

Course Section: STAT 121 0101
 Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S
 Instructor: KLEIN, MARTIN D
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1618
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	0	1	2	9	18	14	3.95	1230/1669	3.84	4.15	4.23	4.02	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	13	15	16	3.96	1164/1666	4.11	4.21	4.19	4.11	3.96	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	2	7	14	20	4.07	946/1421	4.08	4.23	4.24	4.11	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	12	2	1	7	9	14	3.97	1084/1617	4.05	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.97	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	8	6	10	12	3.58	1192/1555	3.50	3.77	4.00	3.92	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	4	3	7	13	5	3.38	1311/1543	3.75	3.93	4.06	3.86	3.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	4	8	12	20	4.02	1032/1647	4.21	4.35	4.12	4.06	4.02	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	1	43	4.98	214/1668	4.82	4.71	4.67	4.62	4.98	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	1	1	16	13	2	3.42	1391/1605	3.66	3.93	4.07	3.96	3.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	1	4	9	25	4.40	955/1514	4.56	4.54	4.39	4.32	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	1	4	13	24	4.35	1299/1551	4.61	4.62	4.66	4.55	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	4	7	15	12	3.85	1193/1503	4.08	4.14	4.24	4.17	3.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	2	1	1	4	11	23	4.35	819/1506	4.21	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	25	2	2	3	6	3	3.38	1009/1311	3.79	3.41	3.85	3.68	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	9	4	13	11	6	3.02	1325/1490	2.96	3.30	4.05	3.85	3.02	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	6	3	18	11	6	3.18	1379/1502	3.43	3.76	4.26	4.06	3.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	3	15	17	6	3.51	1274/1489	3.70	3.84	4.29	4.07	3.51	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	30	4	3	5	0	1	2.31	995/1006	3.20	3.36	4.00	3.81	2.31	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	4	2	1	4	2	0	2.67	****/ 226	****	4.00	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	1	0	5	3	1	3.30	****/ 233	****	3.00	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	1	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	****/ 225	****	4.00	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	1	0	5	2	2	3.40	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	2	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	****/ 206	****	4.00	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	42	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 112	****	2.67	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 98	****	4.50	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	44	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	44	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	44	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	4.67	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	42	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 46	****	4.67	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 33	****	4.00	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: STAT 121 0101
 Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S
 Instructor: KLEIN, MARTIN D
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1618
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 9	General 6	Under-grad 47 Non-major 47
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 7	D 2		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 18	
			? 3		

Course Section: STAT 121 0201
 Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S
 Instructor: KHALATBARI, FAR
 Enrollment: 73
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1619
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	3	5	5	13	9	3.57	1449/1669	3.84	4.15	4.23	4.02	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	4	6	8	15	3.86	1273/1666	4.11	4.21	4.19	4.11	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	4	2	6	8	15	3.80	1118/1421	4.08	4.23	4.24	4.11	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	2	1	6	8	12	3.93	1126/1617	4.05	4.04	4.15	3.99	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	8	4	3	6	7	3.00	1427/1555	3.50	3.77	4.00	3.92	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	3	3	6	8	11	3.68	1190/1543	3.75	3.93	4.06	3.86	3.68	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	0	2	7	24	4.46	566/1647	4.21	4.35	4.12	4.06	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1668	4.82	4.71	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	2	2	8	11	4	3.48	1365/1605	3.66	3.93	4.07	3.96	3.48	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	10	22	4.49	830/1514	4.56	4.54	4.39	4.32	4.49	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	5	27	4.69	1000/1551	4.61	4.62	4.66	4.55	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	4	7	8	15	3.91	1157/1503	4.08	4.14	4.24	4.17	3.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	4	3	8	17	3.91	1163/1506	4.21	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	3	3	7	3	12	3.64	861/1311	3.79	3.41	3.85	3.68	3.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	13	6	5	4	3	2.29	1460/1490	2.96	3.30	4.05	3.85	2.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	7	4	4	7	8	3.17	1382/1502	3.43	3.76	4.26	4.06	3.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	4	4	8	8	6	3.27	1359/1489	3.70	3.84	4.29	4.07	3.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	21	2	3	2	1	1	2.56	****/1006	3.20	3.36	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.00	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	3.00	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.00	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	4.00	4.15	4.01	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	37	Non-major	37
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0						
				?	2						
						Other	24				

