

Course-Section: PHYS 101 0101  
 Title IDEAS IN MODERN PHYSIC  
 Instructor: SINSKY, JOEL  
 Enrollment: 95  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1242  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	4	7	3.88	1257/1576	3.88	4.38	4.30	4.11	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	653/1576	4.47	4.18	4.27	4.18	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	430/1342	4.65	4.36	4.32	4.19	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	179/1520	4.83	4.21	4.25	4.09	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	4	5	4	3.67	1166/1465	3.67	3.94	4.12	4.02	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1434	****	4.17	4.14	3.94	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	315/1547	4.69	4.36	4.19	4.10	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	527/1574	4.88	4.75	4.64	4.59	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	732/1554	4.23	3.97	4.10	4.01	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	846/1488	4.53	4.40	4.47	4.41	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	334/1493	4.94	4.66	4.73	4.65	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	806/1486	4.41	4.16	4.32	4.26	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	2	12	4.35	867/1489	4.35	4.13	4.32	4.22	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	2	6	4	4	3.63	963/1277	3.63	3.84	4.03	3.91	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	1	1	4	1	3.11	1171/1279	3.11	4.15	4.17	3.96	3.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	597/1270	4.56	4.40	4.35	4.09	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	835/1269	4.22	4.28	4.35	4.09	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	8	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 878	****	4.41	4.05	3.91	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	15	14	4.27	928/1576	4.27	4.38	4.30	4.11	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	9	17	4.27	920/1576	4.27	4.18	4.27	4.18	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	6	19	4.30	797/1342	4.30	4.36	4.32	4.19	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	3	1	2	5	6	3.59	1336/1520	3.59	4.21	4.25	4.09	3.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	9	9	12	3.97	905/1465	3.97	3.94	4.12	4.02	3.97	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	18	1	1	3	3	6	3.86	1033/1434	3.86	4.17	4.14	3.94	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	7	18	4.25	838/1547	4.25	4.36	4.19	4.10	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	22	4.69	881/1574	4.69	4.75	4.64	4.59	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	6	15	5	3.96	978/1554	3.96	3.97	4.10	4.01	3.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	9	20	4.53	834/1488	4.53	4.40	4.47	4.41	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	27	4.78	849/1493	4.78	4.66	4.73	4.65	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	4	9	17	4.25	959/1486	4.25	4.16	4.32	4.26	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	9	17	4.25	955/1489	4.25	4.13	4.32	4.22	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	1	7	7	14	4.17	600/1277	4.17	3.84	4.03	3.91	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	2	1	2	1	2	3.00	****/1279	****	4.15	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	1	0	1	5	1	3.63	****/1270	****	4.40	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	****/1269	****	4.28	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	25	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 878	****	4.41	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	6	7	4	5	3	2.68	231/ 234	2.68	3.70	4.23	4.08	2.68	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	3	2	4	6	10	3.72	219/ 240	3.72	4.15	4.35	4.29	3.72	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	1	2	0	6	3	13	4.04	200/ 229	4.04	4.62	4.51	4.43	4.04	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	6	4	2	4	8	3.17	218/ 232	3.17	4.10	4.29	4.27	3.17	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	7	3	0	2	4	9	3.89	329/ 379	3.89	4.10	4.20	4.15	3.89	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.52	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.33	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.83	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C 10	General 2	Under-grad 33	Non-major 33
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	25	
?	2			

