# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

## General

1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course? 1 0 1 3 7 12 14 3.95 1206/1639 4.00 4.34 4.27 4.08 3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals? 1 0 1 1 2 18 15 4.22 895/1639 4.30 4.46 4.22 4.17 4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals? 1 0 1 2 2 14 18 4.24 804/1397 4.39 4.50 4.28 4.18 4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals? 13 1 2 2 7 12 4.13 919/1583 4.17 4.35 4.19 4.01 4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned? 1 8 3 4 3 7 12 3.72 1081/1532 3.98 4.14 4.01 3.88 3.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned? 1 17 1 1 5 4 9 3.95 884/1504 4.25 4.24 4.05 3.78 3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained? 1 0 1 1 2 2 4.49 518/1612 4.46 4.54 4.16 4.10 4.49
8. How many times was class cancelled? 1 0 0 0 0 0 37 5.00 1/1635 4.88 4.75 4.65 4.56 5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness? 6 3 0 1 4 19 5 3.97 955/1579 4.07 4.21 4.08 3.95 3.97

## Lecture

1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared? 1 0 0 1 3 7 26 4.57 733/1518 4.68 4.70 4.43 4.38 4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject? 1 0 0 2 1 10 24 4.51 1180/1520 4.75 4.70 4.61 4.56 4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly? 1 0 2 5 13 17 4.22 928/1517 4.48 4.42 4.27 4.20 4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned? 1 0 0 2 3 8 24 4.46 703/1550 4.57 4.54 4.22 4.17 4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding? 3 20 0 1 1 7 5 4.00 623/1295 3.97 3.98 3.94 3.84 3.84

## Discussion

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned? 2 0 0 3 11 19 2 4.28 608/1398 4.00 3.75 4.07 3.85 4.28
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate? 1 0 2 6 7 12 10 3.59 1194/1391 3.68 3.95 4.30 4.07 3.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion? 2 0 0 4 10 6 16 3.94 998/1388 3.99 4.01 4.28 4.01 3.94
4. Were special techniques successful? 1 28 1 0 0 4 4 4.11 ****/958 3.54 3.61 3.93 3.71 ****

## Laboratory

1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material? 35 1 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 ****/224 4.10 3.90 4.10 3.90 ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information? 35 0 1 1 0 1 0 2.33 ****/240 4.11 4.01 ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities? 35 1 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 ****/219 4.44 4.44 ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance? 36 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/215 4.35 4.43 ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified? 36 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/198 4.18 4.25 4.18 4.25 ****

## Frequency Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits Earned</th>
<th>Cum GPA</th>
<th>Expected Grades</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00-27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00-0.99</td>
<td>A12</td>
<td>Required for Majors</td>
<td>7 Graduate 0 Mj or 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.00-1.99</td>
<td>B9</td>
<td>1 Graduate</td>
<td>0 Mj or 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00-2.99</td>
<td>C7</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>1 Under-grad 38 Non-maj or 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00-3.49</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>1 Under-grad</td>
<td>38 Non-maj or 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.50-4.00</td>
<td>F0</td>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>0 **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P0</td>
<td>0 Other</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | NR | NA | 1 2 3 4 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
|-----------|----|----|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course? | 1 0 1 3 7 12 14 | 3.95 | 1206/1639 | 4.00 | 4.34 | 4.27 | 4.08 | 3.95 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals? | 1 0 1 1 2 18 15 | 4.22 | 895/1639 | 4.30 | 4.46 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.22 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals? | 1 0 1 2 2 14 18 | 4.24 | 804/1397 | 4.39 | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 4.24 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals? | 13 1 2 2 7 12 | 4.13 | 919/1583 | 4.17 | 4.35 | 4.19 | 4.01 | 4.13 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned? | 1 8 3 4 3 7 12 | 3.72 | 1081/1532 | 3.98 | 4.14 | 4.01 | 3.88 | 3.72 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned? | 1 17 1 1 5 4 9 | 3.95 | 884/1504 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.05 | 3.78 | 3.95 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained? | 1 0 1 1 4 8 24 | 4.49 | 518/1612 | 4.46 | 4.54 | 4.16 | 4.10 | 4.49 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled? | 1 0 0 0 0 0 37 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 4.88 | 4.75 | 4.65 | 4.56 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness? | 29 0 0 0 0 1 5 | 3.42 | 4.07/1579 | 4.07 | 4.21 | 4.08 | 3.50 | 3.97 |
Lecture
1. Were the instructor’s lectures well prepared 28 0 0 0 1 2 7 4.60 68/1518 4.68 4.70 4.43 4.38 4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 28 0 0 0 0 4 6 4.60 1115/1520 4.75 4.70 4.61 4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 28 0 0 0 0 4 6 4.60 474/1517 4.48 4.42 4.27 4.20 4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 27 1 0 0 2 8 4.80 288/1550 4.57 4.54 4.22 4.17 4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 29 6 0 0 1 1 4.00 ****/1295 4.05 3.93 3.94 3.84 4.00

Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 3 3 11 19 4.28 608/1398 4.00 3.75 4.07 3.85 4.28
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 2 6 7 12 10 3.59 1194/1391 3.68 3.95 4.30 4.07 3.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 4 10 6 16 3.94 998/1388 3.99 4.01 4.28 4.01 3.94
4. Were special techniques successful 1 28 0 0 0 2 8 4.80 288/1550 4.57 4.54 4.22 4.17 4.63

Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 35 1 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 ****/ 224 4.10 4.04 4.10 ****
2. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 35 1 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 ****/ 219 4.44 4.44 ****
3. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 36 1 0 0 0 0 1 1.00 ****/ 198 4.18 4.25 ****

Credits Earned
00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 12 Required for Majors 7 Graduate 0 Maj or 0
28-55 7 1.00-1.99 0 B 9
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 2 C 7 General 1 Under-grad 38 Non-maj or 38
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 3 D 1
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0

Course-Section: STAT 121 0201  University of Maryland Page 1588
Title: INTRO STATISTICS: S  Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: MARFANI, ERUM F  Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 62
Questionnaires: 46
Sentinar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme
   2. Was the instructor available for individual attention
   3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned
   4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned
   5. Were criteria for grading made clear

Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria
3. Was the instructor available for consultation
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities

Self Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal
3. Did your contacts with the instructor helpful
4. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

Course-Section: STAT 121  0301
Enrollment: 52
Questionnaires: 30

Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria
3. Was the instructor available for consultation
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities

Self Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal
3. Did your contacts with the instructor helpful
4. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

Frequency Distribution
Credits Earned    Cum. GPA    Expected Grades    Reasons
00-27     12        0.00-0.99    0           A   20            Required for Majors  15       Graduate      0       Major        0
28-55     11        1.00-1.99    0           B   15   Under-grad   46       Non-major   46
56-83      3        2.00-2.99    8           C    4            General               1       Under-grad   46       Non-major   46
84-150     4        3.00-3.49    6           D    0
Grad.  0        3.50-4.00    5           E    0
P    0
I    0
O    23

Instructor:   MARFANI, ERUM F  Fall 2007  Job IRBR3029
Title: INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S  Baltimore County  FEB 13, 2008
Enrollment: 52
Questionnaires: 30

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Table

Questions
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned
5. Did the grading system clearly explained
6. How many times was class cancelled
7. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness

Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned
5. Did audioritual techniques enhance your understanding

Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion
4. Were special techniques successful
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Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Table

Questions
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned
5. Did the grading system clearly explained

Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned
5. Did audioritual techniques enhance your understanding

Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion
4. Were special techniques successful
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Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Table

Questions
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned
5. Did the grading system clearly explained

Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned
5. Did audioritual techniques enhance your understanding

Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion
4. Were special techniques successful
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Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Table

Questions
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned
5. Did the grading system clearly explained

Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned
5. Did audioritual techniques enhance your understanding

Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion
4. Were special techniques successful
**Laboratory**

1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 28 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 224 **** **** 4.10 3.90 ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 28 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 240 **** **** 4.11 4.01 ****
3. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 28 1 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 215 **** **** 4.35 4.43 ****

**Seminar**

1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 28 0 0 0 1 0 0 4.00 ****/ 85 **** **** 4.58 4.50 ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 28 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 82 **** **** 4.52 4.12 ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 28 0 0 0 1 0 0 5.00 ****/ 78 **** **** 4.47 4.25 ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 28 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 80 **** **** 4.47 4.39 ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear 28 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 82 **** **** 4.16 3.90 ****

**Field Work**

1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 28 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.04 3.61 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 28 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.05 3.51 ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 28 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.75 4.79 ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 28 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.58 5.00 ****

**Self Paced**

1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 28 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 50 **** **** 4.45 4.54 ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 28 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.51 4.67 ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 28 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 43 **** **** 4.69 4.69 ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 28 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.37 4.67 ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 28 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 21 **** **** 4.52 5.00 ****

**Course-Section**: STAT 121 0301  
**University of Maryland**  
**Title**: INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S  
**Baltimore County**  
**FEB 13, 2008**  
**Enrollment**: 52  
**Questionnaires**: 30  

---

**Frequency Distribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits Earned</th>
<th>Cum GPA</th>
<th>Expected Grades</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mjors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>1.00-1.99</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Required for Majors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Graduate 0 Mj or 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>B 11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-83</td>
<td>2.00-2.99</td>
<td>C 5</td>
<td>General 4</td>
<td>Under-grad 30 Non-mj or 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-150</td>
<td>3.00-3.49</td>
<td>D 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad.</td>
<td>3.50-4.00</td>
<td>F 0</td>
<td>Electives 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I 0</td>
<td>Other    18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire**

---

**Lecture**

1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 5 11 9 4.08 1089/1639 4.00 4.34 4.27 4.08 4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 8 15 4.42 650/1639 4.30 4.46 4.22 4.17 4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 9 17 4.65 375/1397 4.39 4.50 4.28 4.18 4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 3 2 0 11 9 4.23 822/1583 4.17 4.35 4.19 4.01 4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 0 15 16 4.54 311/1532 3.98 4.14 4.01 3.88 4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 25 5.00 1/1635 4.88 4.75 4.65 4.56 5.00
7. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 0 17 2 4.31 830/1579 4.07 4.21 4.08 3.95 4.11

---

**Discussion**

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 2 9 10 3.92 863/1398 4.00 3.75 4.07 3.85 3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate?

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion?

4. Were special techniques successful?

5. Did the lab increase understanding of the material?

6. Were you provided with adequate background information?

7. Were necessary materials available for lab activities?

8. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified?

9. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme?

10. Did research projects contribute to what you learned?

11. Did presentations contribute to what you learned?

12. Did field experience contribute to what you learned?

13. Did study questions make clear the expected goal?

14. Were study questions make clear the expected goal?

15. Did the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful?

16. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared?

