

Course-Section: PHYS 101 0101
 Title IDEAS IN MODERN PHYSIC
 Instructor: SINSKY, JOEL
 Enrollment: 105
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1173
 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	1	0	1	1	1	7	13	4.30	826/1504	4.30	4.19	4.27	4.13	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	6	16	4.57	426/1503	4.57	4.03	4.20	4.16	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	1	20	4.74	270/1290	4.74	4.09	4.28	4.19	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	563/1453	4.43	4.03	4.21	4.11	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	3	4	12	4.09	685/1421	4.09	3.76	4.00	3.91	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	105/1365	4.83	3.94	4.08	3.96	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	6	15	4.52	433/1485	4.52	3.98	4.16	4.13	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	726/1504	4.86	4.86	4.69	4.66	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	1	13	6	4.10	798/1483	4.10	3.96	4.06	3.97	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	0	5	16	4.48	818/1425	4.48	4.44	4.41	4.36	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	0	22	4.87	596/1426	4.87	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	4	17	4.57	501/1418	4.57	4.11	4.25	4.20	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	1	3	16	4.45	688/1416	4.45	4.07	4.26	4.21	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	0	8	11	4.29	471/1199	4.29	3.63	3.97	3.82	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	4	1	8	3.93	784/1312	3.93	3.58	4.00	3.69	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	1	2	9	4.21	821/1303	4.21	3.90	4.24	3.93	4.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	445/1299	4.67	3.93	4.25	3.94	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	9	12	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 758	****	4.53	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 105 0101
 Title IDEAS IN ASTRONOMY
 Instructor: Turner, Jane
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1174
 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	5	9	4.44	654/1504	4.44	4.19	4.27	4.13	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	5	4.06	1014/1503	4.06	4.03	4.20	4.16	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	5	8	4.19	839/1290	4.19	4.09	4.28	4.19	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	844/1453	4.20	4.03	4.21	4.11	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	7	7	4.33	479/1421	4.33	3.76	4.00	3.91	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	3	6	4	3.86	935/1365	3.86	3.94	4.08	3.96	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	727/1485	4.29	3.98	4.16	4.13	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	916/1504	4.73	4.86	4.69	4.66	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	947/1483	3.93	3.96	4.06	3.97	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	541/1425	4.69	4.44	4.41	4.36	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	940/1426	4.69	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	736/1418	4.38	4.11	4.25	4.20	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	714/1416	4.44	4.07	4.26	4.21	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	394/1199	4.38	3.63	3.97	3.82	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	682/1312	4.11	3.58	4.00	3.69	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1076/1303	3.67	3.90	4.24	3.93	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1047/1299	3.78	3.93	4.25	3.94	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	7	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 758	****	4.53	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.13	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 244	****	4.15	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 227	****	4.50	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.55	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 207	****	4.31	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 76	****	4.67	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	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	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: PHYS 105 0101
 Title IDEAS IN ASTRONOMY
 Instructor: Turner, Jane
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1174
 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	6	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0101
 Title BASIC PHYSICS I
 Instructor: ROGERS, RAYMOND
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1175
 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	2	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1302/1504	3.84	4.19	4.27	4.13	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	910/1503	4.27	4.03	4.20	4.16	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	937/1290	4.01	4.09	4.28	4.19	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	844/1453	3.98	4.03	4.21	4.11	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	745/1421	3.83	3.76	4.00	3.91	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	782/1365	3.96	3.94	4.08	3.96	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	200/1485	4.37	3.98	4.16	4.13	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	830/1504	4.89	4.86	4.69	4.66	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	457/1483	4.16	3.96	4.06	3.97	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1425	4.26	4.44	4.41	4.36	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1426	4.53	4.67	4.69	4.56	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1418	4.09	4.11	4.25	4.20	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1416	3.96	4.07	4.26	4.21	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1312	3.61	3.58	4.00	3.69	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1303	3.39	3.90	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1299	4.33	3.93	4.25	3.94	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	4.50	4.53	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	102/ 233	4.05	4.13	4.09	3.90	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	53/ 244	4.38	4.15	4.09	4.07	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 227	4.83	4.50	4.40	4.24	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 225	4.72	4.55	4.23	4.01	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 207	4.59	4.31	4.09	4.01	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0101
 Title BASIC PHYSICS I
 Instructor: DYMSKI TERRANCE
 Enrollment: 122
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1176
 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	3	0	0	7	16	11	4	3.32	1407/1504	3.84	4.19	4.27	4.13	3.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	6	12	13	6	3.45	1331/1503	4.27	4.03	4.20	4.16	3.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	4	9	13	12	3.87	1038/1290	4.01	4.09	4.28	4.19	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	10	2	2	9	11	4	3.46	1302/1453	3.98	4.03	4.21	4.11	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	6	4	3	13	7	4	3.13	1283/1421	3.83	3.76	4.00	3.91	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	11	4	0	15	5	2	3.04	1292/1365	3.96	3.94	4.08	3.96	3.04
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	0	7	13	16	4.16	866/1485	4.37	3.98	4.16	4.13	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	0	37	5.00	1/1504	4.89	4.86	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	2	7	10	12	1	3.09	1370/1483	4.16	3.96	4.06	3.97	3.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	3	11	9	13	3.89	1227/1425	4.26	4.44	4.41	4.36	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	6	12	16	4.20	1290/1426	4.53	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	5	11	12	5	3.37	1287/1418	4.09	4.11	4.25	4.20	3.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	2	3	10	13	7	3.57	1225/1416	3.96	4.07	4.26	4.21	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	18	5	4	4	5	1	2.63	1129/1199	3.32	3.63	3.97	3.82	2.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	3	1	4	1	2	2.82	1198/1312	3.61	3.58	4.00	3.69	2.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	5	1	1	3	1	2.45	1248/1303	3.39	3.90	4.24	3.93	2.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	2	1	2	3	2	3.20	****/1299	4.33	3.93	4.25	3.94	****
4. Were special techniques successful	30	10	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 758	4.50	4.53	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	4	0	7	12	4	3.44	198/ 233	4.05	4.13	4.09	3.90	3.44
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	1	9	5	11	3.89	165/ 244	4.38	4.15	4.09	4.07	3.89
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	4	5	18	4.52	122/ 227	4.83	4.50	4.40	4.24	4.52
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	1	1	5	4	16	4.22	140/ 225	4.72	4.55	4.23	4.01	4.22
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	2	1	5	6	12	3.96	116/ 207	4.59	4.31	4.09	4.01	3.96
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	2	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	2	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.67	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	1	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0101
 Title BASIC PHYSICS I
 Instructor: DYMSKI TERRANCE
 Enrollment: 122
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1176
 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	1	A	12	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C	15	General	0	Under-grad	40	Non-major	41
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	32				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0102
 Title BASIC PHYSICS I
 Instructor: LEAHY-HOPPA, ME
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1177
 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	9	6	2	3.50	1353/1504	3.84	4.19	4.27	4.13	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	10	2	3.78	1197/1503	4.27	4.03	4.20	4.16	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1091/1290	4.01	4.09	4.28	4.19	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	2	5	4	3	3.40	1333/1453	3.98	4.03	4.21	4.11	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	5	4	4	3	3.31	1217/1421	3.83	3.76	4.00	3.91	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	3	5	4	4	3.56	1123/1365	3.96	3.94	4.08	3.96	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	7	2	9	4.11	926/1485	4.37	3.98	4.16	4.13	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	983/1504	4.89	4.86	4.69	4.66	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	9	5	0	3.36	1295/1483	4.16	3.96	4.06	3.97	3.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	8	7	4.22	1057/1425	4.26	4.44	4.41	4.36	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	5	8	5	4.00	1319/1426	4.53	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	12	2	3.89	1106/1418	4.09	4.11	4.25	4.20	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	3	4	6	3.56	1232/1416	3.96	4.07	4.26	4.21	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	919/1199	3.32	3.63	3.97	3.82	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1312	3.61	3.58	4.00	3.69	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1303	3.39	3.90	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1299	4.33	3.93	4.25	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	2	6	3	4	3.44	199/ 233	4.05	4.13	4.09	3.90	3.44
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	7	3	5	3.75	183/ 244	4.38	4.15	4.09	4.07	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	46/ 227	4.83	4.50	4.40	4.24	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	78/ 225	4.72	4.55	4.23	4.01	4.69
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	1	3	4	7	3.94	124/ 207	4.59	4.31	4.09	4.01	3.94