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	3	0	1	2	8	6	15	4.00	1173/1669	3.84	4.15	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	4	7	21	4.53	516/1666	4.11	4.21	4.19	4.11	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	2	2	6	21	4.38	710/1421	4.08	4.23	4.24	4.11	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	3	0	2	2	12	13	4.24	811/1617	4.05	4.04	4.15	3.99	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	2	3	0	7	5	14	3.93	889/1555	3.50	3.77	4.00	3.92	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	2	3	13	13	4.19	723/1543	3.75	3.93	4.06	3.86	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	4	1	13	14	4.16	955/1647	4.21	4.35	4.12	4.06	4.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	17	15	4.47	1223/1668	4.82	4.71	4.67	4.62	4.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	4	13	6	4.09	864/1605	3.66	3.93	4.07	3.96	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	4	26	4.81	360/1514	4.56	4.54	4.39	4.32	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	4	26	4.81	788/1551	4.61	4.62	4.66	4.55	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	1	10	19	4.48	588/1503	4.08	4.14	4.24	4.17	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	12	16	4.35	819/1506	4.21	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	4	1	5	19	4.34	381/1311	3.79	3.41	3.85	3.68	4.34	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	2	4	6	11	3.57	1128/1490	2.96	3.30	4.05	3.85	3.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	3	2	7	15	3.93	1085/1502	3.43	3.76	4.26	4.06	3.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	2	2	10	15	4.31	883/1489	3.70	3.84	4.29	4.07	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	1	0	5	7	10	4.09	463/1006	3.20	3.36	4.00	3.81	4.09	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 226	****	4.00	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 233	****	3.00	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 225	****	4.00	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 206	****	4.00	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 112	****	2.67	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 98	****	4.50	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	4.67	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46	****	4.67	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 33	****	4.00	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: STAT 121 0301
 Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S
 Instructor: KEGAN, BONNIE E
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1620
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 4	C 3	General 1	Under-grad 35 Non-major 35
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 19	
			? 1		

Course Section: STAT 350 0101
 Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI
 Instructor: VALLEJOS, RONNY
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1621
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	4	28	4.79	231/1669	4.10	4.15	4.23	4.28	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	27	4.81	173/1666	4.07	4.21	4.19	4.20	4.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	30	4.91	151/1421	4.23	4.23	4.24	4.25	4.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	6	1	2	1	4	17	4.36	684/1617	3.79	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	3	0	5	7	12	3.93	905/1555	3.43	3.77	4.00	4.03	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	1	5	4	13	4.26	649/1543	3.60	3.93	4.06	4.14	4.26	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	27	4.73	241/1647	4.40	4.35	4.12	4.14	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	11	21	4.66	1077/1668	4.60	4.71	4.67	4.68	4.66	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	103/1605	3.83	3.93	4.07	4.09	4.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	30	4.94	132/1514	4.24	4.54	4.39	4.46	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1551	4.25	4.62	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	28	4.82	210/1503	3.87	4.14	4.24	4.28	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	28	4.84	237/1506	4.16	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	25	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	****/1311	1.54	3.41	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	6	1	6	4	9	3.35	1231/1490	3.21	3.30	4.05	4.11	3.35	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	3	5	7	8	3.54	1294/1502	3.74	3.76	4.26	4.28	3.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	1	5	6	10	3.76	1186/1489	3.77	3.84	4.29	4.35	3.76	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	23	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1006	3.14	3.36	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 226	****	4.00	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 233	****	3.00	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.00	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.00	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	2.67	4.38	4.53	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.67	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	4.00	4.25	3.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0
				P	0
				Required for Majors	1
				General	0
				Electives	1
				Graduate	1
				Under-grad	33
				Major	0
				Non-major	34
#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					