17. How many times was class cancelled?

18. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared?

19. Were assigned readings contribute to what you learned?

20. Were written assignments contribute to what you learned?

21. Were the grading system clearly explained?

22. How many times was class cancelled?

23. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness?
Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion
4. Were special techniques successful

Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material
2. Were you provided with adequate background information
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified

Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned
5. Were criteria for grading made clear

Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria
3. Was the instructor available for consultation
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities

Self Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

Course-Section: STAT 350 0101
Instructor: JACOBS, JUSTIN
Enrollment: 61
Questionnaires: 42

Frequency Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits Earned</th>
<th>Cum GPA</th>
<th>Expected Grades</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00-27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00-0.99</td>
<td>A 27</td>
<td>Required for Majors</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.00-1.99</td>
<td>B 8</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-83</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.00-2.99</td>
<td>C 2</td>
<td>Under-grad</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-150</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.00-3.49</td>
<td>D 0</td>
<td>Non-maj or 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad. 1</td>
<td>3.50-4.00</td>
<td>F 0</td>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course-Section: STAT 350 0301
Instructor: KAPOOR, JAGMOHA (Instr. A)
Enrollment: 68
Questionnaires: 23

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  
   2  5  0  1  4  1  0  10  4.25  612/1504  4.25  4.24  4.05  4.12  4.25

7. Was the grading system clearly explained  
   2  0  0  1  2  4  14  4.48  532/1612  4.56  4.54  4.16  4.12  4.48

8. How many times was class canceled  
   2  0  0  0  0  2  21  5.00  1/1635  4.74  4.75  4.65  4.66  5.00

9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  
   5  0  0  1  4  5  8  4.11  818/1579  4.21  4.21  4.08  4.07  4.06

Lecture  
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  
   3  0  0  1  2  17  4.80  360/1518  4.90  4.70  4.33  4.39  4.90

2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  
   4  0  0  0  3  4  12  4.47  1213/1520  4.67  4.70  4.68  4.57

3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  
   3  0  0  2  2  16  4.70  371/1517  4.85  4.42  4.27  4.23  4.85

4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned  
   3  0  1  3  1  15  4.50  638/1550  4.76  4.54  4.20  4.70  4.75

5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  
   4  13  1  1  3  0  3.67  894/1295  4.18  3.93  3.94  3.95  3.67

Discussion  
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  
   6  0  3  1  3  6  4  3.40  1156/1398  3.50  4.07  4.13  3.41

2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  
   6  0  3  0  2  5  7  3.76  1141/1391  3.84  3.95  4.30  4.35  3.76

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  
   6  0  3  1  4  3  6  3.47  1197/1388  3.68  4.01  4.28  4.34  3.47

4. Were special techniques successful  
   7  11  0  1  1  3  0  3.40  894/1295  4.18  3.93  3.94  3.95  3.67

Seminar  
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  
   22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  85 ****/ 52 ****  4.58  4.78  4.04  5.00  4.45

2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  
   22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  82 ****/ 52 ****  4.69  4.86  4.04  5.00  4.45

3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  
   22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  80 ****/ 52 ****  4.58  4.75  4.04  5.00  4.45

4. Were presentations successful  
   22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  82 ****/ 52 ****  4.58  4.75  4.04  5.00  4.45

5. Did criteria for grading made clear  
   22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  82 ****/ 52 ****  4.58  4.75  4.04  5.00  4.45

Field Work  
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  
   22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  52 ****/ 52 ****  4.45  5.00  4.04  5.00  4.52

2. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful  
   22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  52 ****/ 52 ****  4.45  5.00  4.04  5.00  4.52

3. Were enough proctors for all the students  
   22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  21 ****/ 32 ****  4.52  5.00  4.04  5.00  4.52

Self Paced  
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  
   22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  52 ****/ 52 ****  4.45  5.00  4.04  5.00  4.52

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goals  
   22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  52 ****/ 52 ****  4.45  5.00  4.04  5.00  4.52

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful  
   22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  52 ****/ 52 ****  4.45  5.00  4.04  5.00  4.52

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful  
   22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  52 ****/ 52 ****  4.45  5.00  4.04  5.00  4.52

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students  
   22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  21 ****/ 32 ****  4.52  5.00  4.04  5.00  4.52

Frequency Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits Earned</th>
<th>Cum GPA</th>
<th>Expected Grades</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Maj ors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00-27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00-0.99</td>
<td>A 14</td>
<td>Required for Majors</td>
<td>1 Graduate 0 Major 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.00-1.99</td>
<td>B 4</td>
<td>Under-grad 23 Non-maj or 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.00-2.99</td>
<td>C 0</td>
<td>General 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-150</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.00-3.49</td>
<td>D 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.50-4.00</td>
<td>F 0</td>
<td>Electives 0 ****- Means there are not enough responses to be significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I 0</td>
<td>Other 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>? 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course-Section: STAT 350 0301  
University of Maryland  
Page 1593  
Title: STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI  
Baltimore County  
FEB 13, 2008  
Instructor: KAPPOO, JAGCHHA (Instr. B)  
Fall 2007  
Job IRR6029  
Enrollment: 68  
Questionnaires: 23  
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared            17   0   0   0   0   0   6  5.00    1/1518  4.90  4.70  4.43  4.39  4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject       17   0   0   0   0   2   4  4.67 1033/1520  4.67  4.70  4.70  4.68  4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly    17   0   0   0   0   0   6  5.00 1/1517  4.85  4.42  4.27  4.23  4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned         17   0   0   0   0   0   6  5.00 1/1550  4.76  4.54  4.22  4.20  4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 18 3 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **/**1295 4.18 3.93 3.94 3.95 3.67

Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   6   0   3   1   3   6   4  3.41 1156/1398  3.50  3.75  4.07  4.13  3.41
2. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  6   0   3   1   4   3   6  3.47 1197/1388  3.68  4.01  4.28  4.34  3.47
4. Were special techniques successful                      7  11 0 1 1 3 0 3.40 **/958 3.61 3.93 3.97 ****

Seminars
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme    22   0   0   0   0   1   5.00 **/**  85 **** 4.58 4.50 ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 22   0   0   0   0   1   5.00 **/**  82 **** 4.52 4.59 ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   22   0   0   0   0   0   1   5.00 **/**  70 **** 4.57 4.63 ****
4. Did presentation contribute to what you learned       22   0   0   0   0   0   1   5.00 **/**  80 **** 4.47 4.65 ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   22   0   0   0   0   0   1   5.00 **/**  82 **** 4.16 4.08 ****

Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    22   0   0   0   0   0   1   5.00 **/**  54 **** 4.45 5.00 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria   22   0   0   0   0   0   1   5.00 **/**  50 **** 4.45 5.00 ****
3. Did the instructor available for consultation         22   0   0   0   0   0   1   5.00 **/**  42 **** 4.75 4.63 ****
4. Did special techniques contribute to what you learned 22   0   0   0   0   0   1   5.00 **/**  37 **** 4.58 4.52 ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities   22   0   0   0   0   0   1   5.00 **/**  32 **** 4.56 4.30 ****

Self-paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   22   0   0   0   0   0   1   5.00 **/**  50 **** 4.45 5.00 ****
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goal       22   0   0   0   0   0   1   5.00 **/**  32 **** 4.51 5.00 ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful        22   0   0   0   0   0   1   5.00 **/**  43 **** 4.69 5.00 ****
4. Did reading assignments contribute to what you learned 22   0   0   0   0   0   1   5.00 **/**  32 **** 4.37 5.00 ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      22   0   0   0   0   0   1   5.00 **/**  21 **** 4.52 5.00 ****

Frequency Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits Earned</th>
<th>Cum GPA</th>
<th>Expected Grades</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00-27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00-0.99</td>
<td>A 14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.00-1.99</td>
<td>B 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Maj or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.00-2.99</td>
<td>C 0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Under-grad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-150</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.00-3.99</td>
<td>D 0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Non-maj or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.50-4.00</td>
<td>F 0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>I 0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course-Section: STAT 351 0101
Title: APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO
University of Maryland
FEB 13, 2008
Enrollment: 59
Questionnaires: 29

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
**Discussion**

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned?
   0 8 4 6 6 4 2.79 1326/1398 3.46 3.75 4.07 4.13 2.79

2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate?
   0 7 4 4 9 3 2.89 1349/1391 3.42 3.95 4.30 4.35 2.89

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion?
   0 6 3 6 6 6 3.11 1304/1388 3.46 4.01 4.28 4.34 3.11

4. Were special techniques used successfully?
   2 24 21 0 0 0 1.33 958 2.73 3.61 3.93 3.97

**Laboratory**

1. Did lab increase understanding of the material?
   0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 224 4.10 4.06

2. Were you provided with adequate background information?
   0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 240 4.11 4.08

3. Did lab instructor provide assistance?
   0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 215 4.35 4.21

4. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified?
   0 8 0 0 0 1 3.00 198 4.18 4.04

**Seminar**

1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme?
   0 0 0 0 0 0 1.00

2. Was the instructor available for individual attention?
   0 0 0 0 0 0 1.00

3. Were criteria for grading made clear?
   0 0 0 0 0 0 1.00

**Frequency Distribution**

| Course-Section: STAT 351 0201 | University of Maryland | Page 1595 |
| Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI | Baltimore County | FEB 13, 2008 |
| Enrollment: 76 | Job IRBR029 |
| Questionnaires: 39 | Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire |

---

**Discussion**

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned?
   12 0 0 1 2 4 13 4.07 745/1398 3.46 3.75 4.07 4.13 3.97

2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate?
   12 0 1 2 4 8 12 4.07 745/1398 3.46 3.75 4.07 4.13 3.97

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion?
   12 0 1 1 8 6 11 3.93 1016/1388 3.46 4.01 4.28 4.34 3.93

4. Were special techniques used successfully?
   13 15 3 3 1 2 2 3.73 989/1589 2.73 3.61 3.93 3.97 2.73

**Laboratory**

1. Did lab increase understanding of the material?
   37 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 224 4.10 4.06

2. Were you provided with adequate background information?
   37 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 240 4.11 4.08

3. Did lab instructor provide assistance?
   37 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 215 4.35 4.21

4. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified?
   37 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 198 4.18 4.04

**Seminar**

1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme?
   38 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 85 4.58 4.50

2. Was the instructor available for individual attention?
   38 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 82 4.52 4.59
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  20  2  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 219  ****  ****  4.44  4.44 ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance  20  1  0  0  0  1  3  4.75 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.35  4.21 ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  21  1  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.18  4.04 ****

Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  23  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.58  4.50 ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  23  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.52  4.59 ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  23  1  0  0  0  1  0  5.00 ****/  75  ****  ****  4.47  4.65 ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned  23  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.47  4.65 ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear  23  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  82  ****  ****  4.16  4.08 ****

Field Work
3. Was the instructor available for consultation  23  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.75  4.63 ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  23  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.58  4.52 ****

Self Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  23  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.45  5.00 ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goals  23  0  0  0  0  2  8  4.33 1112/1532  3.65  4.14  4.01  4.05  4.33
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful  23  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  43  ****  ****  4.69  4.50 ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful  23  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  32  ****  ****  4.37  5.00 ****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades               Reasons                    Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      2        0.00-0.99    1           A    8            Required for Majors   1       Graduate      0       Major        0
28-55      2        1.00-1.99    1           B    8
56-83      5        2.00-2.99    6           C    5            General               0       Under-grad   25       Non-major   25
84-150     2        3.00-3.49    5           D    0
Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    2           F    0
 1          Other                19
 7           ?          0

Course-Section: STAT 351  0301                         University of Maryland                                             Page 1596
Title           APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO                    Baltimore County                                             FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:     KAPOOR, JAGMOHA                              Fall   2007                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      69
Questionnaires:  25                            Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades               Reasons                    Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      2        0.00-0.99    1           A    8
28-55      2        1.00-1.99    1           B    8
56-83      5        2.00-2.99    6           C    5
84-150     2        3.00-3.49    5           D    0
Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    2           F    0
 1          Other                19
 7           ?          0

Course-Section: STAT 355  0101                         University of Maryland                                             Page 1597
Instructor:     ABERCROMBIE, MA                              Fall   2007                                               Job IRBR3029
Questionnaires:  18                            Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades               Reasons                    Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      2        0.00-0.99    1           A    8
28-55      2        1.00-1.99    1           B    8
56-83      5        2.00-2.99    6           C    5
84-150     2        3.00-3.49    5           D    0
Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    2           F    0
 1          Other                19
 7           ?          0

Course-Section: STAT 357  0401                         University of Maryland                                             Page 1598
Title           APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO                    Baltimore County                                             FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:     KAPOOR, JAGMOHA                              Fall   2007                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      69
Questionnaires:  25                            Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades               Reasons                    Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      2        0.00-0.99    1           A    8
28-55      2        1.00-1.99    1           B    8
56-83      5        2.00-2.99    6           C    5
84-150     2        3.00-3.49    5           D    0
Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    2           F    0
 1          Other                19
 7           ?          0

Course-Section: STAT 375  0101                         University of Maryland                                             Page 1599
Title           APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO                    Baltimore County                                             FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:     KAPOOR, JAGMOHA                              Fall   2007                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      69
Questionnaires:  25                            Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades               Reasons                    Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 3 3 4 3 3 3.00 1321/1391 3.23 3.95 4.30 4.35 3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 5 0 4 3 3 2.93 1335/1388 3.35 4.01 4.28 4.34 2.93
4. Were special techniques successful 3 13 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/958 3.75 3.61 3.93 3.97 ****

Frequency Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits Earned</th>
<th>Cum GPA</th>
<th>Expected Grades</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00-27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00-0.99</td>
<td>A 1</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00-1.99</td>
<td>B 7</td>
<td>Maj or</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.00-2.99</td>
<td>C 3</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-150</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.00-3.49</td>
<td>D 0</td>
<td>Under-grad</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.50-4.00</td>
<td>E 0</td>
<td>Non-maj or</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P 0</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course-Section: STAT 355 0301
University of Maryland
Page 1599
Title: INTRO APP PROB & STAT
Baltimore County
FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: ABERCROMBE, MA
Fall 2007
Job IRB3029
Enrollment: 71
Questionnaires: 33
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
### Lecture

1. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals? 0 0 2 3 5 11 12 3.85 1300/1639 4.27 4.46 4.22 4.20 3.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject? 0 1 2 3 4 5 20 4.25 1356/1520 4.48 4.70 4.68 4.26
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly? 1 0 3 3 6 7 13 3.75 1260/1517 4.26 4.42 4.27 4.23 3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned? 0 1 5 3 4 4 15 3.68 1270/1550 4.13 4.54 4.22 4.20 3.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding? 3 1 1 8 5 15 4.07 928/1388 3.35 4.01 4.28 4.34 3.55

### Discussion

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned? 3 0 4 0 6 7 13 3.83 916/1398 2.99 3.75 4.07 4.13 3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate? 3 0 2 0 6 6 16 4.13 911/1391 3.23 3.95 4.30 4.35 4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion? 3 0 1 8 5 15 4.07 928/1388 3.35 4.01 4.28 4.34 4.07
4. Were special techniques successful? 3 0 1 2 0 1 7 3.75 610/958 3.75 3.61 3.93 3.97 3.75

### Frequency Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits Earned</th>
<th>Cum. GPA</th>
<th>Expected Grades</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00-27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00-0.99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.00-1.99</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-83</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.00-2.99</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4-150</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.00-3.49</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.50-4.00</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.00-4.49</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.50-5.00</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.00-5.49</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Course-Section

Title: INTRO PROBABILITY THEO
University of Maryland
Page 1600
Course: STAT 451 0101
Instructor: WANG, XI AO
Fall 2007
Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 20
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

