
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 244	****	3.89	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.63	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.50	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.44	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	49	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 73	****	3.89	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: MATH 152 0201  
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY  
 Instructor: TIGHE, BONNY  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 996  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	25	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	23	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	2	Under-grad	51	Non-major	51
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	27	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	46				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 152 0301  
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY  
 Instructor: KAPOOR, JAGMOHA  
 Enrollment: 80  
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 997  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	18	25	4.51	535/1504	4.37	4.19	4.27	4.13	4.51
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	37	4.78	200/1503	4.53	4.23	4.20	4.16	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	38	4.82	187/1290	4.55	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	20	0	2	1	6	16	4.44	532/1453	4.31	4.19	4.21	4.11	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	18	2	2	6	6	11	3.81	935/1421	3.88	3.88	4.00	3.91	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	23	0	0	1	11	10	4.41	420/1365	4.25	4.13	4.08	3.96	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	11	29	4.51	444/1485	4.52	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.51
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	38	6	4.11	1376/1504	4.57	4.85	4.69	4.66	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	16	19	4.46	397/1483	4.33	4.05	4.06	3.97	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	39	4.89	209/1425	4.59	4.45	4.41	4.36	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	2	7	34	4.62	1022/1426	4.66	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	36	4.77	233/1418	4.46	4.13	4.25	4.20	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	38	4.84	209/1416	4.49	4.18	4.26	4.21	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	22	4	0	5	7	6	3.50	919/1199	3.63	3.63	3.97	3.82	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	7	3	11	10	6	3.14	1124/1312	2.84	3.65	4.00	3.69	3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	5	5	11	7	10	3.32	1157/1303	3.26	3.95	4.24	3.93	3.32
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	7	2	12	6	11	3.32	1157/1299	3.07	3.88	4.25	3.94	3.32
4. Were special techniques successful	7	32	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	****/ 758	4.21	3.68	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	13	0.00-0.99 0	A 18	Required for Majors	2
28-55	18	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 8	C 8	General	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 8	D 4	Under-grad	45
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives	2
			P 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	37
			? 2		

Course-Section: MATH 152 0401  
 Title CALC & ANALY GEOMETRY  
 Instructor: KAPOOR, JAGMOHA  
 Enrollment: 78  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 998  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	416/1504	4.37	4.19	4.27	4.13	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	119/1503	4.53	4.23	4.20	4.16	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	19	4.76	240/1290	4.55	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	194/1453	4.31	4.19	4.21	4.11	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	1	3	3	8	4.00	745/1421	3.88	3.88	4.00	3.91	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	245/1365	4.25	4.13	4.08	3.96	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	6	16	4.44	536/1485	4.52	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	7	4.28	1255/1504	4.57	4.85	4.69	4.66	4.28
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	266/1483	4.33	4.05	4.06	3.97	4.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	143/1425	4.59	4.45	4.41	4.36	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	2	20	4.64	995/1426	4.66	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	101/1418	4.46	4.13	4.25	4.20	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	472/1416	4.49	4.18	4.26	4.21	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	3	2	1	1	6	3.38	970/1199	3.63	3.63	3.97	3.82	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	7	1	3	7	4	3.00	1149/1312	2.84	3.65	4.00	3.69	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	4	2	6	2	7	3.29	1162/1303	3.26	3.95	4.24	3.93	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	5	2	7	3	3	2.85	1220/1299	3.07	3.88	4.25	3.94	2.85
4. Were special techniques successful	4	19	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 758	4.21	3.68	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	3.89	4.09	4.07	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.63	4.35	4.43	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors		1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B 7							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General		0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D 1							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0							
				I 0	Other		20				
				? 1							



Course-Section: MATH 152H 0101  
 Title CALC/ANALY GEOM II-HON  
 Instructor: ZWECK, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 999  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	639/1504	4.44	4.19	4.27	4.13	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	437/1503	4.56	4.23	4.20	4.16	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	588/1290	4.44	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	810/1453	4.22	4.19	4.21	4.11	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1113/1421	3.50	3.88	4.00	3.91	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	672/1365	4.17	4.13	4.08	3.96	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	536/1485	4.44	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	493/1483	4.38	4.05	4.06	3.97	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	384/1425	4.78	4.45	4.41	4.36	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	549/1426	4.89	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	772/1418	4.33	4.13	4.25	4.20	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	574/1416	4.56	4.18	4.26	4.21	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1199	****	3.63	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	966/1312	3.63	3.65	4.00	3.69	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	488/1303	4.63	3.95	4.24	3.93	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	883/1299	4.13	3.88	4.25	3.94	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	722/ 758	2.75	3.68	4.01	3.80	2.75

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	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Title