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	2	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 18	Non-major 18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	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 15		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0103
 Title BASIC PHYSICS I
 Instructor: HACKLEY, JUSTIN
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1178
 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	1	0	0	0	5	1	3	3.78	1257/1504	3.84	4.19	4.27	4.13	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	200/1503	4.27	4.03	4.20	4.16	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	507/1290	4.01	4.09	4.28	4.19	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	532/1453	3.98	4.03	4.21	4.11	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	392/1421	3.83	3.76	4.00	3.91	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	187/1365	3.96	3.94	4.08	3.96	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	795/1485	4.37	3.98	4.16	4.13	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	4.89	4.86	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	211/1483	4.16	3.96	4.06	3.97	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1165/1425	4.26	4.44	4.41	4.36	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	967/1426	4.53	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1013/1418	4.09	4.11	4.25	4.20	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1199/1416	3.96	4.07	4.26	4.21	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/1199	3.32	3.63	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1312	3.61	3.58	4.00	3.69	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1303	3.39	3.90	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1299	4.33	3.93	4.25	3.94	****
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	4.50	4.53	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	143/ 233	4.05	4.13	4.09	3.90	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	24/ 244	4.38	4.15	4.09	4.07	4.86
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	50/ 227	4.83	4.50	4.40	4.24	4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	72/ 225	4.72	4.55	4.23	4.01	4.71
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	42/ 207	4.59	4.31	4.09	4.01	4.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	1	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0105
 Title BASIC PHYSICS I
 Instructor: CARTER, FRANCES
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1179
 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	4	4.20	962/1504	3.84	4.19	4.27	4.13	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	279/1503	4.27	4.03	4.20	4.16	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	937/1290	4.01	4.09	4.28	4.19	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	810/1453	3.98	4.03	4.21	4.11	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	548/1421	3.83	3.76	4.00	3.91	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	451/1365	3.96	3.94	4.08	3.96	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	591/1485	4.37	3.98	4.16	4.13	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	4.89	4.86	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	149/1483	4.16	3.96	4.06	3.97	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	900/1425	4.26	4.44	4.41	4.36	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	4.53	4.67	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	709/1418	4.09	4.11	4.25	4.20	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	921/1416	3.96	4.07	4.26	4.21	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	860/1199	3.32	3.63	3.97	3.82	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	947/1312	3.61	3.58	4.00	3.69	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1303	3.39	3.90	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1299	4.33	3.93	4.25	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	88/ 233	4.05	4.13	4.09	3.90	4.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	64/ 244	4.38	4.15	4.09	4.07	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	41/ 227	4.83	4.50	4.40	4.24	4.90
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 225	4.72	4.55	4.23	4.01	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	19/ 207	4.59	4.31	4.09	4.01	4.90
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.67	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful

9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0105
 Title BASIC PHYSICS I
 Instructor: CARTER, FRANCES
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1179
 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	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 111 0106
 Title BASIC PHYSICS I
 Instructor: MOORE, ERIC
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1180
 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	0	3	4	4.57	455/1504	3.84	4.19	4.27	4.13	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	258/1503	4.27	4.03	4.20	4.16	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	937/1290	4.01	4.09	4.28	4.19	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	901/1453	3.98	4.03	4.21	4.11	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	903/1421	3.83	3.76	4.00	3.91	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	690/1365	3.96	3.94	4.08	3.96	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	380/1485	4.37	3.98	4.16	4.13	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	743/1504	4.89	4.86	4.69	4.66	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	211/1483	4.16	3.96	4.06	3.97	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	331/1425	4.26	4.44	4.41	4.36	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	738/1426	4.53	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	191/1418	4.09	4.11	4.25	4.20	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	255/1416	3.96	4.07	4.26	4.21	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	919/1199	3.32	3.63	3.97	3.82	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	530/1312	3.61	3.58	4.00	3.69	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	737/1303	3.39	3.90	4.24	3.93	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	741/1299	4.33	3.93	4.25	3.94	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	4.53	4.01	3.80	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	47/ 233	4.05	4.13	4.09	3.90	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	83/ 244	4.38	4.15	4.09	4.07	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	53/ 227	4.83	4.50	4.40	4.24	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	81/ 225	4.72	4.55	4.23	4.01	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 207	4.59	4.31	4.09	4.01	5.00