I	0	Other	23
?	0		

Course Section: STAT 350 0201
 Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI
 Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI
 Enrollment: 58
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1622
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	8	15	14	4.16	1026/1669	4.10	4.15	4.23	4.28	4.16	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	14	21	4.49	577/1666	4.07	4.21	4.19	4.20	4.49	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	11	24	4.57	502/1421	4.23	4.23	4.24	4.25	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	3	2	7	7	8	3.56	1353/1617	3.79	4.04	4.15	4.22	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	5	4	9	5	9	3.28	1345/1555	3.43	3.77	4.00	4.03	3.28	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	2	3	4	3	5	3.35	1317/1543	3.60	3.93	4.06	4.14	3.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	8	26	4.57	412/1647	4.40	4.35	4.12	4.14	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	32	5	4.14	1457/1668	4.60	4.71	4.67	4.68	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	16	16	4.37	538/1605	3.83	3.93	4.07	4.09	4.37	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	14	21	4.51	787/1514	4.24	4.54	4.39	4.46	4.51	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	11	25	4.65	1055/1551	4.25	4.62	4.66	4.70	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	16	17	4.32	811/1503	3.87	4.14	4.24	4.28	4.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	8	27	4.65	496/1506	4.16	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	31	1	0	0	4	1	3.67	****/1311	1.54	3.41	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	4	11	12	4	3.23	1278/1490	3.21	3.30	4.05	4.11	3.23	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	3	5	12	13	3.89	1129/1502	3.74	3.76	4.26	4.28	3.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	7	11	14	3.97	1064/1489	3.77	3.84	4.29	4.35	3.97	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	21	1	2	6	4	1	3.14	908/1006	3.14	3.36	4.00	4.10	3.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 226	****	4.00	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.50	****/ 233	****	3.00	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.00	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.00	4.15	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	23	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	37	Non-major	37
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
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	30				
				?	1						

Course Section: STAT 350 0301
 Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI
 Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA
 Enrollment: 77
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1623
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	4	4	11	8	8	3.34	1540/1669	4.10	4.15	4.23	4.28	3.34	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	8	10	9	3	2.91	1589/1666	4.07	4.21	4.19	4.20	2.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	8	9	8	7	3.23	1314/1421	4.23	4.23	4.24	4.25	3.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	4	2	6	5	8	3.44	1403/1617	3.79	4.04	4.15	4.22	3.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	6	3	4	7	5	3.08	1415/1555	3.43	3.77	4.00	4.03	3.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	4	4	5	4	6	3.17	1368/1543	3.60	3.93	4.06	4.14	3.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	2	7	5	17	3.91	1149/1647	4.40	4.35	4.12	4.14	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1668	4.60	4.71	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	11	4	13	1	1	2.23	1578/1605	3.83	3.93	4.07	4.09	2.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	6	6	7	3	12	3.26	1429/1514	4.24	4.54	4.39	4.46	3.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	7	6	6	7	8	3.09	1522/1551	4.25	4.62	4.66	4.70	3.09	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	12	5	8	7	2	2.47	1474/1503	3.87	4.14	4.24	4.28	2.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	9	3	9	5	8	3.00	1403/1506	4.16	4.22	4.26	4.30	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	19	9	2	1	1	0	1.54	1289/1311	1.54	3.41	3.85	3.97	1.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	8	1	5	2	8	3.04	1323/1490	3.21	3.30	4.05	4.11	3.04	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	3	0	5	7	9	3.79	1184/1502	3.74	3.76	4.26	4.28	3.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	1	7	6	6	3.59	1241/1489	3.77	3.84	4.29	4.35	3.59	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	17	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/1006	3.14	3.36	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	3.00	4.19	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	35	Non-major	35
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	32				
				?	2						

Course Section: STAT 351 0101
 Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO
 Instructor: STANWYCK, ELIZA
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1624
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	7	21	4.66	404/1669	4.47	4.15	4.23	4.28	4.66	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	22	4.76	243/1666	4.55	4.21	4.19	4.20	4.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	25	4.76	280/1421	4.54	4.23	4.24	4.25	4.76	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	1	0	3	2	15	4.43	612/1617	4.26	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	3	1	4	5	12	3.88	955/1555	4.20	3.77	4.00	4.03	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	3	0	5	3	13	3.96	957/1543	4.05	3.93	4.06	4.14	3.96	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	156/1647	4.65	4.35	4.12	4.14	4.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	19	9	4.32	1337/1668	4.75	4.71	4.67	4.68	4.32	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	1	0	1	6	9	4.29	642/1605	4.13	3.93	4.07	4.09	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	151/1514	4.77	4.54	4.39	4.46	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	26	4.89	539/1551	4.80	4.62	4.66	4.70	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	243/1503	4.48	4.14	4.24	4.28	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	23	4.78	326/1506	4.53	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	19	1	2	0	2	3	3.50	939/1311	3.64	3.41	3.85	3.97	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	2	5	8	6	3.31	1242/1490	3.49	3.30	4.05	4.11	3.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	3	8	4	11	3.88	1129/1502	3.92	3.76	4.26	4.28	3.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	8	6	10	3.88	1133/1489	3.91	3.84	4.29	4.35	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	13	3	2	2	1	5	3.23	880/1006	3.42	3.36	4.00	4.10	3.23	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 226	****	4.00	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 233	****	3.00	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.00	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.00	4.15	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.67	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.67	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.00	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 15	Required for Majors 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	Graduate 0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	Under-grad 29
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Non-major 29
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 2
				P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	23
?	0		