Baltimore County

JUN 14, 2005

Instructor: ZWECK, JOHN

Spring 2005

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 7

Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		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	5	4.83	183/1504	4.83	4.19	4.27	4.13	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.23	4.20	4.16	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.37	4.28	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.19	4.21	4.11	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	320/1421	4.50	3.88	4.00	3.91	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	139/1365	4.75	4.13	4.08	3.96	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	670/1485	4.33	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.05	4.06	3.97	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	285/1425	4.83	4.45	4.41	4.36	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	378/1418	4.67	4.13	4.25	4.20	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.18	4.26	4.21	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1199	****	3.63	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	1011/1312	3.50	3.65	4.00	3.69	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1303	5.00	3.95	4.24	3.93	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	570/1299	4.50	3.88	4.25	3.94	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	630/ 758	3.33	3.68	4.01	3.80	3.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 155 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY CALCULUS  
 Instructor: SONG, YOON J  
 Enrollment: 65  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1001  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	4	6	12	12	3.94	1153/1504	4.14	4.19	4.27	4.13	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	9	19	4.32	765/1503	4.38	4.23	4.20	4.16	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	6	22	4.39	651/1290	4.45	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	752/1453	4.33	4.19	4.21	4.11	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	4	1	3	5	9	3.64	1036/1421	3.99	3.88	4.00	3.91	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	21	2	1	2	3	5	3.62	1097/1365	4.07	4.13	4.08	3.96	3.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	27	4.68	280/1485	4.71	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	28	4.82	795/1504	4.91	4.85	4.69	4.66	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	1	2	12	7	4.14	762/1483	4.24	4.05	4.06	3.97	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	1	1	28	4.72	492/1425	4.77	4.45	4.41	4.36	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	4	25	4.69	940/1426	4.75	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	11	17	4.34	763/1418	4.55	4.13	4.25	4.20	4.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	4	23	4.44	714/1416	4.59	4.18	4.26	4.21	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	19	2	0	1	3	4	3.70	845/1199	3.85	3.63	3.97	3.82	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	5	0	5	2	9	3.48	1023/1312	3.72	3.65	4.00	3.69	3.48
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	4	4	2	10	3.76	1044/1303	3.81	3.95	4.24	3.93	3.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	2	6	2	9	3.80	1038/1299	3.95	3.88	4.25	3.94	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	14	15	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/ 758	4.50	3.68	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	5	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	****/ 244	****	3.89	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.63	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.50	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 76	****	4.44	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 73	****	3.89	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: MATH 155 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY CALCULUS  
 Instructor: SONG, YOON J  
 Enrollment: 65  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1001  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	14	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	7	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	34	Non-major	34
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 155 0201  
 Title ELEMENTARY CALCULUS  
 Instructor: SONG, YOON J  
 Enrollment: 85  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1002  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		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	1	10	21	4.34	775/1504	4.14	4.19	4.27	4.13	4.34
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	3	5	24	4.44	587/1503	4.38	4.23	4.20	4.16	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	5	25	4.51	497/1290	4.45	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.51
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	1	1	6	15	4.38	631/1453	4.33	4.19	4.21	4.11	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	2	1	5	12	4.35	459/1421	3.99	3.88	4.00	3.91	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	282/1365	4.07	4.13	4.08	3.96	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	29	4.74	210/1485	4.71	4.32	4.16	4.13	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1504	4.91	4.85	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	2	13	11	4.35	530/1483	4.24	4.05	4.06	3.97	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	27	4.82	315/1425	4.77	4.45	4.41	4.36	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	6	27	4.82	714/1426	4.75	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	4	26	4.75	261/1418	4.55	4.13	4.25	4.20	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	26	4.75	324/1416	4.59	4.18	4.26	4.21	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	16	1	0	5	0	8	4.00	636/1199	3.85	3.63	3.97	3.82	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	1	2	4	12	3.95	765/1312	3.72	3.65	4.00	3.69	3.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	3	0	5	3	11	3.86	1008/1303	3.81	3.95	4.24	3.93	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	2	4	2	13	4.09	899/1299	3.95	3.88	4.25	3.94	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	12	13	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	3.68	4.01	3.80	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	3	0	1	1	1	2.50	****/ 244	****	3.89	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	4.63	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	4.50	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.44	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	3.89	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	1	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: MATH 155 0201  
 Title ELEMENTARY CALCULUS  
 Instructor: SONG, YOON J  
 Enrollment: 85  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1002  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	8	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	35	Non-major	35
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	3						



Course-Section: MATH 215 0201  
 Title FINITE MATH FOR INFO S  
 Instructor: LO, JAMES T  
 Enrollment: 55  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1003  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	9	13	3	3.54	1343/1504	4.08	4.19	4.27	4.26	3.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	8	14	3	3.59	1275/1503	4.23	4.23	4.20	4.18	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	6	12	6	3.74	1081/1290	4.31	4.37	4.28	4.27	3.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	2	3	3	8	2	3.28	1361/1453	3.92	4.19	4.21	4.20	3.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	8	11	2	3.36	1193/1421	3.93	3.88	4.00	3.90	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	2	3	3	8	3	3.37	1215/1365	4.18	4.13	4.08	4.00	3.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	7	10	8	3.79	1158/1485	4.14	4.32	4.16	4.15	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1504	4.88	4.85	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	3	10	7	2	3.26	1324/1483	3.92	4.05	4.06	4.02	3.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	3	8	11	5	3.57	1296/1425	4.22	4.45	4.41	4.40	3.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	3	7	15	4.30	1252/1426	4.65	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	4	7	11	4	3.48	1256/1418	4.18	4.13	4.25	4.22	3.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	3	3	13	4	3.46	1256/1416	3.86	4.18	4.26	4.24	3.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	17	4	0	5	1	0	2.30	1167/1199	3.48	3.63	3.97	3.95	2.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	2	0	2	2	0	2.67	****/1312	4.43	3.65	4.00	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	863/1303	4.50	3.95	4.24	4.23	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/1299	5.00	3.88	4.25	4.21	****
4. Were special techniques successful	21	5	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 758	4.00	3.68	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	3.89	4.09	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.24	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	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	25				
				?	3						

Course-Section: MATH 215 8020  
 Title FINITE MATH FOR INFO S  
 Instructor: ROY, ATUL  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1004  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	0	3	5	4.63	396/1504	4.08	4.19	4.27	4.26	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	125/1503	4.23	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	152/1290	4.31	4.37	4.28	4.27	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	363/1453	3.92	4.19	4.21	4.20	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	320/1421	3.93	3.88	4.00	3.90	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1365	4.18	4.13	4.08	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	455/1485	4.14	4.32	4.16	4.15	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	891/1504	4.88	4.85	4.69	4.68	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	282/1483	3.92	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	224/1425	4.22	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1426	4.65	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	145/1418	4.18	4.13	4.25	4.22	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	871/1416	3.86	4.18	4.26	4.24	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	177/1199	3.48	3.63	3.97	3.95	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	444/1312	4.43	3.65	4.00	3.98	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	248/1303	4.50	3.95	4.24	4.23	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1299	5.00	3.88	4.25	4.21	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	3.68	4.01	3.89	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 221 0101  
 Title INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR  
 Instructor: PITTENGER, ARTH  
 Enrollment: 59  
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1005  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	5	10	22	4.28	864/1504	3.98	4.19	4.27	4.26	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	13	18	4.13	972/1503	3.92	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	3	15	16	3.97	962/1290	4.15	4.37	4.28	4.27	3.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	2	2	9	9	4.14	912/1453	4.02	4.19	4.21	4.20	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	1	11	18	4.57	276/1421	4.14	3.88	4.00	3.90	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	21	0	0	4	7	8	4.21	625/1365	3.95	4.13	4.08	4.00	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	7	10	19	4.07	953/1485	4.17	4.32	4.16	4.15	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	39	4.97	197/1504	4.91	4.85	4.69	4.68	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	10	18	4	3.76	1123/1483	3.58	4.05	4.06	4.02	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	5	10	24	4.49	807/1425	4.37	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	36	4.92	401/1426	4.69	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	8	14	12	3.87	1115/1418	3.82	4.13	4.25	4.22	3.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	1	6	12	14	3.76	1162/1416	3.75	4.18	4.26	4.24	3.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	26	2	1	2	3	4	3.50	919/1199	2.89	3.63	3.97	3.95	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	5	2	6	2	3	2.78	1205/1312	2.71	3.65	4.00	3.98	2.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	5	4	0	2	6	3.00	1195/1303	3.11	3.95	4.24	4.23	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	6	3	4	1	3	2.53	1247/1299	2.80	3.88	4.25	4.21	2.53
4. Were special techniques successful	23	13	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 758	****	3.68	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	3.89	4.09	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0