Course-Section: PHYS 112 0101  
 Title BASIC PHYSICS II  
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ERIC  
 Enrollment: 175  
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1244  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	3	2	10	15	18	3.90	1249/1576	3.90	4.38	4.30	4.11	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	7	21	16	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.18	4.27	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	10	18	16	3.92	1058/1342	3.92	4.36	4.32	4.19	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	21	2	2	8	12	3	3.44	1384/1520	3.44	4.21	4.25	4.09	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	1	1	10	15	15	4.00	850/1465	4.00	3.94	4.12	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	32	2	1	1	7	3	3.57	1181/1434	3.57	4.17	4.14	3.94	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	13	29	4.40	699/1547	4.40	4.36	4.19	4.10	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	10	37	4.79	702/1574	4.79	4.75	4.64	4.59	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	2	1	9	15	12	3.87	1081/1554	3.87	3.97	4.10	4.01	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	4	11	32	4.52	846/1488	4.52	4.40	4.47	4.41	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	5	9	33	4.54	1176/1493	4.54	4.66	4.73	4.65	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	8	16	21	4.10	1069/1486	4.10	4.16	4.32	4.26	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	5	4	16	22	4.10	1065/1489	4.10	4.13	4.32	4.22	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	0	7	11	25	4.34	455/1277	4.34	3.84	4.03	3.91	4.34
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/1279	****	4.15	4.17	3.96	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	44	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/1270	****	4.40	4.35	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	44	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/1269	****	4.28	4.35	4.09	****
4. Were special techniques successful	44	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.41	4.05	3.91	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	6	9	4	8	5	2.91	228/ 234	2.91	3.70	4.23	4.08	2.91
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	3	3	6	9	11	3.69	220/ 240	3.69	4.15	4.35	4.29	3.69
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	3	1	6	4	18	4.03	201/ 229	4.03	4.62	4.51	4.43	4.03
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	2	0	2	12	16	4.25	144/ 232	4.25	4.10	4.29	4.27	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	10	1	1	1	7	12	4.27	148/ 379	4.27	4.10	4.20	4.15	4.27
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.63	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.75	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.25	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.33	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	47	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.83	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	47	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.83	4.03	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****

Course-Section: PHYS 112 0101  
 Title BASIC PHYSICS II  
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ERIC  
 Enrollment: 175  
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1244  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	13	2.00-2.99	3	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	49	Non-major	49
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	9	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	42				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0102  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: CUI, LILI  
 Enrollment: 262  
 Questionnaires: 98

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1245  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	5	11	20	37	23	3.65	1392/1576	3.65	4.38	4.30	4.11	3.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	7	11	25	34	19	3.49	1401/1576	3.49	4.18	4.27	4.18	3.49
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	5	11	23	34	23	3.61	1181/1342	3.61	4.36	4.32	4.19	3.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	30	8	10	20	20	8	3.15	1456/1520	3.15	4.21	4.25	4.09	3.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	16	6	10	19	23	20	3.53	1235/1465	3.53	3.94	4.12	4.02	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	47	3	5	16	14	9	3.45	1239/1434	3.45	4.17	4.14	3.94	3.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	2	9	19	33	30	3.86	1174/1547	3.86	4.36	4.19	4.10	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	0	11	24	57	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.75	4.64	4.59	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	1	6	14	34	20	4	3.03	1444/1554	3.03	3.97	4.10	4.01	3.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	3	3	15	35	38	4.09	1209/1488	4.09	4.40	4.47	4.41	4.09
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	2	20	24	46	4.20	1374/1493	4.20	4.66	4.73	4.65	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	7	19	28	27	10	3.15	1403/1486	3.15	4.16	4.32	4.26	3.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	9	18	22	26	18	3.28	1377/1489	3.28	4.13	4.32	4.22	3.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	5	8	8	18	25	23	3.57	987/1277	3.57	3.84	4.03	3.91	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	52	0	5	3	14	17	7	3.39	1109/1279	3.39	4.15	4.17	3.96	3.39
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	52	0	6	2	7	19	12	3.63	1103/1270	3.63	4.40	4.35	4.09	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	53	0	5	2	14	13	11	3.51	1113/1269	3.51	4.28	4.35	4.09	3.51
4. Were special techniques successful	50	3	4	3	11	15	12	3.62	682/ 878	3.62	4.41	4.05	3.91	3.62
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	97	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.48	4.20	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	97	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.83	4.03	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	97	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	17	0.00-0.99 0	A 26	Required for Majors	3
28-55	24	1.00-1.99 1	B 30		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 8	C 15	General	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 14	D 1		Under-grad 98
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 25	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	66
			? 2		