Course Section: STAT 351 0201
 Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI
 Enrollment: 80
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1625
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	6	27	4.55	534/1669	4.47	4.15	4.23	4.28	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	9	27	4.63	399/1666	4.55	4.21	4.19	4.20	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	29	4.68	368/1421	4.54	4.23	4.24	4.25	4.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	1	3	0	6	16	4.27	790/1617	4.26	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	2	2	3	2	19	4.21	592/1555	4.20	3.77	4.00	4.03	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	2	1	5	2	13	4.00	895/1543	4.05	3.93	4.06	4.14	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	30	4.71	250/1647	4.65	4.35	4.12	4.14	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	37	4.97	214/1668	4.75	4.71	4.67	4.68	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	0	5	6	17	4.31	617/1605	4.13	3.93	4.07	4.09	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	30	4.76	441/1514	4.77	4.54	4.39	4.46	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	34	4.89	539/1551	4.80	4.62	4.66	4.70	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	1	9	24	4.46	637/1503	4.48	4.14	4.24	4.28	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	6	26	4.46	706/1506	4.53	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	25	2	0	2	0	8	4.00	587/1311	3.64	3.41	3.85	3.97	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	9	2	6	7	10	3.21	1288/1490	3.49	3.30	4.05	4.11	3.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	5	3	8	15	3.79	1184/1502	3.92	3.76	4.26	4.28	3.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	4	4	9	14	3.88	1137/1489	3.91	3.84	4.29	4.35	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	24	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	****/1006	3.42	3.36	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	1	3	1	0	0	1	2.00	****/ 226	****	4.00	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/ 233	****	3.00	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	3	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 225	****	4.00	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	1	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	1	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/ 206	****	4.00	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 112	****	2.67	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 98	****	4.50	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 55	****	4.67	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 46	****	4.67	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.00	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: STAT 351 0201
 Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI
 Enrollment: 80
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1625
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	22	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	38	Non-major	38
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	0						

Course Section: STAT 351 0301
 Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO
 Instructor: WILSON, MARY C
 Enrollment: 52
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1626
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	11	12	4.21	963/1669	4.47	4.15	4.23	4.28	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	7	15	4.25	881/1666	4.55	4.21	4.19	4.20	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	6	15	4.18	878/1421	4.54	4.23	4.24	4.25	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	3	3	6	11	4.09	981/1617	4.26	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	340/1555	4.20	3.77	4.00	4.03	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	2	1	9	9	4.19	723/1543	4.05	3.93	4.06	4.14	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	3	20	4.43	617/1647	4.65	4.35	4.12	4.14	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	285/1668	4.75	4.71	4.67	4.68	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	6	12	4	3.78	1187/1605	4.13	3.93	4.07	4.09	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	663/1514	4.77	4.54	4.39	4.46	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	8	17	4.62	1097/1551	4.80	4.62	4.66	4.70	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	6	6	13	4.19	932/1503	4.48	4.14	4.24	4.28	4.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	6	5	15	4.35	828/1506	4.53	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	3	1	1	5	4	3.43	983/1311	3.64	3.41	3.85	3.97	3.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	6	5	12	3.96	891/1490	3.49	3.30	4.05	4.11	3.96	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	3	3	5	14	4.08	986/1502	3.92	3.76	4.26	4.28	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	4	8	11	3.96	1072/1489	3.91	3.84	4.29	4.35	3.96	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	16	1	1	3	1	4	3.60	729/1006	3.42	3.36	4.00	4.10	3.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 1	A 12	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 4	C 6	General 0	Under-grad 28 Non-major 28
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 20	
			? 1		