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	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
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	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 112 0101
 Title BASIC PHYSICS II
 Instructor: DYMSKI, TERRANC (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 162
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1181
 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	4	0	2	7	18	19	11	3.53	1346/1504	3.53	4.19	4.27	4.13	3.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	2	5	19	18	13	3.61	1267/1503	3.61	4.03	4.20	4.16	3.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	2	3	17	13	22	3.88	1034/1290	3.88	4.09	4.28	4.19	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	19	2	5	12	10	8	3.46	1307/1453	3.46	4.03	4.21	4.11	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	9	6	9	15	8	10	3.15	1276/1421	3.15	3.76	4.00	3.91	3.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	19	5	8	11	6	6	3.00	1296/1365	3.00	3.94	4.08	3.96	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	8	12	37	4.51	455/1485	4.51	3.98	4.16	4.13	4.51
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	2	8	46	4.79	854/1504	4.79	4.86	4.69	4.66	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	2	6	24	13	5	3.26	1324/1483	3.65	3.96	4.06	3.97	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	4	1	13	16	23	3.93	1211/1425	4.16	4.44	4.41	4.36	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	2	2	10	12	31	4.19	1290/1426	4.30	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	3	7	20	12	14	3.48	1256/1418	3.84	4.11	4.25	4.20	3.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	7	12	14	18	3.59	1222/1416	3.79	4.07	4.26	4.21	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	37	3	1	5	2	5	3.31	993/1199	3.31	3.63	3.97	3.82	3.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	43	0	6	2	6	2	2	2.56	1240/1312	2.56	3.58	4.00	3.69	2.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	5	0	9	0	4	2.89	1224/1303	2.89	3.90	4.24	3.93	2.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	43	0	5	1	7	2	3	2.83	1223/1299	2.83	3.93	4.25	3.94	2.83
4. Were special techniques successful	45	12	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	****/ 758	****	4.53	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	5	8	4	19	8	3.39	204/ 233	3.39	4.13	4.09	3.90	3.39
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	3	7	14	12	8	3.34	213/ 244	3.34	4.15	4.09	4.07	3.34
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	5	8	12	12	7	3.18	213/ 227	3.18	4.50	4.40	4.24	3.18
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	3	0	8	10	23	4.14	149/ 225	4.14	4.55	4.23	4.01	4.14
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	2	4	9	12	17	3.86	137/ 207	3.86	4.31	4.09	4.01	3.86
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	56	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	56	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	1	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	56	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 76	****	4.67	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	57	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	57	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	57	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	57	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	1	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: PHYS 112 0101
 Title BASIC PHYSICS II
 Instructor: DYMSKI, TERRANC (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 162
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1181
 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	1	A	27	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	6	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	61	Non-major	61
84-150	19	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	50				
				?	3						

Course-Section: PHYS 112 0101
 Title BASIC PHYSICS II
 Instructor: WICKS, DEBRA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 162
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1182
 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	4	0	2	7	18	19	11	3.53	1346/1504	3.53	4.19	4.27	4.13	3.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	2	5	19	18	13	3.61	1267/1503	3.61	4.03	4.20	4.16	3.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	2	3	17	13	22	3.88	1034/1290	3.88	4.09	4.28	4.19	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	19	2	5	12	10	8	3.46	1307/1453	3.46	4.03	4.21	4.11	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	9	6	9	15	8	10	3.15	1276/1421	3.15	3.76	4.00	3.91	3.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	19	5	8	11	6	6	3.00	1296/1365	3.00	3.94	4.08	3.96	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	8	12	37	4.51	455/1485	4.51	3.98	4.16	4.13	4.51
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	2	8	46	4.79	854/1504	4.79	4.86	4.69	4.66	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	34	1	0	0	5	15	6	4.04	832/1483	3.65	3.96	4.06	3.97	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	40	0	0	0	1	11	9	4.38	920/1425	4.16	4.44	4.41	4.36	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	41	0	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	1197/1426	4.30	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	41	0	0	0	3	10	7	4.20	905/1418	3.84	4.11	4.25	4.20	3.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	2	4	6	8	4.00	1029/1416	3.79	4.07	4.26	4.21	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	43	14	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1199	3.31	3.63	3.97	3.82	3.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	43	0	6	2	6	2	2	2.56	1240/1312	2.56	3.58	4.00	3.69	2.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	5	0	9	0	4	2.89	1224/1303	2.89	3.90	4.24	3.93	2.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	43	0	5	1	7	2	3	2.83	1223/1299	2.83	3.93	4.25	3.94	2.83
4. Were special techniques successful	45	12	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	****/ 758	****	4.53	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	5	8	4	19	8	3.39	204/ 233	3.39	4.13	4.09	3.90	3.39
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	3	7	14	12	8	3.34	213/ 244	3.34	4.15	4.09	4.07	3.34
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	5	8	12	12	7	3.18	213/ 227	3.18	4.50	4.40	4.24	3.18
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	3	0	8	10	23	4.14	149/ 225	4.14	4.55	4.23	4.01	4.14
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	2	4	9	12	17	3.86	137/ 207	3.86	4.31	4.09	4.01	3.86
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	56	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	56	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	1	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	56	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 76	****	4.67	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	57	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	57	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	57	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	57	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	1	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: PHYS 112 0101
 Title BASIC PHYSICS II
 Instructor: WICKS, DEBRA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 162
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1182
 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	1	A	27	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	6	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	61	Non-major	61
84-150	19	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	50				
				?	3						

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0101
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I
 Instructor: WORCHESKY, TERR (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 208
 Questionnaires: 162