Course-Section: PHYS 121H 0101  
 Title INTRO PHYSICS I-HONORS  
 Instructor: CUI, LILI  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1246  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	928/1576	4.28	4.38	4.30	4.11	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	5	8	4.06	1107/1576	4.06	4.18	4.27	4.18	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	5	9	4.17	899/1342	4.17	4.36	4.32	4.19	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	1	9	2	3.92	1141/1520	3.92	4.21	4.25	4.09	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	3	2	4	5	3.60	1208/1465	3.60	3.94	4.12	4.02	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	4	6	2	3.50	1204/1434	3.50	4.17	4.14	3.94	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	755/1547	4.33	4.36	4.19	4.10	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.75	4.64	4.59	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	3	5	7	1	3.38	1357/1554	3.38	3.97	4.10	4.01	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	10	5	4.11	1197/1488	4.11	4.40	4.47	4.41	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	10	6	4.17	1384/1493	4.17	4.66	4.73	4.65	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	4	8	3	3.61	1303/1486	3.61	4.16	4.32	4.26	3.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	2	7	4	3.44	1332/1489	3.44	4.13	4.32	4.22	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	3	6	4	4	3.39	1071/1277	3.39	3.84	4.03	3.91	3.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	780/1279	4.08	4.15	4.17	3.96	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	805/1270	4.31	4.40	4.35	4.09	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.28	4.35	4.09	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	405/ 878	4.18	4.41	4.05	3.91	4.18

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 19 Non-major 16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 1	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 15	
			? 1		

Course-Section: PHYS 122 0101  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: CUI, LILI  
 Enrollment: 183  
 Questionnaires: 103

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1247  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	4	4	10	34	50	4.20	1019/1576	4.20	4.38	4.30	4.11	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	8	7	18	26	43	3.87	1253/1576	3.87	4.18	4.27	4.18	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	6	10	21	28	37	3.78	1119/1342	3.78	4.36	4.32	4.19	3.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	42	2	8	12	20	18	3.73	1266/1520	3.73	4.21	4.25	4.09	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	18	5	8	17	23	29	3.77	1095/1465	3.77	3.94	4.12	4.02	3.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	50	4	7	11	10	18	3.62	1162/1434	3.62	4.17	4.14	3.94	3.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	4	3	9	24	59	4.32	765/1547	4.32	4.36	4.19	4.10	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	0	9	89	4.91	469/1574	4.91	4.75	4.64	4.59	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	14	10	29	29	8	3.08	1436/1554	3.08	3.97	4.10	4.01	3.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	2	13	18	66	4.46	920/1488	4.46	4.40	4.47	4.41	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	2	2	11	22	62	4.41	1278/1493	4.41	4.66	4.73	4.65	4.41	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	5	14	22	27	29	3.63	1300/1486	3.63	4.16	4.32	4.26	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	12	7	14	25	41	3.77	1251/1489	3.77	4.13	4.32	4.22	3.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	7	6	18	21	40	3.88	812/1277	3.88	3.84	4.03	3.91	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	80	0	3	5	6	4	5	3.13	****/1279	****	4.15	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	80	0	3	3	7	5	5	3.26	****/1270	****	4.40	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	81	0	5	2	6	1	8	3.23	****/1269	****	4.28	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	81	4	1	3	5	1	8	3.67	****/ 878	****	4.41	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	102	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 234	****	3.70	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	102	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	4.15	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	102	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 229	****	4.62	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	102	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	102	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 379	****	4.10	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	102	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	102	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	102	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 72	****	4.63	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	102	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	4.75	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	102	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 375	****	4.25	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	102	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	102	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	4.33	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	102	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 44	****	4.83	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	102	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	102	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 326	****	4.83	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	102	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	102	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	102	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	102	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	102	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****	



Course-Section: PHYS 122 0101  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: CUI, LILI  
 Enrollment: 183  
 Questionnaires: 103

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1247  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 1	A 30	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	15	1.00-1.99 0	B 37		
56-83	21	2.00-2.99 7	C 19	General 2	Under-grad 103 Non-major 97
84-150	14	3.00-3.49 17	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 28	F 1	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 82	
			? 1		

Course-Section: PHYS 122H 0101  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: CUI, LILI  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1248  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	0	3	5	6	3.65	1392/1576	3.65	4.38	4.30	4.11	3.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	1	5	5	3.41	1433/1576	3.41	4.18	4.27	4.18	3.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	6	5	3.82	1101/1342	3.82	4.36	4.32	4.19	3.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	3	0	5	3	3.50	1362/1520	3.50	4.21	4.25	4.09	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	2	5	4	3.57	1218/1465	3.57	3.94	4.12	4.02	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	1380/1434	3.00	4.17	4.14	3.94	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	794/1547	4.29	4.36	4.19	4.10	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.75	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	1	7	5	0	3.00	1448/1554	3.00	3.97	4.10	4.01	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	4	4	8	4.06	1218/1488	4.06	4.40	4.47	4.41	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	1311/1493	4.35	4.66	4.73	4.65	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	4	8	3	3.59	1311/1486	3.59	4.16	4.32	4.26	3.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	1	0	5	5	3.12	1407/1489	3.12	4.13	4.32	4.22	3.12	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	3	7	3	3.67	943/1277	3.67	3.84	4.03	3.91	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	4	0	1	3.17	1161/1279	3.17	4.15	4.17	3.96	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1135/1270	3.50	4.40	4.35	4.09	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	1210/1269	3.00	4.28	4.35	4.09	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	3	1	0	0	2.25	****/ 878	****	4.41	4.05	3.91	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	2						