Course Section: STAT 355 0101
 Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT
 Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1627
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	7	3	14	8	3.35	1537/1669	3.78	4.15	4.23	4.28	3.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	8	9	13	3.68	1380/1666	4.20	4.21	4.19	4.20	3.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	6	11	17	4.08	939/1421	4.46	4.23	4.24	4.25	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	3	8	10	10	3.78	1235/1617	3.70	4.04	4.15	4.22	3.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	3	7	6	5	7	3.21	1378/1555	3.43	3.77	4.00	4.03	3.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	6	2	8	5	9	3.30	1331/1543	3.36	3.93	4.06	4.14	3.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	14	18	4.33	759/1647	4.44	4.35	4.12	4.14	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	35	5.00	1/1668	4.64	4.71	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	4	2	14	9	2	3.10	1496/1605	3.83	3.93	4.07	4.09	3.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	5	7	9	15	3.86	1284/1514	4.47	4.54	4.39	4.46	3.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	8	9	17	4.20	1361/1551	4.40	4.62	4.66	4.70	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	5	5	10	8	9	3.30	1387/1503	4.07	4.14	4.24	4.28	3.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	2	6	3	6	10	10	3.43	1341/1506	4.12	4.22	4.26	4.30	3.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	23	2	1	7	3	1	3.00	1115/1311	3.00	3.41	3.85	3.97	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	14	6	2	4	2	2.07	1471/1490	2.49	3.30	4.05	4.11	2.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	8	5	6	2	6	2.74	1452/1502	3.03	3.76	4.26	4.28	2.74	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	8	2	6	4	6	2.92	1424/1489	3.10	3.84	4.29	4.35	2.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	21	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	****/1006	3.64	3.36	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.00	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	3.00	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.00	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	4.00	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	2.67	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.50	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.67	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	4.67	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	4.00	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: STAT 355 0101
 Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT
 Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1627
 JAN 18, 2007
 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 9	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 17		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 6	C 7	General 0	Under-grad 37 Non-major 37
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 9	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 36	
			? 1		

Course Section: STAT 355 0201
 Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT
 Instructor: WANG, XIAO
 Enrollment: 66
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1628
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	5	13	16	4.08	1117/1669	3.78	4.15	4.23	4.28	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	26	4.59	450/1666	4.20	4.21	4.19	4.20	4.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	28	4.70	344/1421	4.46	4.23	4.24	4.25	4.70		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	2	5	9	14	4.17	899/1617	3.70	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	3	6	9	7	3.80	1021/1555	3.43	3.77	4.00	4.03	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	3	7	10	10	3.90	1019/1543	3.36	3.93	4.06	4.14	3.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	5	27	4.57	412/1647	4.44	4.35	4.12	4.14	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	10	26	4.72	1004/1668	4.64	4.71	4.67	4.68	4.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	7	14	10	4.03	897/1605	3.83	3.93	4.07	4.09	4.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	34	4.86	257/1514	4.47	4.54	4.39	4.46	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	3	10	23	4.49	1208/1551	4.40	4.62	4.66	4.70	4.49	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	4	11	21	4.38	753/1503	4.07	4.14	4.24	4.28	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	6	25	4.47	680/1506	4.12	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	27	1	2	1	0	4	3.50	****/1311	3.00	3.41	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	8	3	4	13	4	3.06	1321/1490	2.49	3.30	4.05	4.11	3.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	4	8	7	11	3.66	1258/1502	3.03	3.76	4.26	4.28	3.66	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	4	1	10	6	11	3.59	1241/1489	3.10	3.84	4.29	4.35	3.59	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	18	2	2	2	1	7	3.64	706/1006	3.64	3.36	4.00	4.10	3.64	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Graduate	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0		Major
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	3	Under-grad	37
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6		Non-major
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6		37
			F	Electives	0
			P	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I		
			?	Other	32
					1

Course Section: STAT 355 0301
 Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT
 Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI
 Enrollment: 55
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1629
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	9	15	11	3.92	1276/1669	3.78	4.15	4.23	4.28	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	10	21	4.32	789/1666	4.20	4.21	4.19	4.20	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	26	4.59	475/1421	4.46	4.23	4.24	4.25	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	3	5	6	7	4	3.16	1492/1617	3.70	4.04	4.15	4.22	3.16	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	18	2	2	6	7	2	3.26	1354/1555	3.43	3.77	4.00	4.03	3.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	2	5	4	5	1	2.88	1466/1543	3.36	3.93	4.06	4.14	2.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	7	8	22	4.41	651/1647	4.44	4.35	4.12	4.14	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	29	7	4.19	1418/1668	4.64	4.71	4.67	4.68	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	4	9	17	4.35	565/1605	3.83	3.93	4.07	4.09	4.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	8	26	4.67	584/1514	4.47	4.54	4.39	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	11	22	4.53	1176/1551	4.40	4.62	4.66	4.70	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	8	24	4.53	537/1503	4.07	4.14	4.24	4.28	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	6	7	23	4.47	680/1506	4.12	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	30	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1311	3.00	3.41	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	14	9	3	2	6	2.32	1457/1490	2.49	3.30	4.05	4.11	2.32	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	10	6	8	4	6	2.71	1461/1502	3.03	3.76	4.26	4.28	2.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	10	6	6	5	7	2.79	1435/1489	3.10	3.84	4.29	4.35	2.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	31	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/1006	3.64	3.36	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	4.00	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	3.00	4.19	4.13	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.29	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 13	Required for Majors	1
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	B 18		Graduate 0
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 37
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	34
			? 1		