28-55	11	1.00-1.99	1	B	11						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	5	C	13	General	0	Under-grad	40	Non-major	40
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	9	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	1	Electives	0	####	- Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	38				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 221 0201  
 Title INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR  
 Instructor: ARLINGHAUS, FRA  
 Enrollment: 63  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1006  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		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	3	19	14	4.24	902/1504	3.98	4.19	4.27	4.26	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	17	16	4.27	827/1503	3.92	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	10	21	4.42	628/1290	4.15	4.37	4.28	4.27	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	19	1	1	0	5	11	4.33	680/1453	4.02	4.19	4.21	4.20	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	15	0	0	3	9	10	4.32	499/1421	4.14	3.88	4.00	3.90	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	18	0	0	0	11	8	4.42	395/1365	3.95	4.13	4.08	4.00	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	10	23	4.49	482/1485	4.17	4.32	4.16	4.15	4.49
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	37	5.00	1/1504	4.91	4.85	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	1	3	19	9	4.03	832/1483	3.58	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	14	20	4.47	818/1425	4.37	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	31	4.86	596/1426	4.69	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	4	17	14	4.19	905/1418	3.82	4.13	4.25	4.22	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	6	16	13	4.11	985/1416	3.75	4.18	4.26	4.24	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	29	2	2	1	1	1	2.57	****/1199	2.89	3.63	3.97	3.95	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/1312	2.71	3.65	4.00	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	35	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1303	3.11	3.95	4.24	4.23	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	35	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1299	2.80	3.88	4.25	4.21	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	9	General	3	Under-grad	38	Non-major	35
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	29				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 221 0301  
 Title INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR  
 Instructor: LYNN, YEN-MOW  
 Enrollment: 49  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1007  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	8	8	6	3.71	1290/1504	3.98	4.19	4.27	4.26	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	11	3	7	3.54	1291/1503	3.92	4.23	4.20	4.18	3.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	5	4	11	4.19	832/1290	4.15	4.37	4.28	4.27	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	4	7	5	3.94	1062/1453	4.02	4.19	4.21	4.20	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	642/1421	4.14	3.88	4.00	3.90	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	3	4	5	6	3.78	988/1365	3.95	4.13	4.08	4.00	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	591/1485	4.17	4.32	4.16	4.15	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1504	4.91	4.85	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	1	9	5	1	3.38	1287/1483	3.58	4.05	4.06	4.02	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	4	7	10	4.04	1150/1425	4.37	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	3	4	15	4.39	1202/1426	4.69	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	6	7	7	3.74	1172/1418	3.82	4.13	4.25	4.22	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	3	4	4	7	3.43	1264/1416	3.75	4.18	4.26	4.24	3.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	16	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	****/1199	2.89	3.63	3.97	3.95	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	6	1	2	2	3	2.64	1227/1312	2.71	3.65	4.00	3.98	2.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	3	3	1	2	5	3.21	1175/1303	3.11	3.95	4.24	4.23	3.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	3	3	2	4	3.07	1192/1299	2.80	3.88	4.25	4.21	3.07
4. Were special techniques successful	11	11	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	3.68	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 244	****	3.89	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	4.63	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	4.50	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.44	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	3.89	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: MATH 221 0301  
 Title INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR  
 Instructor: LYNN, YEN-MOW  
 Enrollment: 49  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1007  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	9	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						



Course-Section: MATH 221 0401  
 Title INTRO TO LINEAR ALGEBR  
 Instructor: NAYAKKANKUPPAM,  
 Enrollment: 56  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1008  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	7	8	5	3.68	1296/1504	3.98	4.19	4.27	4.26	3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	9	5	3.73	1221/1503	3.92	4.23	4.20	4.18	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	9	8	4.00	937/1290	4.15	4.37	4.28	4.27	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	4	5	2	3.67	1229/1453	4.02	4.19	4.21	4.20	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	2	4	3	6	3.53	1101/1421	4.14	3.88	4.00	3.90	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	2	4	6	2	3.40	1201/1365	3.95	4.13	4.08	4.00	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	4	8	6	3.73	1194/1485	4.17	4.32	4.16	4.15	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	983/1504	4.91	4.85	4.69	4.68	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	3	1	6	8	1	3.16	1355/1483	3.58	4.05	4.06	4.02	3.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	818/1425	4.37	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	1073/1426	4.69	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	3	5	5	6	3.48	1259/1418	3.82	4.13	4.25	4.22	3.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	2	5	9	3.71	1184/1416	3.75	4.18	4.26	4.24	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	2	2	2	1	0	2.29	1168/1199	2.89	3.63	3.97	3.95	2.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1312	2.71	3.65	4.00	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1303	3.11	3.95	4.24	4.23	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1299	2.80	3.88	4.25	4.21	****

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	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B 7						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C 11	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	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	20				
				? 0						

Course-Section: MATH 221H 0101  
 Title INTRO LINEAR ALGEBRA  
 Instructor: NAYAKKANKUPPAM,  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1009  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	357/1504	4.67	4.19	4.27	4.26	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	587/1503	4.44	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	880/1290	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.27	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.19	4.21	4.20	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	392/1421	4.43	3.88	4.00	3.90	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	493/1365	4.33	4.13	4.08	4.00	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	670/1485	4.33	4.32	4.16	4.15	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1376/1504	4.11	4.85	4.69	4.68	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	493/1483	4.38	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.38
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	209/1425	4.89	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	549/1426	4.89	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	877/1418	4.22	4.13	4.25	4.22	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	896/1416	4.22	4.18	4.26	4.24	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1199	****	3.63	3.97	3.95	****

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	2	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	9
			P 0		Non-major
			I 0		8
			? 0	Other	7