Course-Section: PHYS 122L 0101  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS L  
 Instructor: SHIH, YANHUA  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1249  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	2	5	3	3.54	1434/1576	3.77	4.38	4.30	4.11	3.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	3	4	0	2.62	1563/1576	3.01	4.18	4.27	4.18	2.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1342	4.00	4.36	4.32	4.19	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	6	2	3.67	1300/1520	3.93	4.21	4.25	4.09	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	850/1465	4.00	3.94	4.12	4.02	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	1204/1434	4.25	4.17	4.14	3.94	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	784/1547	4.15	4.36	4.19	4.10	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1128/1574	4.73	4.75	4.64	4.59	4.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	4	3	2	0	1	2.10	1547/1554	2.65	3.97	4.10	4.01	2.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	4	2	1	1	0	1.88	1486/1488	1.69	4.40	4.47	4.41	1.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	1	2	4	0	3.13	1489/1493	3.56	4.66	4.73	4.65	3.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	4	3	0	1	0	1.75	1486/1486	1.88	4.16	4.32	4.26	1.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	2	0	1	0	1.63	1487/1489	1.81	4.13	4.32	4.22	1.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	1267/1277	2.00	3.84	4.03	3.91	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	2	0	1	1	2.50	1249/1279	2.50	4.15	4.17	3.96	2.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	1253/1270	2.40	4.40	4.35	4.09	2.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	4	0	0	1	1	2.17	1257/1269	2.17	4.28	4.35	4.09	2.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	1	2	0	2	4	2	3.40	218/ 234	3.40	3.70	4.23	4.08	3.40	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	214/ 240	3.91	4.15	4.35	4.29	3.82	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	52/ 229	4.91	4.62	4.51	4.43	4.82	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	4	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	201/ 232	3.59	4.10	4.29	4.27	3.57	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	346/ 379	3.81	4.10	4.20	4.15	3.82	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHYS 122L 0102  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS L  
 Instructor: SHIH, YANHUA  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1250  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1148/1576	3.77	4.38	4.30	4.11	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1438/1576	3.01	4.18	4.27	4.18	3.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.36	4.32	4.19	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	921/1520	3.93	4.21	4.25	4.09	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	850/1465	4.00	3.94	4.12	4.02	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	4.25	4.17	4.14	3.94	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1041/1547	4.15	4.36	4.19	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1574	4.73	4.75	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1405/1554	2.65	3.97	4.10	4.01	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1487/1488	1.69	4.40	4.47	4.41	1.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1411/1493	3.56	4.66	4.73	4.65	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	1483/1486	1.88	4.16	4.32	4.26	2.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	1480/1489	1.81	4.13	4.32	4.22	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1279	2.50	4.15	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1270	2.40	4.40	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1269	2.17	4.28	4.35	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	218/ 234	3.40	3.70	4.23	4.08	3.40	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	198/ 240	3.91	4.15	4.35	4.29	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 229	4.91	4.62	4.51	4.43	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	200/ 232	3.59	4.10	4.29	4.27	3.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	349/ 379	3.81	4.10	4.20	4.15	3.80	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.52	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: PHYS 220 0101  
 Title INTRO COMPUTATIONAL PH  
 Instructor: MCCANN, KEVIN  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1251  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	3	1	8	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.38	4.30	4.35	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	0	3	3	5	3.50	1392/1576	3.50	4.18	4.27	4.32	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1342	****	4.36	4.32	4.41	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	2	0	4	5	3.83	1212/1520	3.83	4.21	4.25	4.26	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	1458/1465	2.25	3.94	4.12	4.09	2.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	3	1	2	2	3.11	1356/1434	3.11	4.17	4.14	4.06	3.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	3	4	3	3.29	1407/1547	3.29	4.36	4.19	4.22	3.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.75	4.64	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1132/1554	3.80	3.97	4.10	4.05	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	1072/1488	4.31	4.40	4.47	4.44	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	1184/1493	4.54	4.66	4.73	4.75	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	0	3	7	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.16	4.32	4.29	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	0	2	7	3.85	1218/1489	3.85	4.13	4.32	4.31	3.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	2	1	8	4.08	664/1277	4.08	3.84	4.03	4.01	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1279	****	4.15	4.17	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1270	****	4.40	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1269	****	4.28	4.35	4.29	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: PHYS 224 0101  
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I  
 Instructor: GEORGE, IAN  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1252  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	952/1576	4.25	4.38	4.30	4.35	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	1023/1576	4.17	4.18	4.27	4.32	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	899/1342	4.17	4.36	4.32	4.41	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1199/1520	3.86	4.21	4.25	4.26	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	9	1	3.91	989/1465	3.91	3.94	4.12	4.09	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	748/1434	4.20	4.17	4.14	4.06	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	339/1547	4.67	4.36	4.19	4.22	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	1	4.08	1431/1574	4.08	4.75	4.64	4.62	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	477/1554	4.44	3.97	4.10	4.05	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	1171/1488	4.17	4.40	4.47	4.44	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	734/1493	4.83	4.66	4.73	4.75	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	7	2	3.92	1187/1486	3.92	4.16	4.32	4.29	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	888/1489	4.33	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	268/1277	4.58	3.84	4.03	4.01	4.58	