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1183
 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	2	0	0	3	13	30	114	4.59	429/1504	4.59	4.19	4.27	4.13	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	1	8	36	113	4.63	357/1503	4.63	4.03	4.20	4.16	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	13	36	108	4.55	459/1290	4.55	4.09	4.28	4.19	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	43	0	2	12	31	71	4.47	486/1453	4.47	4.03	4.21	4.11	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	25	3	8	21	39	63	4.13	660/1421	4.13	3.76	4.00	3.91	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	54	2	3	16	29	54	4.25	581/1365	4.25	3.94	4.08	3.96	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	5	20	43	90	4.38	625/1485	4.38	3.98	4.16	4.13	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	4	155	4.97	197/1504	4.97	4.86	4.69	4.66	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	6	2	1	5	19	113	4.71	173/1483	4.11	3.96	4.06	3.97	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	13	143	4.88	209/1425	4.26	4.44	4.41	4.36	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	6	150	4.94	351/1426	4.62	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	4	32	120	4.73	303/1418	4.09	4.11	4.25	4.20	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	10	24	120	4.62	511/1416	3.91	4.07	4.26	4.21	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	58	9	7	12	18	47	3.94	714/1199	3.94	3.63	3.97	3.82	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	16	16	39	32	47	3.52	1004/1312	3.52	3.58	4.00	3.69	3.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	3	5	23	37	81	4.26	789/1303	4.26	3.90	4.24	3.93	4.26
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	9	13	21	38	64	3.93	973/1299	3.93	3.93	4.25	3.94	3.93
4. Were special techniques successful	13	55	8	6	17	22	41	3.87	478/ 758	3.87	4.53	4.01	3.80	3.87
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	154	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 233	****	4.13	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	157	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 244	****	4.15	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	157	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 227	****	4.50	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	156	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/ 225	****	4.55	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	157	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 207	****	4.31	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	156	1	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	158	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	159	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	159	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.67	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	159	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	160	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	161	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	160	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	161	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	159	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	160	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	160	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	160	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	159	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	159	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0101
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I
 Instructor: WORCHESKY, TERR (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 208
 Questionnaires: 162

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1183
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	28	0.00-0.99	3	A	45	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	52	1.00-1.99	3	B	65						
56-83	16	2.00-2.99	17	C	32	General	5	Under-grad	162	Non-major	153
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	35	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	51	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	142				
				?	8						

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0101
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I
 Instructor: LOHEN, JACOB (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 208
 Questionnaires: 162

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1184
 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	2	0	0	3	13	30	114	4.59	429/1504	4.59	4.19	4.27	4.13	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	1	8	36	113	4.63	357/1503	4.63	4.03	4.20	4.16	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	13	36	108	4.55	459/1290	4.55	4.09	4.28	4.19	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	43	0	2	12	31	71	4.47	486/1453	4.47	4.03	4.21	4.11	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	25	3	8	21	39	63	4.13	660/1421	4.13	3.76	4.00	3.91	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	54	2	3	16	29	54	4.25	581/1365	4.25	3.94	4.08	3.96	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	5	20	43	90	4.38	625/1485	4.38	3.98	4.16	4.13	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	4	155	4.97	197/1504	4.97	4.86	4.69	4.66	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	88	9	0	4	29	27	5	3.51	1233/1483	4.11	3.96	4.06	3.97	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	107	0	5	1	17	18	14	3.64	1284/1425	4.26	4.44	4.41	4.36	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	107	0	3	1	4	15	32	4.31	1248/1426	4.62	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	108	0	5	9	11	15	14	3.44	1269/1418	4.09	4.11	4.25	4.20	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	109	3	7	8	12	14	9	3.20	1304/1416	3.91	4.07	4.26	4.21	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	106	41	4	1	2	3	5	3.27	****/1199	3.94	3.63	3.97	3.82	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	16	16	39	32	47	3.52	1004/1312	3.52	3.58	4.00	3.69	3.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	3	5	23	37	81	4.26	789/1303	4.26	3.90	4.24	3.93	4.26
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	9	13	21	38	64	3.93	973/1299	3.93	3.93	4.25	3.94	3.93
4. Were special techniques successful	13	55	8	6	17	22	41	3.87	478/ 758	3.87	4.53	4.01	3.80	3.87
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	154	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 233	****	4.13	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	157	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 244	****	4.15	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	157	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 227	****	4.50	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	156	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/ 225	****	4.55	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	157	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 207	****	4.31	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	156	1	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	158	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	159	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	159	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.67	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	159	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	160	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	161	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	160	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	161	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	159	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	160	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	160	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	160	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	159	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	159	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: PHYS 121 0101
 Title INTRODUCTION PHYSICS I
 Instructor: LOHEN, JACOB (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 208
 Questionnaires: 162

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1184
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	28	0.00-0.99	3	A	45	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	52	1.00-1.99	3	B	65						
56-83	16	2.00-2.99	17	C	32	General	5	Under-grad	162	Non-major	153
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	35	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	51	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	142				
				?	8						

Course-Section: PHYS 122 0101
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I
 Instructor: KRAMER, IVAN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 127
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1185
 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	6	6	10	21	3.93	1163/1504	3.93	4.19	4.27	4.13	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	8	8	15	10	3.42	1340/1503	3.42	4.03	4.20	4.16	3.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	7	11	12	14	3.69	1102/1290	3.69	4.09	4.28	4.19	3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	30	0	4	4	1	6	3.60	1253/1453	3.60	4.03	4.21	4.11	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	4	10	13	14	3.90	863/1421	3.90	3.76	4.00	3.91	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	35	1	2	2	2	3	3.40	****/1365	****	3.94	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	7	8	11	13	3.40	1312/1485	3.40	3.98	4.16	4.13	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	43	4.96	329/1504	4.96	4.86	4.69	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	4	7	9	10	12	3.45	1254/1483	3.50	3.96	4.06	3.97	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	7	13	22	4.18	1088/1425	3.90	4.44	4.41	4.36	3.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	3	8	33	4.62	1022/1426	4.35	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	5	5	9	18	8	3.42	1275/1418	3.33	4.11	4.25	4.20	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	5	4	13	17	3.67	1199/1416	3.46	4.07	4.26	4.21	3.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	36	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	****/1199	****	3.63	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	4	14	5	12	3.38	1059/1312	3.38	3.58	4.00	3.69	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	5	4	9	6	15	3.56	1106/1303	3.56	3.90	4.24	3.93	3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	6	9	6	15	3.62	1089/1299	3.62	3.93	4.25	3.94	3.62
4. Were special techniques successful	5	37	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 758	****	4.53	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 233	****	4.13	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 244	****	4.15	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	42	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 227	****	4.50	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 225	****	4.55	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.31	4.09	4.01	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	0	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	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	B	12						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	6	C	18	General	1	Under-grad	45	Non-major	35
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	12	D	3						
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	39				
				?	6						