Course Section: STAT 405 0101
 Title SURVEY SAMPLING
 Instructor: SINHA, BIMAL
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1630
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	143/1669	4.89	4.15	4.23	4.39	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	777/1666	4.33	4.21	4.19	4.22	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	164/1421	4.89	4.23	4.24	4.38	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	612/1617	4.43	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	698/1555	4.11	3.77	4.00	4.08	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	250/1543	4.67	3.93	4.06	4.18	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	1	3	3.33	1474/1647	3.33	4.35	4.12	4.14	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	1464/1668	4.13	4.71	4.67	4.70	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	448/1605	4.44	3.93	4.07	4.16	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	408/1514	4.78	4.54	4.39	4.45	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	567/1551	4.89	4.62	4.66	4.73	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	653/1503	4.44	4.14	4.24	4.27	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	326/1506	4.78	4.22	4.26	4.29	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1253/1311	2.33	3.41	3.85	3.88	2.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1490	5.00	3.30	4.05	4.26	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1502	5.00	3.76	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	3.84	4.29	4.52	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	3.36	4.00	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: STAT 418 0101
 Title APPL MULTIVARIATE METH
 Instructor: STAFF
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1631
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	1367/1669	3.77	4.15	4.23	4.39	3.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	3	3.62	1424/1666	3.62	4.21	4.19	4.22	3.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	1042/1421	3.92	4.23	4.24	4.38	3.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	970/1617	4.10	4.04	4.15	4.22	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	0	3	4	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.77	4.00	4.08	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	0	2	7	4.27	638/1543	4.27	3.93	4.06	4.18	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	5	5	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	4.35	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	1039/1668	4.69	4.71	4.67	4.70	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	1	0	3	6	1	3.55	1339/1605	3.55	3.93	4.07	4.16	3.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	1136/1514	4.17	4.54	4.39	4.45	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	1127/1551	4.58	4.62	4.66	4.73	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	1235/1503	3.75	4.14	4.24	4.27	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	3	5	3.75	1243/1506	3.75	4.22	4.26	4.29	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	687/1311	3.92	3.41	3.85	3.88	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	849/1490	4.00	3.30	4.05	4.26	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	754/1502	4.40	3.76	4.26	4.46	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	953/1489	4.20	3.84	4.29	4.52	4.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.00	4.20	4.61	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	3.00	4.19	4.40	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.00	4.50	4.39	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.67	4.34	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	4.67	4.45	4.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	3	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	10	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Course Section: STAT 451 0101
 Title INTRO PROBABILITY THEO
 Instructor: WANG, XIAO
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1632
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	1090/1669	4.12	4.15	4.23	4.39	4.12	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	2	10	4.29	827/1666	4.29	4.21	4.19	4.22	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	924/1421	4.12	4.23	4.24	4.38	4.12	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	2	4	0	3	3.44	1403/1617	3.44	4.04	4.15	4.22	3.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	5	5	1	3.42	1295/1555	3.42	3.77	4.00	4.08	3.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	895/1543	4.00	3.93	4.06	4.18	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	324/1647	4.65	4.35	4.12	4.14	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	428/1668	4.94	4.71	4.67	4.70	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	7	5	3	3.63	1299/1605	3.63	3.93	4.07	4.16	3.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	647/1514	4.63	4.54	4.39	4.45	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	1193/1551	4.50	4.62	4.66	4.73	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	4	7	3	3.69	1269/1503	3.69	4.14	4.24	4.27	3.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	2	6	4	3.44	1338/1506	3.44	4.22	4.26	4.29	3.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1311	****	3.41	3.85	3.88	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/1490	****	3.30	4.05	4.26	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/1502	****	3.76	4.26	4.46	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/1489	****	3.84	4.29	4.52	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1006	****	3.36	4.00	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 3	General 4	Under-grad 17 Non-major 15
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 13	
			? 1		