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

Course-Section: MATH 225 0101  
 Title INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT  
 Instructor: HOFFMAN, KATHLE  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1010  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	2	12	22	4.56	482/1504	4.12	4.19	4.27	4.26	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	11	24	4.64	346/1503	4.03	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	6	29	4.83	187/1290	4.27	4.37	4.28	4.27	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	363/1453	4.02	4.19	4.21	4.20	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	2	1	6	6	8	3.74	976/1421	3.86	3.88	4.00	3.90	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	14	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	370/1365	4.22	4.13	4.08	4.00	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	9	24	4.63	329/1485	4.29	4.32	4.16	4.15	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1504	4.94	4.85	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	1	13	15	4.32	555/1483	3.69	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	10	25	4.67	572/1425	3.96	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	8	28	4.78	790/1426	4.51	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	14	19	4.46	643/1418	3.61	4.13	4.25	4.22	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	9	25	4.64	485/1416	3.77	4.18	4.26	4.24	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	22	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	177/1199	3.39	3.63	3.97	3.95	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1312	4.11	3.65	4.00	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1303	4.33	3.95	4.24	4.23	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1299	4.00	3.88	4.25	4.21	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 19	Required for Majors	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	B 10		
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	4
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	27

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

Course-Section: MATH 225 0201  
 Title INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT  
 Instructor: POTRA, FLORIAN  
 Enrollment: 54  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1011  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	8	13	4.26	889/1504	4.12	4.19	4.27	4.26	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	7	14	4.30	805/1503	4.03	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	19	4.63	389/1290	4.27	4.37	4.28	4.27	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	2	3	4	8	4.06	974/1453	4.02	4.19	4.21	4.20	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	3	5	14	4.39	419/1421	3.86	3.88	4.00	3.90	4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	407/1365	4.22	4.13	4.08	4.00	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	300/1485	4.29	4.32	4.16	4.15	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1504	4.94	4.85	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	4	10	7	4.05	827/1483	3.69	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	6	8	10	3.96	1188/1425	3.96	4.45	4.41	4.40	3.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	995/1426	4.51	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	2	5	7	9	3.76	1159/1418	3.61	4.13	4.25	4.22	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	5	7	11	4.04	1015/1416	3.77	4.18	4.26	4.24	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	636/1199	3.39	3.63	3.97	3.95	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	2	1	0	6	4.11	682/1312	4.11	3.65	4.00	3.98	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	737/1303	4.33	3.95	4.24	4.23	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	922/1299	4.00	3.88	4.25	4.21	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	18	6	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 758	****	3.68	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	3.89	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.58	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	4.63	4.35	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.24	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 13	Graduate	0
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	C 2	Under-grad	27
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0	Non-major	25

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	23	
				?	0			

Course-Section: MATH 225 0301  
 Title INTRO DIFFERENTL EQUAT  
 Instructor: KOROSTYSHEVSKIY  
 Enrollment: 51  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1012  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	4	10	15	5	3.54	1340/1504	4.12	4.19	4.27	4.26	3.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	14	13	1	3.14	1400/1503	4.03	4.23	4.20	4.18	3.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	16	9	5	3.34	1191/1290	4.27	4.37	4.28	4.27	3.34
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	3	5	8	1	3.41	1327/1453	4.02	4.19	4.21	4.20	3.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	3	7	5	3	3.44	1150/1421	3.86	3.88	4.00	3.90	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	1	0	5	4	5	3.80	967/1365	4.22	4.13	4.08	4.00	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	10	9	10	3.60	1246/1485	4.29	4.32	4.16	4.15	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	6	28	4.82	795/1504	4.94	4.85	4.69	4.68	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	4	6	15	5	0	2.70	1432/1483	3.69	4.05	4.06	4.02	2.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	4	18	6	4	3.24	1348/1425	3.96	4.45	4.41	4.40	3.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	3	17	11	4.12	1304/1426	4.51	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.12
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	6	6	16	5	0	2.61	1388/1418	3.61	4.13	4.25	4.22	2.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	8	6	10	6	2	2.63	1366/1416	3.77	4.18	4.26	4.24	2.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	24	7	1	2	0	0	1.50	1190/1199	3.39	3.63	3.97	3.95	1.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/1312	4.11	3.65	4.00	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	32	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1303	4.33	3.95	4.24	4.23	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	32	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/1299	4.00	3.88	4.25	4.21	****
4. Were special techniques successful	32	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	3.68	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	3.89	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	35	Non-major	35
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	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	32				
				?	3						

Course-Section: MATH 251 0101  
 Title MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS  
 Instructor: SONG, YOON J  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1013  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	9	14	4.42	669/1504	4.38	4.19	4.27	4.26	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	324/1503	4.45	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	311/1290	4.40	4.37	4.28	4.27	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	270/1453	4.20	4.19	4.21	4.20	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	383/1421	4.15	3.88	4.00	3.90	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	346/1365	4.22	4.13	4.08	4.00	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	20	4.77	190/1485	4.56	4.32	4.16	4.15	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	263/1504	4.94	4.85	4.69	4.68	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	433/1483	4.12	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	19	4.76	402/1425	4.55	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	738/1426	4.75	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	10	14	4.52	552/1418	4.27	4.13	4.25	4.22	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	3	17	4.44	701/1416	4.22	4.18	4.26	4.24	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	19	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/1199	3.00	3.63	3.97	3.95	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	966/1312	3.63	3.65	4.00	3.98	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	1	3	2	3	3.50	1121/1303	3.50	3.95	4.24	4.23	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	883/1299	4.13	3.88	4.25	4.21	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	15	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.68	4.01	3.89	****