Course-Section: PHYS 122 0101
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I
 Instructor: WINGERT, BRIAN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 127
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1186
 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	6	6	10	21	3.93	1163/1504	3.93	4.19	4.27	4.13	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	8	8	15	10	3.42	1340/1503	3.42	4.03	4.20	4.16	3.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	7	11	12	14	3.69	1102/1290	3.69	4.09	4.28	4.19	3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	30	0	4	4	1	6	3.60	1253/1453	3.60	4.03	4.21	4.11	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	4	10	13	14	3.90	863/1421	3.90	3.76	4.00	3.91	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	35	1	2	2	2	3	3.40	****/1365	****	3.94	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	7	8	11	13	3.40	1312/1485	3.40	3.98	4.16	4.13	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	43	4.96	329/1504	4.96	4.86	4.69	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	11	0	2	3	3	4	3.75	1123/1483	3.50	3.96	4.06	3.97	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	36	0	0	3	3	1	2	3.22	****/1425	3.90	4.44	4.41	4.36	3.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	37	0	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	****/1426	4.35	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	37	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	****/1418	3.33	4.11	4.25	4.20	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	38	2	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/1416	3.46	4.07	4.26	4.21	3.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	4	14	5	12	3.38	1059/1312	3.38	3.58	4.00	3.69	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	5	4	9	6	15	3.56	1106/1303	3.56	3.90	4.24	3.93	3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	6	9	6	15	3.62	1089/1299	3.62	3.93	4.25	3.94	3.62
4. Were special techniques successful	5	37	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 758	****	4.53	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 233	****	4.13	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 244	****	4.15	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	42	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 227	****	4.50	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 225	****	4.55	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.31	4.09	4.01	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	0	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	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	B	12						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	6	C	18	General	1	Under-grad	45	Non-major	35
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	12	D	3						
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	39				
				?	6						

Course-Section: PHYS 122 0101
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I
 Instructor: BUNCH, ANDREW (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 127
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1187
 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	6	6	10	21	3.93	1163/1504	3.93	4.19	4.27	4.13	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	8	8	15	10	3.42	1340/1503	3.42	4.03	4.20	4.16	3.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	7	11	12	14	3.69	1102/1290	3.69	4.09	4.28	4.19	3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	30	0	4	4	1	6	3.60	1253/1453	3.60	4.03	4.21	4.11	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	4	10	13	14	3.90	863/1421	3.90	3.76	4.00	3.91	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	35	1	2	2	2	3	3.40	****/1365	****	3.94	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	7	8	11	13	3.40	1312/1485	3.40	3.98	4.16	4.13	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	43	4.96	329/1504	4.96	4.86	4.69	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	7	1	2	9	6	2	3.30	1314/1483	3.50	3.96	4.06	3.97	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	32	0	0	2	3	6	2	3.62	1288/1425	3.90	4.44	4.41	4.36	3.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	32	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1312/1426	4.35	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	32	0	1	2	5	3	2	3.23	1310/1418	3.33	4.11	4.25	4.20	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	32	1	1	2	4	3	2	3.25	1295/1416	3.46	4.07	4.26	4.21	3.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	4	14	5	12	3.38	1059/1312	3.38	3.58	4.00	3.69	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	5	4	9	6	15	3.56	1106/1303	3.56	3.90	4.24	3.93	3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	6	9	6	15	3.62	1089/1299	3.62	3.93	4.25	3.94	3.62
4. Were special techniques successful	5	37	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 758	****	4.53	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 233	****	4.13	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 244	****	4.15	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	42	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 227	****	4.50	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 225	****	4.55	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.31	4.09	4.01	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	0	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	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 1	B 12						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 6	C 18	General	1	Under-grad	45	Non-major	35
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 12	D 3						
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	39				
			? 6						

Course-Section: PHYS 224 0101
 Title INTRODUCTORY PHYSICS I
 Instructor: GOUGOUSI, THEOD
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1188
 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	3	6	4.27	864/1504	4.27	4.19	4.27	4.26	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	919/1503	4.18	4.03	4.20	4.18	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	766/1290	4.27	4.09	4.28	4.27	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.03	4.21	4.20	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	6	1	3.45	1144/1421	3.45	3.76	4.00	3.90	3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1241/1365	3.29	3.94	4.08	4.00	3.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	842/1485	4.18	3.98	4.16	4.15	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	989/1483	3.91	3.96	4.06	4.02	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	736/1425	4.55	4.44	4.41	4.40	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	502/1426	4.91	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	7	1	3.73	1177/1418	3.73	4.11	4.25	4.22	3.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1099/1416	3.91	4.07	4.26	4.24	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	4	4	1	3.27	1003/1199	3.27	3.63	3.97	3.95	3.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	1247/1312	2.50	3.58	4.00	3.98	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	796/1303	4.25	3.90	4.24	4.23	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	922/1299	4.00	3.93	4.25	4.21	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	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	12	Non-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 303 0101
 Title THERMAL/STATISTICAL PH
 Instructor: HAYDEN, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1189
 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	1	3	8	4.58	442/1504	4.58	4.19	4.27	4.27	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	751/1503	4.33	4.03	4.20	4.22	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	628/1290	4.42	4.09	4.28	4.31	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.03	4.21	4.23	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	5	2	3.75	967/1421	3.75	3.76	4.00	4.01	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	947/1365	3.83	3.94	4.08	4.08	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	670/1485	4.33	3.98	4.16	4.17	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	613/1483	4.27	3.96	4.06	4.08	4.27