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	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	12	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 305 0101  
 Title STELLAR ASTROPHYSICS  
 Instructor: HENRIKSEN, MARK  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1253  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	203/1576	4.86	4.38	4.30	4.30	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1040/1576	4.14	4.18	4.27	4.28	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	510/1342	4.57	4.36	4.32	4.30	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.21	4.25	4.25	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	758/1465	4.14	3.94	4.12	4.09	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.15	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	939/1547	4.14	4.36	4.19	4.21	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.75	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	504/1554	4.43	3.97	4.10	4.09	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	324/1488	4.86	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	986/1493	4.71	4.66	4.73	4.70	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	221/1486	4.86	4.16	4.32	4.32	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	251/1489	4.86	4.13	4.32	4.34	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1273/1277	1.50	3.84	4.03	4.11	1.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
-----					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	3 Under-grad 7 Non-major 6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	1

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

Course-Section: PHYS 315 0101  
 Title GALAXIES & INTERSTELLA  
 Instructor: TURNER, JANE  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1254  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	952/1576	4.25	4.38	4.30	4.30	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	1058/1576	4.13	4.18	4.27	4.28	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	735/1342	4.38	4.36	4.32	4.30	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.21	4.25	4.25	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	850/1465	4.00	3.94	4.12	4.09	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1093/1434	3.75	4.17	4.14	4.15	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	387/1547	4.63	4.36	4.19	4.21	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1324/1574	4.25	4.75	4.64	4.61	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1110/1554	3.83	3.97	4.10	4.09	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	505/1488	4.75	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	908/1493	4.75	4.66	4.73	4.70	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	1054/1486	4.13	4.16	4.32	4.32	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.13	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	243/1277	4.63	3.84	4.03	4.11	4.63

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	8	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	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	2				
				?	0						



Course-Section: PHYS 320L 0101  
 Title ELECTRONICS LAB  
 Instructor: MCMILLAN, WALLA  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1255  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	114/1576	4.93	4.38	4.30	4.30	4.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	798/1576	4.38	4.18	4.27	4.28	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	835/1342	4.25	4.36	4.32	4.30	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.21	4.25	4.25	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	4	1	7	3.80	1067/1465	3.80	3.94	4.12	4.09	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	625/1434	4.31	4.17	4.14	4.15	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	457/1547	4.56	4.36	4.19	4.21	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	527/1574	4.88	4.75	4.64	4.61	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	816/1554	4.15	3.97	4.10	4.09	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	385/1488	4.81	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	390/1493	4.94	4.66	4.73	4.70	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	0	6	8	4.25	959/1486	4.25	4.16	4.32	4.32	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	625/1489	4.56	4.13	4.32	4.34	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	0	3	3	5	3.92	791/1277	3.92	3.84	4.03	4.11	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	219/1279	4.80	4.15	4.17	4.20	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	559/1270	4.60	4.40	4.35	4.42	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1269	4.80	4.28	4.35	4.41	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.41	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	26/ 234	4.82	3.70	4.23	4.24	4.82	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	42/ 240	4.82	4.15	4.35	4.32	4.82	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 229	5.00	4.62	4.51	4.48	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 232	5.00	4.10	4.29	4.16	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	118/ 379	4.36	4.10	4.20	4.17	4.36	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 1		