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	5
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	3	Under-grad	26	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 251 0201  
 Title MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS  
 Instructor: SONG, YOON J  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1014  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	12	31	4.72	295/1504	4.38	4.19	4.27	4.26	4.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	32	4.72	248/1503	4.45	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	35	4.77	240/1290	4.40	4.37	4.28	4.27	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	20	0	1	2	5	15	4.48	486/1453	4.20	4.19	4.21	4.20	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	1	4	8	13	4.27	540/1421	4.15	3.88	4.00	3.90	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	0	0	5	5	14	4.38	451/1365	4.22	4.13	4.08	4.00	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	5	36	4.77	190/1485	4.56	4.32	4.16	4.15	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	41	4.98	197/1504	4.94	4.85	4.69	4.68	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	13	23	4.59	266/1483	4.12	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	37	4.86	255/1425	4.55	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	8	32	4.71	895/1426	4.75	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	9	30	4.72	303/1418	4.27	4.13	4.25	4.22	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	5	32	4.68	420/1416	4.22	4.18	4.26	4.24	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	29	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	****/1199	3.00	3.63	3.97	3.95	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	35	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	****/1312	3.63	3.65	4.00	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	34	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	****/1303	3.50	3.95	4.24	4.23	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	34	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	****/1299	4.13	3.88	4.25	4.21	****
4. Were special techniques successful	34	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 758	****	3.68	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	3.89	4.09	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	42	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.41	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	42	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	19						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	7	C	6	General	2	Under-grad	43	Non-major	38
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	37				
				?	0						



Course-Section: MATH 251 0301  
 Title MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS  
 Instructor: MUSCEDERE, MICH  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1015  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	1	7	7	18	4.00	1092/1504	4.38	4.19	4.27	4.26	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	5	10	16	3.97	1077/1503	4.45	4.23	4.20	4.18	3.97
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	2	6	7	16	3.75	1078/1290	4.40	4.37	4.28	4.27	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	3	3	5	3	8	3.45	1307/1453	4.20	4.19	4.21	4.20	3.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	1	4	7	4	11	3.74	971/1421	4.15	3.88	4.00	3.90	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	3	0	3	7	8	3.81	967/1365	4.22	4.13	4.08	4.00	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	5	5	21	4.14	902/1485	4.56	4.32	4.16	4.15	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	32	4.89	691/1504	4.94	4.85	4.69	4.68	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	3	1	15	5	6	3.33	1302/1483	4.12	4.05	4.06	4.02	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	7	10	16	4.03	1157/1425	4.55	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.03
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	5	30	4.75	825/1426	4.75	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	4	13	3	12	3.56	1237/1418	4.27	4.13	4.25	4.22	3.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	3	7	12	9	3.54	1235/1416	4.22	4.18	4.26	4.24	3.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	5	5	8	5	5	3.00	1050/1199	3.00	3.63	3.97	3.95	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	1	4	1	1	3.00	****/1312	3.63	3.65	4.00	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	****/1303	3.50	3.95	4.24	4.23	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	****/1299	4.13	3.88	4.25	4.21	****
4. Were special techniques successful	29	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.68	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	3.89	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.63	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.50	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.44	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	3.89	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: MATH 251 0301  
 Title MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS  
 Instructor: MUSCEDERE, MICH  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1015  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	2	C	9	General	2	Under-grad	36	Non-major	35
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	28				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 301 0101  
 Title INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I  
 Instructor: PITTENGER, ARTH  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1016  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	684/1504	4.51	4.19	4.27	4.27	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	1052/1503	4.23	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	902/1290	4.37	4.37	4.28	4.31	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1001/1453	4.23	4.19	4.21	4.23	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1228/1421	3.35	3.88	4.00	4.01	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	645/1365	4.19	4.13	4.08	4.08	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	990/1485	4.23	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	4.98	4.85	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1153/1483	4.16	4.05	4.06	4.08	3.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	736/1425	4.75	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1096/1426	4.75	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	3	5	1	3.36	1289/1418	4.00	4.13	4.25	4.26	3.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	5	2	3	3.55	1235/1416	4.14	4.18	4.26	4.27	3.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1199	****	3.63	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1312	3.33	3.65	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1303	4.14	3.95	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1299	4.20	3.88	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 758	****	3.68	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	2						

Course-Section: MATH 301 0201  
 Title INTRO MATH ANALYSIS I  
 Instructor: GOWDA, MUDDAPPA  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1017  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	416/1504	4.51	4.19	4.27	4.27	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	587/1503	4.23	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	356/1290	4.37	4.37	4.28	4.31	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	501/1453	4.23	4.19	4.21	4.23	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	1	2	4	3	3.42	1168/1421	3.35	3.88	4.00	4.01	3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	654/1365	4.19	4.13	4.08	4.08	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	536/1485	4.23	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	394/1504	4.98	4.85	4.69	4.65	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	250/1483	4.16	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	107/1425	4.75	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	301/1426	4.75	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	4	14	4.63	414/1418	4.00	4.13	4.25	4.26	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	352/1416	4.14	4.18	4.26	4.27	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1199	****	3.63	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	1070/1312	3.33	3.65	4.00	4.09	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	863/1303	4.14	3.95	4.24	4.27	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	834/1299	4.20	3.88	4.25	4.30	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	14	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	3.68	4.01	4.00	****
Field Work														
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****

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 11		Graduate 1
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	19
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 9
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	17

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

Course-Section: MATH 302 0101  
 Title INTRO MATH ANALYSIS II  
 Instructor: ZWECK, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1018  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	788/1504	4.33	4.19	4.27	4.27	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	312/1503	4.67	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	201/1290	4.81	4.37	4.28	4.31	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	2	4	8	4	3.78	1181/1453	3.78	4.19	4.21	4.23	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	3	8	5	3.78	957/1421	3.78	3.88	4.00	4.01	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	1	2	6	6	3.76	996/1365	3.76	4.13	4.08	4.08	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	2	4	11	4.05	964/1485	4.05	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	394/1504	4.95	4.85	4.69	4.65	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	2	10	8	4.19	700/1483	4.19	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	255/1425	4.85	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	620/1426	4.85	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	578/1418	4.50	4.13	4.25	4.26	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	0	1	17	4.74	352/1416	4.74	4.18	4.26	4.27	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	230/1199	4.57	3.63	3.97	4.02	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1312	****	3.65	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1303	****	3.95	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1299	****	3.88	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.68	4.01	4.00	****

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	3	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	3
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	3						