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	161/1425	4.92	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	825/1426	4.75	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	848/1418	4.25	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.07	4.26	4.27	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1050/1199	3.00	3.63	3.97	4.02	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	9

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHYS 315 0101
 Title GALAXIES & INTERSTELLA
 Instructor: DAVIS, DAVID
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1190
 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	0	2	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	0	0	3	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.03	4.20	4.22	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	937/1290	4.00	4.09	4.28	4.31	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	745/1421	4.00	3.76	4.00	4.01	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1296/1365	3.00	3.94	4.08	4.08	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1485	5.00	3.98	4.16	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	850/1483	4.00	3.96	4.06	4.08	4.00

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.44	4.41	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.11	4.25	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	446/1416	4.67	4.07	4.26	4.27	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1199	5.00	3.63	3.97	4.02	5.00

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1312	5.00	3.58	4.00	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1195/1303	3.00	3.90	4.24	4.27	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1194/1299	3.00	3.93	4.25	4.30	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 324 0101
 Title MODERN PHYSICS
 Instructor: RENO, ROBERT C
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1191
 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	5	10	4.56	469/1504	4.56	4.19	4.27	4.27	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	848/1503	4.25	4.03	4.20	4.22	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	201/1290	4.80	4.09	4.28	4.31	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	112/1453	4.89	4.03	4.21	4.23	4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	3	4	3	3.13	1279/1421	3.13	3.76	4.00	4.01	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	451/1365	4.38	3.94	4.08	4.08	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	200/1485	4.75	3.98	4.16	4.17	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	708/1504	4.88	4.86	4.69	4.65	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	518/1483	4.36	3.96	4.06	4.08	4.36

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	239/1425	4.87	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	351/1426	4.93	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	539/1418	4.53	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	255/1416	4.80	4.07	4.26	4.27	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	3	7	2	3.77	815/1199	3.77	3.63	3.97	4.02	3.77

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1312	****	3.58	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1303	****	3.90	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1299	****	3.93	4.25	4.30	****

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	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHYS 331L 0101
 Title MODERN PHYSICS LAB
 Instructor: TAKACS, LASZLO (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1192
 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	1	0	6	4.71	306/1504	4.71	4.19	4.27	4.27	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	618/1503	4.43	4.03	4.20	4.22	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.09	4.28	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.03	4.21	4.23	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	410/1421	4.40	3.76	4.00	4.01	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	187/1365	4.67	3.94	4.08	4.08	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	455/1485	4.50	3.98	4.16	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	743/1504	4.86	4.86	4.69	4.65	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	338/1483	4.75	3.96	4.06	4.08	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.44	4.41	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	682/1418	4.71	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	845/1416	4.64	4.07	4.26	4.27	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	636/1199	4.17	3.63	3.97	4.02	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	364/1312	4.50	3.58	4.00	4.09	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1303	****	3.90	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1299	****	3.93	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 758	****	4.53	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.13	4.09	4.12	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	64/ 244	4.60	4.15	4.09	4.20	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	59/ 227	4.80	4.50	4.40	4.46	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	51/ 225	4.80	4.55	4.23	4.29	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	50/ 207	4.60	4.31	4.09	4.14	4.60

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

Course-Section: PHYS 331L 0101
 Title MODERN PHYSICS LAB
 Instructor: TAKACS, LASZLO (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1193
 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	0	6	4.71	306/1504	4.71	4.19	4.27	4.27	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	618/1503	4.43	4.03	4.20	4.22	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.09	4.28	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.03	4.21	4.23	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	410/1421	4.40	3.76	4.00	4.01	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	187/1365	4.67	3.94	4.08	4.08	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	455/1485	4.50	3.98	4.16	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	743/1504	4.86	4.86	4.69	4.65	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1483	4.75	3.96	4.06	4.08	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.44	4.41	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1418	4.71	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1416	4.64	4.07	4.26	4.27	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	429/1199	4.17	3.63	3.97	4.02	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	364/1312	4.50	3.58	4.00	4.09	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1303	****	3.90	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1299	****	3.93	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 758	****	4.53	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.13	4.09	4.12	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	64/ 244	4.60	4.15	4.09	4.20	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	59/ 227	4.80	4.50	4.40	4.46	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	51/ 225	4.80	4.55	4.23	4.29	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	50/ 207	4.60	4.31	4.09	4.14	4.60

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

Course-Section: PHYS 340L 0101
 Title ELECTRONICS LAB
 Instructor: MCMILLAN, WALLA
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1194
 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	6	6	4.13	1019/1504	4.13	4.19	4.27	4.27	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	7	0	3.33	1365/1503	3.33	4.03	4.20	4.22	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	8	3	2	3.33	1193/1290	3.33	4.09	4.28	4.31	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	3	4	3.60	1253/1453	3.60	4.03	4.21	4.23	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	5	2	2	0	2.00	1410/1421	2.00	3.76	4.00	4.01	2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	8	4	0	3.23	1254/1365	3.23	3.94	4.08	4.08	3.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	5	4	3	3.47	1295/1485	3.47	3.98	4.16	4.17	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	4	7	1	3.62	1192/1483	3.62	3.96	4.06	4.08	3.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	1111/1425	4.13	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	3	2	9	4.27	1264/1426	4.27	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	6	3	3	3.40	1282/1418	3.40	4.11	4.25	4.26	3.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	6	3	3.67	1199/1416	3.67	4.07	4.26	4.27	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	1	4	3	2	3.36	977/1199	3.36	3.63	3.97	4.02	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	1278/1312	2.25	3.58	4.00	4.09	2.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1047/1303	3.75	3.90	4.24	4.27	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	922/1299	4.00	3.93	4.25	4.30	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 758	****	4.53	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	96/ 233	4.36	4.13	4.09	4.12	4.36
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	6	1	3	3.55	195/ 244	3.55	4.15	4.09	4.20	3.55
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	115/ 227	4.55	4.50	4.40	4.46	4.55
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	169/ 225	3.91	4.55	4.23	4.29	3.91
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	3	1	2	3	2	3.00	196/ 207	3.00	4.31	4.09	4.14	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	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	12				
				?	3						