Course-Section: PHYS 321 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE MECHANICS  
 Instructor: MCCANN, KEVIN  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1256  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	485/1576	4.62	4.38	4.30	4.30	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	958/1576	4.23	4.18	4.27	4.28	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	552/1342	4.54	4.36	4.32	4.30	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	891/1520	4.22	4.21	4.25	4.25	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	0	3	4	3.70	1138/1465	3.70	3.94	4.12	4.09	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	461/1434	4.45	4.17	4.14	4.15	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	2	2	2	0	5	3.36	1389/1547	3.36	4.36	4.19	4.21	3.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.75	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	532/1554	4.40	3.97	4.10	4.09	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	736/1488	4.62	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	1017/1493	4.69	4.66	4.73	4.70	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	545/1486	4.62	4.16	4.32	4.32	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	364/1489	4.77	4.13	4.32	4.34	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	258/1277	4.60	3.84	4.03	4.11	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1279	****	4.15	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1270	****	4.40	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1269	****	4.28	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.41	4.05	4.09	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 1		

Course-Section: PHYS 324 0101  
 Title MODERN PHYSICS  
 Instructor: RENO, ROBERT C  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1257  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	19	4.74	324/1576	4.74	4.38	4.30	4.30	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	10	10	4.30	891/1576	4.30	4.18	4.27	4.28	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	9	9	4.13	918/1342	4.13	4.36	4.32	4.30	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.21	4.25	4.25	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	8	9	3.96	919/1465	3.96	3.94	4.12	4.09	3.96	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	647/1434	4.29	4.17	4.14	4.15	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	303/1547	4.70	4.36	4.19	4.21	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	547/1574	4.87	4.75	4.64	4.61	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	649/1554	4.32	3.97	4.10	4.09	4.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	309/1488	4.86	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	557/1493	4.91	4.66	4.73	4.70	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	3	16	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.16	4.32	4.32	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	7	14	4.55	649/1489	4.55	4.13	4.32	4.34	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	2	3	10	4	3.57	987/1277	3.57	3.84	4.03	4.11	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	****/1279	****	4.15	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	****/1270	****	4.40	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	****/1269	****	4.28	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 878	****	4.41	4.05	4.09	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 20
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 1	C 8	General 1	Under-grad 23 Non-major 3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 18	
			? 1		

Course-Section: PHYS 424 0101  
 Title INTRO QUANTAM MECHANIC  
 Instructor: TAKACS, LASZLO  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1258  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	457/1576	4.64	4.38	4.30	4.46	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	313/1576	4.73	4.18	4.27	4.35	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	443/1342	4.64	4.36	4.32	4.46	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.21	4.25	4.38	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	366/1465	4.50	3.94	4.12	4.22	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	498/1434	4.43	4.17	4.14	4.30	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	270/1547	4.73	4.36	4.19	4.24	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	469/1574	4.91	4.75	4.64	4.69	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	532/1554	4.40	3.97	4.10	4.24	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	385/1488	4.82	4.40	4.47	4.55	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	557/1493	4.91	4.66	4.73	4.80	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	379/1486	4.73	4.16	4.32	4.41	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	539/1489	4.64	4.13	4.32	4.38	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	506/1277	4.29	3.84	4.03	4.04	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1279	****	4.15	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1270	****	4.40	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1269	****	4.28	4.35	4.55	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.41	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	3.70	4.23	4.28	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.15	4.35	4.45	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.62	4.51	4.70	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.29	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.10	4.20	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 1		Major 6
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 1		