Course-Section: MATH 306 0101  
 Title GEOMETRY  
 Instructor: HORTA, ARNALDO  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1019  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	9	12	4.38	737/1504	4.38	4.19	4.27	4.27	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	16	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	16	4.54	469/1290	4.54	4.37	4.28	4.31	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	618/1453	4.39	4.19	4.21	4.23	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	6	6	6	3.89	871/1421	3.89	3.88	4.00	4.01	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	536/1365	4.29	4.13	4.08	4.08	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	7	15	4.54	412/1485	4.54	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	14	4.58	1041/1504	4.58	4.85	4.69	4.65	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	9	8	4.19	700/1483	4.19	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	9	12	4.50	784/1425	4.50	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	860/1426	4.74	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	7	14	4.48	617/1418	4.48	4.13	4.25	4.26	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	5	13	4.35	799/1416	4.35	4.18	4.26	4.27	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	17	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	429/1199	4.33	3.63	3.97	4.02	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/1312	****	3.65	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/1303	****	3.95	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	****/1299	****	3.88	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 758	****	3.68	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	5	Under-grad	24	Non-major	7
84-150	11	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	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 341 0101  
 Title COMPUTATIONAL METHODS  
 Instructor: MINKOFF, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1020  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	2	8	4.07	1065/1504	4.07	4.19	4.27	4.27	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	0	7	5	4.07	1008/1503	4.07	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	775/1290	4.27	4.37	4.28	4.31	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	9	1	3.92	1093/1453	3.92	4.19	4.21	4.23	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	3	1	5	3	3.46	1137/1421	3.46	3.88	4.00	4.01	3.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	472/1365	4.36	4.13	4.08	4.08	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	670/1485	4.33	4.32	4.16	4.17	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	2	1	6	4	3.71	1147/1483	3.71	4.05	4.06	4.08	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	1029/1425	4.27	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	967/1426	4.67	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	1072/1418	3.93	4.13	4.25	4.26	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	921/1416	4.20	4.18	4.26	4.27	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	5	3	2	0	0	1.70	1188/1199	1.70	3.63	3.97	4.02	1.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1312	****	3.65	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1303	****	3.95	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1299	****	3.88	4.25	4.30	****

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	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	6	Under-grad	15	Non-major	4
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	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	11				
				?	1						



Course-Section: MATH 404U 0101  
 Title  
 Instructor: LYNN, YEN-MOW  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1021  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1376/1504	3.44	4.19	4.27	4.33	3.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	0	3.44	1331/1503	3.44	4.23	4.20	4.18	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	887/1290	4.11	4.37	4.28	4.32	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1282/1453	3.50	4.19	4.21	4.22	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	1162/1421	3.43	3.88	4.00	4.02	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	0	5	1	3.50	1153/1365	3.50	4.13	4.08	4.09	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	670/1485	4.33	4.32	4.16	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	3	4	0	3.11	1367/1483	3.11	4.05	4.06	4.11	3.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1057/1425	4.22	4.45	4.41	4.38	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1022/1426	4.63	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	1307/1418	3.25	4.13	4.25	4.25	3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	1295/1416	3.25	4.18	4.26	4.26	3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1199	****	3.63	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1312	****	3.65	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1303	****	3.95	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1299	****	3.88	4.25	4.38	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 758	****	3.68	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 407 0101  
 Title MODERN ALGEBRA & NO.TH  
 Instructor: ARMSTRONG, THOM  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1022  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	442/1504	4.58	4.19	4.27	4.33	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1002/1503	4.08	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	1	6	4.00	937/1290	4.00	4.37	4.28	4.32	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	517/1453	4.45	4.19	4.21	4.22	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	642/1421	4.14	3.88	4.00	4.02	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	451/1365	4.38	4.13	4.08	4.09	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	2	0	8	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.32	4.16	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	5	3	2	3.55	1218/1483	3.55	4.05	4.06	4.11	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	736/1425	4.55	4.45	4.41	4.38	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	502/1426	4.91	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	6	2	3	3.73	1177/1418	3.73	4.13	4.25	4.25	3.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	4	3	3.55	1235/1416	3.55	4.18	4.26	4.26	3.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	636/1199	4.00	3.63	3.97	4.05	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 244	****	3.89	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	3.69	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	2 Under-grad 12 Non-major 2
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	7

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

Course-Section: MATH 408 0101  
 Title INTRO ABSTRACT ALGEBR  
 Instructor: TOLL, CHARLES  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1023  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	118/1504	4.92	4.19	4.27	4.33	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	403/1503	4.58	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.37	4.28	4.32	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	215/1453	4.73	4.19	4.21	4.22	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	410/1421	4.40	3.88	4.00	4.02	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	111/1365	4.82	4.13	4.08	4.09	4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	738/1485	4.27	4.32	4.16	4.14	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	115/1483	4.82	4.05	4.06	4.11	4.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	285/1425	4.83	4.45	4.41	4.38	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	526/1418	4.55	4.13	4.25	4.25	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	446/1416	4.67	4.18	4.26	4.26	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	129/1199	4.75	3.63	3.97	4.05	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1093/1312	3.25	3.65	4.00	4.07	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1047/1303	3.75	3.95	4.24	4.34	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	354/1299	4.75	3.88	4.25	4.38	4.75

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	1	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	11	Non-major	3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 411 0101  
 Title LINEAR ALGEBRA  
 Instructor: DILLON, JOHN F  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1024  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	5	4.33	788/1504	4.33	4.19	4.27	4.33	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	587/1503	4.44	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	588/1290	4.44	4.37	4.28	4.32	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.19	4.21	4.22	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	571/1421	4.22	3.88	4.00	4.02	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	493/1365	4.33	4.13	4.08	4.09	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	290/1485	4.67	4.32	4.16	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	409/1483	4.44	4.05	4.06	4.11	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	384/1425	4.78	4.45	4.41	4.38	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	549/1426	4.89	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	972/1418	4.11	4.13	4.25	4.25	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	806/1416	4.33	4.18	4.26	4.26	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1199	****	3.63	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1312	****	3.65	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1303	****	3.95	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1299	****	3.88	4.25	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 413 0101  
 Title NUMBER THEORY  
 Instructor: CAMPBELL, ROBER  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1025  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	0	3	5	4.33	788/1504	4.33	4.19	4.27	4.33	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	587/1503	4.44	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	588/1290	4.44	4.37	4.28	4.32	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	680/1453	4.33	4.19	4.21	4.22	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	0	3	0	2.83	1353/1421	2.83	3.88	4.00	4.02	2.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	708/1365	4.13	4.13	4.08	4.09	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	402/1485	4.56	4.32	4.16	4.14	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	635/1483	4.25	4.05	4.06	4.11	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	5	1	3.56	1299/1425	3.56	4.45	4.41	4.38	3.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1154/1418	3.78	4.13	4.25	4.25	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	806/1416	4.33	4.18	4.26	4.26	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1199	****	3.63	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1312	****	3.65	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1303	****	3.95	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1299	****	3.88	4.25	4.38	****