### General

1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course? 0 0 2 2 7 9 4.15 1003/1639 4.15 4.34 4.27 4.42 4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals? 0 0 2 3 8 7 4.00 1003/1639 4.00 4.46 4.28 4.34 4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals? 0 0 2 3 6 7 3.70 1200/1397 3.70 4.50 4.28 4.38 3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals? 1 8 1 0 1 5 4 4.00 1010/1583 4.00 4.35 4.19 4.31 4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned? 0 6 1 1 2 7 3 3.71 1092/1532 3.71 4.14 4.01 4.07 3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned? 0 9 0 0 1 7 3 3.48 678/1504 3.48 4.24 4.05 4.20 3.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained? 0 0 0 0 0 4 16 4.80 166/1612 4.80 4.54 4.16 4.18 4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled? 1 1 0 0 0 2 16 4.89 691/1635 4.89 4.75 4.65 4.72 4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness? 6 0 2 3 3 4 2 3.07 1467/1579 3.07 4.21 4.08 4.21 3.07

### Lecture

1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared? 0 0 1 1 2 7 9 4.30 1376/1520 4.30 4.75 4.10
2. Did the instructor present the subject clearly? 0 0 1 1 2 7 9 4.30 1376/1520 4.30 4.75 4.10
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly? 1 0 3 1 5 5 5 3.42 1376/1517 3.42 4.42 4.27 3.34 3.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned? 0 0 3 2 1 6 8 3.70 1259/1550 3.70 4.54 4.22 4.24 3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding? 1 1 3 1 0 3 1 3.17 1132/1295 3.17 3.93 3.94 4.01 3.17

### Discussion

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned? 15 0 3 0 0 0 2 2.60 1349/1398 2.60 3.75 4.07 4.23 2.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate? 15 0 1 1 0 0 3 3.60 1192/1391 3.60 3.95 4.30 4.48 3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion? 15 0 1 1 0 0 3 3.40 1247/1517 3.40 4.01 4.28 4.50 3.75
4. Were special techniques successful? 15 4 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/958 **** 3.61 3.93 4.24 ****
### Applied Statistics

**Course-Section:** STAT 454 0101  
**Title:** APPLIED STATISTICS  
**Instructor:** PARK, JUNYONG  
**Enrollment:** 24  
**Frequency Distribution:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Earned</th>
<th>Cum GPA</th>
<th>Expected Grades</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00-27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00-0.99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>A 10 Required for Majors 0</td>
<td>Graduate 0</td>
<td>Maj or 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.00-1.99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>B 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00-2.99</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C 0</td>
<td>General 3</td>
<td>Under-grad 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-150</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.00-3.49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.50-4.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F 0</td>
<td>Electives 0</td>
<td>## - Means there are not enough responses to be significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.00-4.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>P 0</td>
<td>I 0</td>
<td>Other 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Questions**

1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course?  
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals?  
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals?  
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals?  
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned?  
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned?  
7. Was the grading system clearly explained?  
8. How many times was class cancelled?  
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness?

**Design Quality Control**

**Course-Section:** STAT 455 0101  
**Title:** DESIGN QUALITY CONTROL  
**Instructor:** ROY, ANINDYA  
**Enrollment:** 5  
**Frequency Distribution:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Earned</th>
<th>Cum GPA</th>
<th>Expected Grades</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00-27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00-0.99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>A 10 Required for Majors 0</td>
<td>Graduate 0</td>
<td>Maj or 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.00-1.99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>B 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00-2.99</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C 0</td>
<td>General 3</td>
<td>Under-grad 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-150</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.00-3.49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.50-4.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F 0</td>
<td>Electives 0</td>
<td>## - Means there are not enough responses to be significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.00-4.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>P 0</td>
<td>I 0</td>
<td>Other 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Questions**

1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course?  
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals?  
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals?  
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals?  
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned?  
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned?  
7. Was the grading system clearly explained?  
8. How many times was class cancelled?  
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness?
### Lecture

1. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared? 0 0 0 0 0 0 5.00 1/1518 5.00 4.70 4.43 4.51 5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject? 0 0 0 0 0 0 5.00 1/1520 5.00 4.70 4.70 4.75 5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly? 0 0 0 0 0 0 5.00 1/1517 5.00 4.42 4.27 4.34 5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned? 0 0 0 0 0 0 5.00 1/1550 5.00 4.54 4.22 4.24 5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding? 0 1 0 0 0 0 3.50 1/1295 5.00 3.93 3.94 4.01 5.00

### Discussion

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned? 1 0 0 0 0 0 5.00 1/1398 5.00 3.75 4.07 4.23 5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate? 1 0 0 0 0 0 5.00 1/1391 5.00 3.95 4.30 4.48 5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion? 1 0 0 0 0 0 5.00 1/1388 5.00 4.01 4.28 4.50 5.00