Course-Section: PHYS 425 0101  
 Title RELATIVISTIC PHYSICS  
 Instructor: KUNDU, PRASUN  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1259  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.38	4.30	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.18	4.27	4.35	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1132/1342	3.75	4.36	4.32	4.46	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.21	4.25	4.38	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1242/1465	3.50	3.94	4.12	4.22	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	594/1434	4.33	4.17	4.14	4.30	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1347/1547	3.50	4.36	4.19	4.24	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	758/1574	4.75	4.75	4.64	4.69	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1367/1554	3.33	3.97	4.10	4.24	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	666/1488	4.67	4.40	4.47	4.55	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.66	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.16	4.32	4.41	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	888/1489	4.33	4.13	4.32	4.38	4.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 607 0101  
 Title ELECTROMAG WAVES/RADIA  
 Instructor: KRAMER, IVAN  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1260  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	277/1576	4.78	4.38	4.30	4.43	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	392/1576	4.67	4.18	4.27	4.32	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	191/1342	4.89	4.36	4.32	4.38	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	339/1520	4.67	4.21	4.25	4.36	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	1	5	4.00	850/1465	4.00	3.94	4.12	4.25	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	226/1434	4.71	4.17	4.14	4.35	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	0	5	3.89	1159/1547	3.89	4.36	4.19	4.24	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.75	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	712/1554	4.25	3.97	4.10	4.18	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	278/1488	4.89	4.40	4.47	4.52	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.66	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.16	4.32	4.37	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	888/1489	4.33	4.13	4.32	4.38	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1149/1277	3.00	3.84	4.03	4.08	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	335/1279	4.67	4.15	4.17	4.34	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.40	4.35	4.53	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.28	4.35	4.55	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	4.41	4.05	4.11	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 610 0101  
 Title QUANTUM ELECTRONICS  
 Instructor: PITTMAN, TODD B  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1261  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.38	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.18	4.27	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.36	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.21	4.25	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	206/1465	4.75	3.94	4.12	4.25	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	193/1434	4.75	4.17	4.14	4.35	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.36	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.75	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1554	5.00	3.97	4.10	4.18	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.40	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.66	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.16	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.13	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	943/1277	3.67	3.84	4.03	4.08	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.15	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.40	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.28	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.41	4.05	4.11	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 614 0101  
 Title INTRO SURFACE PHYS  
 Instructor: GOUGOUSI, THEOD  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1262  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.38	4.30	4.43	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.18	4.27	4.32	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	480/1342	4.60	4.36	4.32	4.38	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	179/1520	4.83	4.21	4.25	4.36	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	708/1465	4.20	3.94	4.12	4.25	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.36	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	606/1574	4.83	4.75	4.64	4.75	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	395/1554	4.50	3.97	4.10	4.18	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.40	4.47	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.66	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.16	4.32	4.37	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	274/1489	4.83	4.13	4.32	4.38	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.84	4.03	4.08	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	335/1279	4.67	4.15	4.17	4.34	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.40	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.28	4.35	4.55	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	4.41	4.05	4.11	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	61/ 85	4.50	4.75	4.72	4.79	4.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.77	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	47/ 72	4.50	4.63	4.64	4.70	4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.75	4.61	4.70	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.25	4.01	4.10	****