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	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	9	Non-major	2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	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	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 432 0101  
 Title HISTORY OF MATHEMATICS  
 Instructor: SEIDMAN, THOMAS  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1026  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	5	2	3.73	1280/1504	3.73	4.19	4.27	4.33	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	2	2	3.25	1381/1503	3.25	4.23	4.20	4.18	3.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1290	****	4.37	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	5	3	3.73	1204/1453	3.73	4.19	4.21	4.22	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1036/1421	3.64	3.88	4.00	4.02	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	3	4	3.75	1003/1365	3.75	4.13	4.08	4.09	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	4	2	2	1	3.00	1387/1485	3.00	4.32	4.16	4.14	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	2	2	3	2	3.30	1314/1483	3.30	4.05	4.06	4.11	3.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	4	1	3	3.18	1357/1425	3.18	4.45	4.41	4.38	3.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	1162/1426	4.45	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	4	2	2	2	3.00	1330/1418	3.00	4.13	4.25	4.25	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	2	2	3	3.18	1306/1416	3.18	4.18	4.26	4.26	3.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	860/1199	3.67	3.63	3.97	4.05	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	716/1312	4.00	3.65	4.00	4.07	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	910/1303	4.00	3.95	4.24	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	798/1299	4.25	3.88	4.25	4.38	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.68	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	11	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 452 0101  
 Title INTRO STOCHASTIC PROCE  
 Instructor: RATHINAM, MURUH  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1027  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	4	5	5	4.07	1061/1504	4.07	4.19	4.27	4.33	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	1008/1503	4.07	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	817/1290	4.21	4.37	4.28	4.32	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	810/1453	4.22	4.19	4.21	4.22	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	1	4	3	3.55	1090/1421	3.55	3.88	4.00	4.02	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	525/1365	4.30	4.13	4.08	4.09	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	380/1485	4.57	4.32	4.16	4.14	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	10	1	3.86	1041/1483	3.86	4.05	4.06	4.11	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	9	4	4.21	1064/1425	4.21	4.45	4.41	4.38	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	1222/1426	4.36	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	8	3	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.13	4.25	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	8	5	4.21	904/1416	4.21	4.18	4.26	4.26	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1199	****	3.63	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1312	****	3.65	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1303	****	3.95	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1299	****	3.88	4.25	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	13	Non-major	6
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MATH 465 0101  
 Title INTRO ARTIFICIAL NEURA  
 Instructor: LO, JAMES T  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1028  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.19	4.27	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1381/1503	3.25	4.23	4.20	4.18	3.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1236/1290	3.00	4.37	4.28	4.32	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1282/1453	3.50	4.19	4.21	4.22	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1017/1421	3.67	3.88	4.00	4.02	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	782/1365	4.00	4.13	4.08	4.09	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.32	4.16	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1123/1483	3.75	4.05	4.06	4.11	3.75
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1165/1425	4.00	4.45	4.41	4.38	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1307/1418	3.25	4.13	4.25	4.25	3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1295/1416	3.25	4.18	4.26	4.26	3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1007/1199	3.25	3.63	3.97	4.05	3.25

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		0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		4
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	3

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



Course-Section: MATH 479 0101  
 Title MATH PROBLEM SOLVING S  
 Instructor: ARMSTRONG, THOM  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1029  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	2	8	8	4.21	940/1504	4.21	4.19	4.27	4.33	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	2	4	9	3.79	1192/1503	3.79	4.23	4.20	4.18	3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1290	****	4.37	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	194/1453	4.75	4.19	4.21	4.22	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1421	****	3.88	4.00	4.02	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	237/1365	4.58	4.13	4.08	4.09	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	8	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	1086/1485	3.91	4.32	4.16	4.14	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	8	5	4.06	821/1483	4.06	4.05	4.06	4.11	4.06
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1238/1425	3.83	4.45	4.41	4.38	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	905/1418	4.20	4.13	4.25	4.25	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	921/1416	4.20	4.18	4.26	4.26	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1199	****	3.63	3.97	4.05	****
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1312	****	3.65	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1303	****	3.95	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1299	****	3.88	4.25	4.38	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.68	4.01	4.17	****
-----														
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	57/ 76	4.56	4.56	4.61	4.63	4.56
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	38/ 70	4.63	4.63	4.35	4.63	4.63
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	3	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	37/ 67	4.50	4.50	4.34	4.34	4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	49/ 76	4.44	4.44	4.44	4.51	4.44
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	53/ 73	3.89	3.89	4.17	4.29	3.89
-----														
Field Work														
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	12	Under-grad	19	Non-major	7
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MATH 481 0101  
 Title MATH MODELING  
 Instructor: SEIDMAN, THOMAS  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1030  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	1	3	1	3.13	1438/1504	3.13	4.19	4.27	4.33	3.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	3	1	1	2.75	1461/1503	2.75	4.23	4.20	4.18	2.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1290	****	4.37	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1339/1453	3.38	4.19	4.21	4.22	3.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1256/1421	3.20	3.88	4.00	4.02	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	4	1	3.33	1225/1365	3.33	4.13	4.08	4.09	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	4	0	1	1	0	1.83	1482/1485	1.83	4.32	4.16	4.14	1.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	3	1	3	1	0	2.25	1458/1483	2.25	4.05	4.06	4.11	2.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	0	4	1	1	2.67	1404/1425	2.67	4.45	4.41	4.38	2.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	967/1426	4.67	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	2	1	3	0	2.44	1396/1418	2.44	4.13	4.25	4.25	2.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	2	0	2.67	1362/1416	2.67	4.18	4.26	4.26	2.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1199	****	3.63	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1312	****	3.65	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1303	****	3.95	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1299	****	3.88	4.25	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 482 0101  
 Title NONLINEAR OPTIMIZATION  
 Instructor: GULER, OSMAN  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1031  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	1267/1504	3.75	4.19	4.27	4.33	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	692/1503	4.38	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	671/1290	4.38	4.37	4.28	4.32	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.19	4.21	4.22	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	1	3.75	967/1421	3.75	3.88	4.00	4.02	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	1	4.00	782/1365	4.00	4.13	4.08	4.09	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	914/1485	4.13	4.32	4.16	4.14	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1087/1504	4.50	4.85	4.69	4.73	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	772/1483	4.13	4.05	4.06	4.11	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	634/1425	4.63	4.45	4.41	4.38	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	825/1426	4.75	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	964/1418	4.13	4.13	4.25	4.25	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	776/1416	4.38	4.18	4.26	4.26	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	636/1199	4.00	3.63	3.97	4.05	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1312	****	3.65	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1303	****	3.95	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1299	****	3.88	4.25	4.38	****