Course-Section: PHYS 408 0101
 Title OPTICS
 Instructor: RUBIN, MORTON H
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1195
 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	3	2	5	4.20	962/1504	4.20	4.19	4.27	4.33	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	1136/1503	3.90	4.03	4.20	4.18	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	1030/1290	3.89	4.09	4.28	4.32	3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1261/1453	3.57	4.03	4.21	4.22	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1056/1421	3.60	3.76	4.00	4.02	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	4	0	4	4.00	782/1365	4.00	3.94	4.08	4.09	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	3	0	1	3	2.80	1419/1485	2.80	3.98	4.16	4.14	2.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	3	3	3	0	3.00	1379/1483	3.00	3.96	4.06	4.11	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	784/1425	4.50	4.44	4.41	4.38	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	502/1426	4.90	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	2	5	0	3.20	1314/1418	3.20	4.11	4.25	4.25	3.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1216/1416	3.60	4.07	4.26	4.26	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1199	****	3.63	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1149/1312	3.00	3.58	4.00	4.07	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1076/1303	3.67	3.90	4.24	4.34	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1239/1299	2.67	3.93	4.25	4.38	2.67
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.19	****
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 2
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 9
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 4	Other	9

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PHYS 424 0101
 Title INTRO QUANTAM MECHANIC
 Instructor: SPARLING, LYNN
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1196
 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	1	2	7	4.60	416/1504	4.60	4.19	4.27	4.33	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	380/1503	4.60	4.03	4.20	4.18	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.09	4.28	4.32	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	680/1453	4.33	4.03	4.21	4.22	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	596/1421	4.20	3.76	4.00	4.02	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	245/1365	4.57	3.94	4.08	4.09	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	990/1485	4.00	3.98	4.16	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	700/1483	4.20	3.96	4.06	4.11	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	900/1425	4.40	4.44	4.41	4.38	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	926/1426	4.70	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	905/1418	4.20	4.11	4.25	4.25	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1029/1416	4.00	4.07	4.26	4.26	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	894/1199	3.57	3.63	3.97	4.05	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1312	****	3.58	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1303	****	3.90	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1299	****	3.93	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 5		Graduate
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
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
			? 1		

Course-Section: PHYS 602 0101
 Title STATISTICAL MECHANICS
 Instructor: MCCANN, KEVIN
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1197
 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	5	4.50	549/1504	4.50	4.19	4.27	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	1390/1503	3.20	4.03	4.20	4.28	3.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	3	1	3.40	1175/1290	3.40	4.09	4.28	4.36	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	0	2	4	1	3.22	1372/1453	3.22	4.03	4.21	4.34	3.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	679/1421	4.10	3.76	4.00	4.27	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	2	5	0	3.11	1282/1365	3.11	3.94	4.08	4.35	3.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	2	3	0	2.50	1452/1485	2.50	3.98	4.16	4.24	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	8	0	3.89	1009/1483	3.89	3.96	4.06	4.20	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1002/1425	4.30	4.44	4.41	4.51	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1128/1426	4.50	4.67	4.69	4.80	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	981/1418	4.10	4.11	4.25	4.36	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	1099/1416	3.90	4.07	4.26	4.38	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	5	4	0	3.44	946/1199	3.44	3.63	3.97	4.04	3.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	716/1312	4.00	3.58	4.00	4.31	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	910/1303	4.00	3.90	4.24	4.58	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1038/1299	3.80	3.93	4.25	4.56	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	4.53	4.01	4.24	****

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	6	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 604 0101
 Title SOLID STATE I
 Instructor: ROUS, PHILIP
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1198
 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	2	3	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	1	3	1	4.00	1052/1503	4.00	4.03	4.20	4.28	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.09	4.28	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	775/1453	4.25	4.03	4.21	4.34	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	745/1421	4.00	3.76	4.00	4.27	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	297/1365	4.50	3.94	4.08	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1146/1485	3.80	3.98	4.16	4.24	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1411/1504	4.00	4.86	4.69	4.79	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	457/1483	4.40	3.96	4.06	4.20	4.40

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.44	4.41	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	450/1418	4.60	4.11	4.25	4.36	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	525/1416	4.60	4.07	4.26	4.38	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	820/1199	3.75	3.63	3.97	4.04	3.75

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1199
 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	1	4	4	4.33	788/1504	4.33	4.19	4.27	4.44	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	0	3.56	1288/1503	3.56	4.03	4.20	4.28	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1071/1290	3.78	4.09	4.28	4.36	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	3	1	3.44	1312/1453	3.44	4.03	4.21	4.34	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	1162/1421	3.43	3.76	4.00	4.27	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	1241/1365	3.29	3.94	4.08	4.35	3.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	1	2	3.11	1376/1485	3.11	3.98	4.16	4.24	3.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	751/1483	4.14	3.96	4.06	4.20	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	572/1425	4.67	4.44	4.41	4.51	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	967/1426	4.67	4.67	4.69	4.80	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1106/1418	3.89	4.11	4.25	4.36	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	985/1416	4.11	4.07	4.26	4.38	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	3	3	0	3.00	1050/1199	3.00	3.63	3.97	4.04	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	858/1312	3.83	3.58	4.00	4.31	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	910/1303	4.00	3.90	4.24	4.58	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1106/1299	3.50	3.93	4.25	4.56	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	4.53	4.01	4.24	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 610 0101
 Title QUANTUM ELECTRONICS
 Instructor: SHIH, YANHUA
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1200
 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	1	1	2	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	1	2	4.25	848/1503	4.25	4.03	4.20	4.28	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.09	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.03	4.21	4.34	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	548/1421	4.25	3.76	4.00	4.27	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	782/1365	4.00	3.94	4.08	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	455/1485	4.50	3.98	4.16	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	850/1483	4.00	3.96	4.06	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1036/1425	4.25	4.44	4.41	4.51	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	578/1418	4.50	4.11	4.25	4.36	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.07	4.26	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1197/1199	1.00	3.63	3.97	4.04	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1312	5.00	3.58	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1303	5.00	3.90	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1299	5.00	3.93	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.53	4.01	4.24	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 622 0101
 Title ATMOS PHYSICS II
 Instructor: MARTINS, JOSE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1201
 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	1	0	3.33	1403/1504	3.33	4.19	4.27	4.44	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1419/1503	3.00	4.03	4.20	4.28	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1236/1290	3.00	4.09	4.28	4.36	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1229/1453	3.67	4.03	4.21	4.34	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1410/1421	2.00	3.76	4.00	4.27	2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	782/1365	4.00	3.94	4.08	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1469/1485	2.33	3.98	4.16	4.24	2.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1233/1483	3.25	3.96	4.06	4.20	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1278/1425	3.67	4.44	4.41	4.51	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1232/1426	4.33	4.67	4.69	4.80	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1330/1418	3.00	4.11	4.25	4.36	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1362/1416	2.67	4.07	4.26	4.38	2.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1162/1199	2.33	3.63	3.97	4.04	2.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1149/1312	3.00	3.58	4.00	4.31	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	563/1303	4.50	3.90	4.24	4.58	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1299	5.00	3.93	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.53	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 2	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 1	Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 2	Non-major 2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 1			