Frequency Distribution

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

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



Course-Section: PHYS 622 0101  
 Title: ATMOS PHYSICS II  
 Instructor: MCMILLAN, WALLA  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1263  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1576	4.80	4.38	4.30	4.43	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	222/1576	4.80	4.18	4.27	4.32	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	240/1342	4.80	4.36	4.32	4.38	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	395/1520	4.60	4.21	4.25	4.36	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	366/1465	4.50	3.94	4.12	4.25	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	151/1434	4.80	4.17	4.14	4.35	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	690/1547	4.40	4.36	4.19	4.24	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.75	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	395/1554	4.50	3.97	4.10	4.18	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	995/1488	4.40	4.40	4.47	4.52	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	810/1493	4.80	4.66	4.73	4.80	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	561/1486	4.60	4.16	4.32	4.37	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.13	4.32	4.38	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	533/1277	4.25	3.84	4.03	4.08	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	603/1279	4.33	4.15	4.17	4.34	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.40	4.35	4.53	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.28	4.35	4.55	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 640 0101  
 Title COMPUTATIONAL PHYSICS  
 Instructor: LARY, DAVID J.  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1264  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	471/1576	4.63	4.38	4.30	4.43	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	324/1576	4.71	4.18	4.27	4.32	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.36	4.32	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	339/1520	4.67	4.21	4.25	4.36	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	290/1465	4.63	3.94	4.12	4.25	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	524/1434	4.40	4.17	4.14	4.35	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	280/1547	4.71	4.36	4.19	4.24	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	832/1574	4.71	4.75	4.64	4.75	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	532/1554	4.40	3.97	4.10	4.18	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.40	4.47	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.66	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.16	4.32	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	251/1489	4.86	4.13	4.32	4.38	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.84	4.03	4.08	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1279	4.75	4.15	4.17	4.34	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.40	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.28	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.41	4.05	4.11	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	3.70	4.23	4.36	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.15	4.35	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.62	4.51	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.29	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.10	4.20	4.37	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 650 0124  
 Title SPECIAL TOPICS  
 Instructor: MARTINS, JOSE  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1265  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	203/1576	4.86	4.38	4.30	4.43	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	187/1576	4.86	4.18	4.27	4.32	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.36	4.32	4.38	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	167/1520	4.86	4.21	4.25	4.36	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	322/1465	4.57	3.94	4.12	4.25	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.17	4.14	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	154/1547	4.86	4.36	4.19	4.24	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.75	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1554	5.00	3.97	4.10	4.18	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.40	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.66	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.16	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.13	4.32	4.38	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	215/1277	4.67	3.84	4.03	4.08	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.15	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.40	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.28	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	129/ 878	4.80	4.41	4.05	4.11	4.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 234	5.00	3.70	4.23	4.36	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	36/ 240	4.86	4.15	4.35	4.37	4.86	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	48/ 229	4.83	4.62	4.51	4.51	4.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 232	5.00	4.10	4.29	4.47	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	99/ 379	4.43	4.10	4.20	4.37	4.43	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.79	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.77	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	39/ 72	4.75	4.63	4.64	4.70	4.75	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	36/ 80	4.75	4.75	4.61	4.70	4.75	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	176/ 375	4.25	4.25	4.01	4.10	4.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	37/ 52	4.50	4.50	4.48	4.40	4.50	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	33/ 48	4.33	4.33	4.40	4.76	4.33	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	30/ 44	4.83	4.83	4.73	4.88	4.83	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.65	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	135/ 326	4.83	4.83	4.03	4.10	4.83	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.50	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.80	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.33	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.75	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.13	****	

Course-Section: PHYS 650 0124  
 Title SPECIAL TOPICS  
 Instructor: MARTINS, JOSE  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1265  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	4	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	3	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: PHYS 701 0101  
 Title QUANTUM MECHANICS II  
 Instructor: FRANSON, JAMES  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1266  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	818/1576	4.38	4.38	4.30	4.43	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	798/1576	4.38	4.18	4.27	4.32	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	735/1342	4.38	4.36	4.32	4.38	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	826/1520	4.29	4.21	4.25	4.36	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1218/1465	3.57	3.94	4.12	4.25	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	345/1434	4.57	4.17	4.14	4.35	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	339/1547	4.67	4.36	4.19	4.24	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1302/1574	4.29	4.75	4.64	4.75	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	924/1554	4.00	3.97	4.10	4.18	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	505/1488	4.75	4.40	4.47	4.52	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	632/1493	4.88	4.66	4.73	4.80	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.16	4.32	4.37	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	434/1489	4.71	4.13	4.32	4.38	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.84	4.03	4.08	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	335/1279	4.67	4.15	4.17	4.34	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.40	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	353/1269	4.83	4.28	4.35	4.55	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.41	4.05	4.11	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 705 0101  
 Title MATHEMATICAL PHYS II  
 Instructor: ROUS, PHILIP  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1267  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	568/1576	4.56	4.38	4.30	4.43	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.18	4.27	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	455/1342	4.63	4.36	4.32	4.38	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.21	4.25	4.36	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	537/1465	4.38	3.94	4.12	4.25	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	345/1434	4.57	4.17	4.14	4.35	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	238/1547	4.75	4.36	4.19	4.24	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1262/1574	4.33	4.75	4.64	4.75	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	263/1554	4.67	3.97	4.10	4.18	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	278/1488	4.89	4.40	4.47	4.52	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1053/1493	4.67	4.66	4.73	4.80	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.16	4.32	4.37	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	350/1489	4.78	4.13	4.32	4.38	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1219/1277	2.67	3.84	4.03	4.08	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.15	4.17	4.34	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	736/1270	4.40	4.40	4.35	4.53	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	728/1269	4.40	4.28	4.35	4.55	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 878	****	4.41	4.05	4.11	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.15	4.35	4.37	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.50	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.80	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.33	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.75	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

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