Course Section: STAT 454 0101
 Title APPLIED STATISTICS
 Instructor: RUKHIN, ANDREW
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1633
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	2	7	14	4.15	1039/1669	4.15	4.15	4.23	4.39	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	2	8	11	3.92	1206/1666	3.92	4.21	4.19	4.22	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	5	4	13	3.96	1005/1421	3.96	4.23	4.24	4.38	3.96	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	1	3	2	2	7	3.73	1262/1617	3.73	4.04	4.15	4.22	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	8	7	1	3.56	1197/1555	3.56	3.77	4.00	4.08	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	2	4	4	6	3.71	1175/1543	3.71	3.93	4.06	4.18	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	4	4	15	4.28	828/1647	4.28	4.35	4.12	4.14	4.28	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	641/1668	4.92	4.71	4.67	4.70	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	5	7	13	4.23	713/1605	4.23	3.93	4.07	4.16	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	5	15	4.46	877/1514	4.46	4.54	4.39	4.45	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	1	21	4.75	880/1551	4.75	4.62	4.66	4.73	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	3	6	12	4.13	996/1503	4.13	4.14	4.24	4.27	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	5	3	4	11	3.91	1163/1506	3.91	4.22	4.26	4.29	3.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	14	0	3	2	2	1	3.13	1097/1311	3.13	3.41	3.85	3.88	3.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	4	2	3	1	1	2.36	1452/1490	2.36	3.30	4.05	4.26	2.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	5	1	1	0	4	2.73	1456/1502	2.73	3.76	4.26	4.46	2.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	4	1	2	1	2	2.60	1462/1489	2.60	3.84	4.29	4.52	2.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	9	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	****	3.36	4.00	4.21	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.00	4.20	4.61	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	3.00	4.19	4.40	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.00	4.50	4.39	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.00	4.15	4.20	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 112	****	2.67	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.50	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	3.94	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.33	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.67	4.34	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	4.67	4.45	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	4.00	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****	