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 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 1		
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	6

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

Course-Section: MATH 485 0101  
 Title INTRO CALC OF VARIATIO  
 Instructor: HOFFMAN, KATHLE  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1032  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	206/1504	4.80	4.19	4.27	4.33	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.23	4.20	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1290	4.80	4.37	4.28	4.32	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	158/1453	4.80	4.19	4.21	4.22	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	745/1421	4.00	3.88	4.00	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1003/1365	3.75	4.13	4.08	4.09	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	150/1485	4.80	4.32	4.16	4.14	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1093/1483	3.80	4.05	4.06	4.11	3.80
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	331/1425	4.80	4.45	4.41	4.38	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	738/1426	4.80	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	709/1418	4.40	4.13	4.25	4.25	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	255/1416	4.80	4.18	4.26	4.26	4.80

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 490 0101  
 Title SPECIAL TOPICS IN MATH  
 Instructor: SINHA, BIMAL  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1033  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1353/1504	3.50	4.19	4.27	4.33	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	751/1503	4.33	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.37	4.28	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1453	****	4.19	4.21	4.22	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	745/1421	4.00	3.88	4.00	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1365	****	4.13	4.08	4.09	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	670/1485	4.33	4.32	4.16	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	778/1504	4.83	4.85	4.69	4.73	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1170/1483	3.67	4.05	4.06	4.11	3.67
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	572/1425	4.67	4.45	4.41	4.38	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1232/1426	4.33	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.13	4.25	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1281/1416	3.33	4.18	4.26	4.26	3.33
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1149/1312	3.00	3.65	4.00	4.07	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1076/1303	3.67	3.95	4.24	4.34	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	741/1299	4.33	3.88	4.25	4.38	4.33

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

Course-Section: MATH 604 0101  
 Title FUNCTIONAL ANALYSIS  
 Instructor: GULER, OSMAN  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1034  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	0	3	4.25	889/1504	4.25	4.19	4.27	4.44	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.23	4.20	4.28	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.37	4.28	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.19	4.21	4.34	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	3.88	4.00	4.27	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	581/1365	4.25	4.13	4.08	4.35	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	761/1485	4.25	4.32	4.16	4.24	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1411/1504	4.00	4.85	4.69	4.79	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	211/1483	4.67	4.05	4.06	4.20	4.67
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	784/1425	4.50	4.45	4.41	4.51	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	825/1426	4.75	4.72	4.69	4.80	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	848/1418	4.25	4.13	4.25	4.36	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1029/1416	4.00	4.18	4.26	4.38	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 611 0101  
 Title APPLIED ANALYSIS  
 Instructor: GOWDA, MUDDAPPA  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1035  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.19	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.23	4.20	4.28	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.37	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.19	4.21	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	596/1421	4.20	3.88	4.00	4.27	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.13	4.08	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	124/1485	4.86	4.32	4.16	4.24	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.05	4.06	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.45	4.41	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.13	4.25	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.18	4.26	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1199	****	3.63	3.97	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	255/1312	4.67	3.65	4.00	4.31	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	796/1303	4.25	3.95	4.24	4.58	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	922/1299	4.00	3.88	4.25	4.56	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1036  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	416/1504	4.60	4.19	4.27	4.44	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	649/1503	4.40	4.23	4.20	4.28	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	1022/1290	3.90	4.37	4.28	4.36	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	680/1453	4.33	4.19	4.21	4.34	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	596/1421	4.20	3.88	4.00	4.27	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	260/1365	4.56	4.13	4.08	4.35	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	349/1485	4.60	4.32	4.16	4.24	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	960/1504	4.70	4.85	4.69	4.79	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	635/1483	4.25	4.05	4.06	4.20	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1076/1425	4.20	4.45	4.41	4.51	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	1197/1426	4.40	4.72	4.69	4.80	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	799/1418	4.30	4.13	4.25	4.36	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	921/1416	4.20	4.18	4.26	4.38	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	919/1199	3.50	3.63	3.97	4.04	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	297/1312	4.60	3.65	4.00	4.31	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	299/1303	4.80	3.95	4.24	4.58	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	303/1299	4.80	3.88	4.25	4.56	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	273/ 758	4.33	3.68	4.01	4.24	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.56	****

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: MATH 650 0101  
 Title FOUNDTNS OF OPTIMIZATI  
 Instructor: POTRA, FLORIAN  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1037  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.19	4.27	4.44	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1304/1503	3.50	4.23	4.20	4.28	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1155/1290	3.50	4.37	4.28	4.36	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1148/1453	3.83	4.19	4.21	4.34	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1017/1421	3.67	3.88	4.00	4.27	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	947/1365	3.83	4.13	4.08	4.35	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	1366/1485	3.17	4.32	4.16	4.24	3.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	635/1483	4.25	4.05	4.06	4.20	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1238/1425	3.83	4.45	4.41	4.51	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1128/1426	4.50	4.72	4.69	4.80	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1201/1418	3.67	4.13	4.25	4.36	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1199/1416	3.67	4.18	4.26	4.38	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	919/1199	3.50	3.63	3.97	4.04	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	255/1312	4.67	3.65	4.00	4.31	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	268/1303	4.83	3.95	4.24	4.58	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	445/1299	4.67	3.88	4.25	4.56	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	3.68	4.01	4.24	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MATH 700 0101  
 Title TOP:APPL/NUMER ANALYSI  
 Instructor: RATHINAM, MURUH  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1038  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.19	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.23	4.20	4.28	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.37	4.28	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.19	4.21	4.34	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	3.88	4.00	4.27	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	297/1365	4.50	4.13	4.08	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.32	4.16	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	338/1483	4.50	4.05	4.06	4.20	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.45	4.41	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1128/1426	4.50	4.72	4.69	4.80	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.13	4.25	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.18	4.26	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	636/1199	4.00	3.63	3.97	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	716/1312	4.00	3.65	4.00	4.31	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	910/1303	4.00	3.95	4.24	4.58	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	922/1299	4.00	3.88	4.25	4.56	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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