Course-Section: PHYS 622 0101
 Title ATMOS PHYSICS II
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1202
 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	1	0	3.33	1403/1504	3.33	4.19	4.27	4.44	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1419/1503	3.00	4.03	4.20	4.28	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1236/1290	3.00	4.09	4.28	4.36	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1229/1453	3.67	4.03	4.21	4.34	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1410/1421	2.00	3.76	4.00	4.27	2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	782/1365	4.00	3.94	4.08	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1469/1485	2.33	3.98	4.16	4.24	2.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1379/1483	3.25	3.96	4.06	4.20	3.25

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1149/1312	3.00	3.58	4.00	4.31	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	563/1303	4.50	3.90	4.24	4.58	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1299	5.00	3.93	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.53	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	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PHYS 640 0101
 Title COMPUTATIONAL PHYSICS
 Instructor: Rancic, M
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1203
 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	1	2	1	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	1	2	0	3.25	1381/1503	3.25	4.03	4.20	4.28	3.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1078/1290	3.75	4.09	4.28	4.36	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.03	4.21	4.34	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	967/1421	3.75	3.76	4.00	4.27	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	782/1365	4.00	3.94	4.08	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	990/1485	4.00	3.98	4.16	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1274/1504	4.25	4.86	4.69	4.79	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	3.00	1379/1483	3.00	3.96	4.06	4.20	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1036/1425	4.25	4.44	4.41	4.51	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1268/1426	4.25	4.67	4.69	4.80	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	848/1418	4.25	4.11	4.25	4.36	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1167/1416	3.75	4.07	4.26	4.38	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	429/1199	4.33	3.63	3.97	4.04	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1149/1312	3.00	3.58	4.00	4.31	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	563/1303	4.50	3.90	4.24	4.58	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	570/1299	4.50	3.93	4.25	4.56	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 650 0119
 Title SPECIAL TOPICS
 Instructor: GEORGE, IAN
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1204
 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	1	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	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.03	4.20	4.28	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	3.76	4.00	4.27	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1485	5.00	3.98	4.16	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	5.00	3.96	4.06	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.44	4.41	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.11	4.25	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.07	4.26	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1199	5.00	3.63	3.97	4.04	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PHYS 698 0101
 Title PHYSICS SEMINAR
 Instructor: HOFF, RAYMOND
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1205
 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	1	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	927/1504	4.22	4.19	4.27	4.44	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	2	2	3.44	1331/1503	3.44	4.03	4.20	4.28	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	937/1290	4.00	4.09	4.28	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	1348/1453	3.33	4.03	4.21	4.34	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	4	1	1	3.14	1276/1421	3.14	3.76	4.00	4.27	3.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	4	1	3.33	1225/1365	3.33	3.94	4.08	4.35	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1176/1485	3.75	3.98	4.16	4.24	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	691/1504	4.89	4.86	4.69	4.79	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1197/1483	3.60	3.96	4.06	4.20	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1165/1425	4.00	4.44	4.41	4.51	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	967/1426	4.67	4.67	4.69	4.80	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1418	****	4.11	4.25	4.36	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1416	****	4.07	4.26	4.38	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1199	****	3.63	3.97	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1312	****	3.58	4.00	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1303	****	3.90	4.24	4.58	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1299	****	3.93	4.25	4.56	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	4.53	4.01	4.24	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	39/ 76	4.67	4.67	4.44	4.39	4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.15	****

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	6	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	7						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PHYS 701 0101
 Title QUANTUM MECHANICS II
 Instructor: KRAMER, IVAN
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1206
 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	0	3	0	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	0	1	1	1	4.00	1052/1503	4.00	4.03	4.20	4.28	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	937/1290	4.00	4.09	4.28	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.03	4.21	4.34	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	212/1421	4.67	3.76	4.00	4.27	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1365	5.00	3.94	4.08	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1387/1485	3.00	3.98	4.16	4.24	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1302/1483	3.33	3.96	4.06	4.20	3.33

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	971/1425	4.33	4.44	4.41	4.51	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	967/1426	4.67	4.67	4.69	4.80	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1201/1418	3.67	4.11	4.25	4.36	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1324/1416	3.00	4.07	4.26	4.38	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	3	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 722 0101
 Title: ATMOS REMOTE SENS
 Instructor: HOFF, RAYMOND
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1207
 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	5	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	1	4	4.80	171/1503	4.80	4.03	4.20	4.28	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	642/1290	4.40	4.09	4.28	4.36	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	158/1453	4.80	4.03	4.21	4.34	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	247/1421	4.60	3.76	4.00	4.27	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	420/1365	4.40	3.94	4.08	4.35	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	349/1485	4.60	3.98	4.16	4.24	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1411/1504	4.00	4.86	4.69	4.79	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	149/1483	4.75	3.96	4.06	4.20	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.44	4.41	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	191/1418	4.80	4.11	4.25	4.36	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	255/1416	4.80	4.07	4.26	4.38	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	129/1199	4.75	3.63	3.97	4.04	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	196/1312	4.75	3.58	4.00	4.31	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1303	5.00	3.90	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1299	5.00	3.93	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	4.53	4.01	4.24	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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