Course Section: STAT 454 0101
 Title APPLIED STATISTICS
 Instructor: RUKHIN, ANDREW
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1633
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	26	Non-major	24
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Course Section: STAT 601 0101
 Title APPLIED STATISTICS I
 Instructor: YI, SEONGBAEK
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1634
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	1409/1669	3.67	4.15	4.23	4.35	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	2	2	3.44	1493/1666	3.44	4.21	4.19	4.19	3.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	1	3	1	3.00	1357/1421	3.00	4.23	4.24	4.33	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1345/1617	3.57	4.04	4.15	4.24	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1192/1555	3.57	3.77	4.00	4.07	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	4	2	1	3.38	1311/1543	3.38	3.93	4.06	4.27	3.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1421/1647	3.44	4.35	4.12	4.15	3.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	965/1668	4.75	4.71	4.67	4.83	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	1	4	1	0	3.00	1501/1605	3.00	3.93	4.07	4.13	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1166/1514	4.11	4.54	4.39	4.37	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	1152/1551	4.56	4.62	4.66	4.72	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	0	5	2	3.78	1225/1503	3.78	4.14	4.24	4.22	3.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	1277/1506	3.67	4.22	4.26	4.24	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1311	****	3.41	3.85	3.89	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	849/1490	4.00	3.30	4.05	4.18	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	754/1502	4.40	3.76	4.26	4.46	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	953/1489	4.20	3.84	4.29	4.44	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	3.36	4.00	4.11	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.00	4.20	4.47	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	3.00	4.19	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.00	4.15	4.39	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	2.67	4.38	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.38	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	4.23	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.50	3.95	3.93	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	4.57	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.31	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.33	4.55	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.67	4.34	4.45	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.40	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.67	4.45	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.00	4.25	4.60	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: STAT 601 0101
 Title APPLIED STATISTICS I
 Instructor: YI, SEONGBAEK
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1634
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: STAT 607 0101
 Title BAYESIAN INFERENCE
 Instructor: CHOI, TAERYON
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1635
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	7	4	4.25	914/1669	4.25	4.15	4.23	4.35	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	1048/1666	4.08	4.21	4.19	4.19	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	1100/1421	3.83	4.23	4.24	4.33	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	0	5	4	4.10	970/1617	4.10	4.04	4.15	4.24	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	4	0	4	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.77	4.00	4.07	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	552/1543	4.36	3.93	4.06	4.27	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.35	4.12	4.15	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1265/1668	4.42	4.71	4.67	4.83	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	8	1	3.83	1148/1605	3.83	3.93	4.07	4.13	3.83	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	703/1514	4.58	4.54	4.39	4.37	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	880/1551	4.75	4.62	4.66	4.72	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1157/1503	3.92	4.14	4.24	4.22	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	4.22	4.26	4.24	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	3	0	2	5	3.64	868/1311	3.64	3.41	3.85	3.89	3.64	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1265/1490	3.25	3.30	4.05	4.18	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1013/1502	4.00	3.76	4.26	4.46	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	532/1489	4.67	3.84	4.29	4.44	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: STAT 611 0101
 Title MATHEMATICAL STAT I
 Instructor: SINHA, BIMAL
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1636
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	6	4.63	448/1669	4.63	4.15	4.23	4.35	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	243/1666	4.75	4.21	4.19	4.19	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	441/1421	4.63	4.23	4.24	4.33	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	673/1617	4.38	4.04	4.15	4.24	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	687/1555	4.13	3.77	4.00	4.07	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	282/1543	4.63	3.93	4.06	4.27	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	828/1647	4.29	4.35	4.12	4.15	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.71	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	127/1605	4.83	3.93	4.07	4.13	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.54	4.39	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.62	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	154/1503	4.88	4.14	4.24	4.22	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	200/1506	4.88	4.22	4.26	4.24	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.41	3.85	3.89	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	778/1490	4.14	3.30	4.05	4.18	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	950/1502	4.14	3.76	4.26	4.46	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	776/1489	4.43	3.84	4.29	4.44	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	759/1006	3.50	3.36	4.00	4.11	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	140/ 226	4.00	4.00	4.20	4.47	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	219/ 233	3.00	3.00	4.19	4.41	3.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	187/ 225	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.65	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	117/ 206	4.00	4.00	4.15	4.39	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	107/ 112	2.67	2.67	4.38	4.39	2.67	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.38	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	5.00	4.22	4.36	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 105	5.00	5.00	4.20	4.23	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	28/ 98	4.50	4.50	3.95	3.93	4.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	5.00	4.22	4.53	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.06	4.57	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.39	4.90	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.31	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	21/ 30	4.00	4.00	4.33	4.55	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	29/ 55	4.67	4.67	4.34	4.45	4.67	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.31	4.40	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	27/ 46	4.67	4.67	4.45	4.61	4.67	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	19/ 33	4.00	4.00	4.25	4.60	4.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: STAT 611 0101
 Title MATHEMATICAL STAT I
 Instructor: SINHA, BIMAL
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1636
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: STAT 651 0101
 Title BASIC PROBABILITY
 Instructor: CHOI, TAERYON
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1637
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	852/1669	4.31	4.15	4.23	4.35	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	715/1666	4.38	4.21	4.19	4.19	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	773/1421	4.31	4.23	4.24	4.33	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	323/1617	4.67	4.04	4.15	4.24	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	1021/1555	3.80	3.77	4.00	4.07	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	390/1543	4.50	3.93	4.06	4.27	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	204/1647	4.77	4.35	4.12	4.15	4.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	825/1668	4.85	4.71	4.67	4.83	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	9	1	3.91	1092/1605	3.91	3.93	4.07	4.13	3.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	584/1514	4.67	4.54	4.39	4.37	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	880/1551	4.75	4.62	4.66	4.72	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	959/1503	4.17	4.14	4.24	4.22	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	838/1506	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.24	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	731/1311	3.86	3.41	3.85	3.89	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	0	3	1	3.50	1154/1490	3.50	3.30	4.05	4.18	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	632/1502	4.50	3.76	4.26	4.46	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	865/1489	4.33	3.84	4.29	4.44	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: STAT 710A 0101
 Title ADVANCED INFERENCE
 Instructor: RUKHIN, ANDREW
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1638
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	207/1669	4.80	4.15	4.23	4.35	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	181/1666	4.80	4.21	4.19	4.19	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.23	4.24	4.33	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.04	4.15	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1555	5.00	3.77	4.00	4.07	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	142/1543	4.80	3.93	4.06	4.27	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1647	5.00	4.35	4.12	4.15	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	901/1668	4.80	4.71	4.67	4.83	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	139/1605	4.80	3.93	4.07	4.13	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	360/1514	4.80	4.54	4.39	4.37	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.62	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	220/1503	4.80	4.14	4.24	4.22	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	286/1506	4.80	4.22	4.26	4.24	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1311	****	3.41	3.85	3.89	****	
Discussion															
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	****	3.36	4.00	4.11	****	

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