### Frequency Distribution

#### Credits Earned

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

#### Course-Section: STAT 490 0101

**University of Maryland**

**Title:** SPECIAL TOPICS IN STAT

**Instructor:** CHO, TAERYON

**Enrollment:** 5

**Questionnaires:** 5

---

### Frequency Distribution

#### Credits Earned

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

#### Course-Section: STAT 601 0101

**University of Maryland**

**Title:** APPL ED STATISTCS

**Instructor:** ROY, ANINDYA

**Enrollment:** 5

**Questionnaires:** 5

---

### Frequency Distribution

#### Credits Earned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits Earned</th>
<th>Cum GPA</th>
<th>Expected Grades</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00-27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00-0.99</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Required for Majors</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00-1.99</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.00-2.99</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-150</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.00-3.49</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.50-4.00</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Course Dept</td>
<td>UMBC Level</td>
<td>Sect</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>137/1639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1/1583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1/1504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Was the grading system clearly explained</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How many times was class cancelled</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1/1635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>170/1518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>887/1550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Were special techniques successful</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Frequency Distribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits Earned</th>
<th>Cum GPA</th>
<th>Expected Grades</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00-27</td>
<td>0.00-0.99</td>
<td>A 7</td>
<td>Requi red for Majors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-55</td>
<td>1.00-1.99</td>
<td>B 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-83</td>
<td>2.00-2.99</td>
<td>C 0</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Under-grad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-150</td>
<td>3.00-3.49</td>
<td>D 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>3.50-4.00</td>
<td>F 0</td>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>#**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>I 0</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course-Section: STAT 611 0101 University of Maryland Page 1605
Title: MATHEMATICAL STAT I Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: SINHA, BIMAL Fall 2007 Job IR883029
Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 14
## Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits Earned</th>
<th>Cum GPA</th>
<th>Expected Grades</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00-27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00-0.99</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Maj or 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00-1.99</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.00-2.99</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.00-3.49</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.50-4.00</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Electives 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Other 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course-Section: STAT 616 0101

University of Maryland

Fall 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

### General

1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course
   0 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 470/1369 4.67 4.34 4.27 4.42 4.67

2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals
   0 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.56 466/1369 4.56 4.46 4.22 4.26 4.56

3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals
   0 7 0 0 0 2 5.00 439/1397 4.50 4.28 4.37

4. Did the other evaluations reflect the expected goals
   0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 217/1583 4.35 4.19 4.31 4.78

5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned
   0 0 0 0 1 2 7 4.78 855/1635 4.65 4.81 4.78

6. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned
   0 0 0 0 1 7 4.56 329/1504 4.54 4.16 4.27 4.56

7. Was the grading system clearly explained
   0 0 0 0 1 7 4.56 439/1612 4.54 4.54 4.16 4.27 4.56

8. How many times was class cancelled
   0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 855/1635 4.65 4.81 4.78

9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness
   0 1 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 382/1579 4.50 4.21 4.08 4.17 4.50

### Lecture

1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared
   0 0 1 0 0 1 7 4.44 891/1518 4.44 4.70 4.43 4.49 4.44

2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject
   0 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 1/1520 5.00 4.70 4.79 5.00

3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly
   0 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 674/1517 4.44 4.42 4.32 4.44

4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned
   0 0 0 0 1 7 4.44 716/1550 4.44 4.54 4.22 4.23 4.44

5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding
   1 5 0 0 1 2 4.33 398/1295 3.93 3.94 3.95 4.33

### Discussion

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned
   5 0 0 0 1 2 4.25 625/1398 4.25 3.75 4.07 4.22 4.25

2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate
   6 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1391 5.00 3.95 4.30 4.47 5.00

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion
   6 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 496/1388 4.67 4.01 4.28 4.49 4.67

4. Were special techniques successful
   6 1 0 1 0 1 3 5.00 958 3.61 3.93 4.01 4.01

### Laboratory

1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material
   8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 224 4.10 4.43 4.44

2. Were you provided with adequate background information
   8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 240 4.11 3.96

3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities
   8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 219 4.44 4.23 4.23

4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance
   8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 215 4.35 4.72 4.72

5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified
   8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 198 4.18 4.74

### Seminar

1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme
   8 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 85 4.58 4.58

2. Were the instructor available for individual attention
   8 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 82 4.52 4.74

3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned
   8 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 78 4.47 4.52 4.52

4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned
   8 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 80 4.47 4.50

5. Were criteria for grading made clear
   8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 82 4.16 4.37

### Field Work

1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned
   8 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 52 4.04 3.64

2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria
   8 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 53 4.45 4.03

3. Was the instructor available for consultation
   8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 42 4.78 4.78

4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations
   8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 37 4.58 4.33

5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities
   8 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 32 4.56 4.59

### Self Paced

1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned
   8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 50 4.45 4.39

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal
   8 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 32 4.51 4.50

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful
   8 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 43 4.69 4.61
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful
8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.37 4.31 ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students
8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** **** 4.52 4.42 ****

Course-Section: STAT 616  0101                         University of Maryland                                             Page 1606
Title: NONPARAMETRIC STATISTICS
Instructor: WANG, XIAO                                   Fall 2007                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 619  0101                         University of Maryland                                             Page 1607
Title: BIOSTATISTICS
Instructor: HUANG, YI-PING                               Fall 2007                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions                          NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean  Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
General
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  0   0   2   1   1   2   2  3.13  1588/1639  3.13  4.34  4.27  4.42  3.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   1   2   1   4   0  3.00  1579/1639  3.00  4.46  4.22  4.26  3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   3   0   1   2   2   0  3.20  1337/1397  3.20  4.50  4.28  4.37  3.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   1   0   4   2   1   3.57 1378/1583  3.57  4.35  4.19  4.31  3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   2   3   1   2   3.13 1402/1532  3.13  4.14  4.01  4.10  3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   1   3   4   0  3.38 1278/1504  3.38  4.24  4.05  4.29  3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0   1   1   2   4  4.13  955/1612  4.13  4.54  4.16  4.27  4.13
8. How many times were class cancelled                0   0   0   0   1   7   1  4.13 144/1635  4.13  4.75  4.65  4.81  4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2   0   2   0   3   1   2  2.50 1555/1579  2.50  4.08  4.17  4.25  2.50

Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   1   1   1   2   3  3.63 1400/1518  3.63  4.70  4.43  4.59  3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   1   0   0   3   4  4.13 1392/1520  4.13  4.70  4.70  4.79  4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   2   2   1   2   1  2.75 1488/1517  2.75  4.42  4.27  4.32  2.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   1   0   2   1   2   3  3.50 1328/1550  3.50  4.54  4.22  4.35  3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0   2   0   1   2   0   3  3.83 783/1295  3.83  3.93  3.95  3.93  3.83

Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 426/1398  4.50  3.75  4.07  4.22  4.50
2. Were we all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 1/1391  5.00  3.95  4.30  4.47  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 1/1388  5.00  4.01  4.28  4.49  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   6   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 958 ****  3.61  3.93  4.01 ****

Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 224 **** **** 4.10 4.43 ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 240 **** **** 4.11 3.96 ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 219 **** **** 4.44 4.23 ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           7   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 215 **** **** 4.35 4.72 ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 7   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.18 4.74 ****

Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 7   0   0   0   0   1   0  3.00 ****/ 85 **** **** 4.58 4.58 ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 7   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/ 82 **** **** 4.52 4.74 ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 7   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/ 78 **** **** 4.47 4.52 ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    7   0   0   1   0   0   0  3.00 ****/ 80 **** **** 4.47 4.50 ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                7   0   0   1   0   0   0  3.00 ****/ 82 **** **** 4.16 4.37 ****

Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.04 3.64 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 7   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.05 4.03 ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       7   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.75 4.78 ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 7 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 37 **** 4.58 4.33 ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 7 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.56 4.59 ****

Self Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 1 0 0 4.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.45 4.39 ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 7 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.51 4.50 ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 7 0 0 0 1 0 0 4.00 ****/ 43 **** 4.69 4.61 ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 7 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.37 4.31 ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 7 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 21 **** 4.52 4.42 ****

Course-Section: STAT 619 0101  University of Maryland  Page 1607
Title     BIOSTATISTICS  Baltimore County  FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:     HUANG, YI-PING  Fall 2007  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      11
Questionnaires:   8

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 5 Maj or 8
28-55     1 1.00-1.99  0 B  3
56-83     0 2.00-2.99  0 C  0 General 3 Under-grad 3 Non-maj or 0
84-150    0 3.00-3.49  1 D  0
Grad.  5 3.50-4.00  7 E  0 Electives 0 **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
    7 0

Course-Section: STAT 651 0101  University of Maryland  Page 1608
Title     BASIC PROBABILITY  Baltimore County  FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:     CHAI, TAERYON  Fall 2007  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      17
Questionnaires:  14

Frequency/Instructor/Course Dept/UMBC Level/ Sect

Questions

Lecture
1. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 3 7 4.86 286/1518 4.86 4.70 4.43 4.49 4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4.50 1/1520 5.00 4.70 4.70 4.79 5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.57 510/1517 4.57 4.42 4.37 4.52 4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 12 4.86 231/1550 4.86 4.54 4.22 4.23 4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 3 9 4.75 135/1295 4.75 3.93 3.94 3.95 4.75

Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4 4.08 742/1398 4.08 3.75 4.07 4.22 4.08
2. Did all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 4 8 4.67 489/1391 4.67 3.95 4.30 4.47 4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 8 4.50 647/1388 4.50 4.01 4.28 4.49 4.50
4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 0 2 9 1 4.33 ****/ 958 **** 3.61 3.93 4.01 ****

Field Work
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.04 3.64 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 0 0 0 1 4.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.05 4.03 ****
3. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 13 0 0 0 0 0 1 4.00 ****/ 37 **** 4.58 4.33 ****
4. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.56 4.59 ****

Self Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.45 4.39 ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 13 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.51 4.50 ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 13 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 43 **** 4.69 4.61 ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 13 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.37 4.31 ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits Earned</th>
<th>Cum GPA</th>
<th>Expected Grades</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00-27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00-0.99</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Required for Majors</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00-1.99</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.00-2.99</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Under-grad</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.00-3.49</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Non-major</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grad. 10

| 3.50-4.00 | 5     | Electives | 3     | Mean responses to be significant |

---

### Frequency Distribution

**Credits Earned** | **Cum GPA** | **Expected Grades** | **Reasons** | **Type** | **Majors**
---|---|---|---|---|---
00-27 | 0.00-0.99 | A | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate 10 Maj or 4
28-55 | 1.00-1.99 | B | 1 | 3 | Under-grad 4 Non-major 10
56-83 | 2.00-2.99 | C | 0 | 3 | Non-major 0
84-150 | 3.00-3.49 | D | 0 | 3 | Non-major 0
Grad. 10 | 3.50-4.00 | E | Electives | 3 | Mean responses to be significant

---

### Questionnaire

**Course-Section**: STAT 700A 0101

**Title**: CROSSOVER DESIGNS BIOE

**Instructor**: MATHEW, THOMAS

**Enrollment**: 3

**Questionnaires**: 2

---

1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned
7. Was the grading system clearly explained
8. How many times was class cancelled
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness

---

**Course-Section**: STAT 700B 0101

**Title**: STATISTICAL DATA MINING

**Instructor**: PARK, JUNYOUNG

**Enrollment**: 8

**Questionnaire**: 7

---

1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned
7. Was the grading system clearly explained
8. How many times was class cancelled
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals
   - Yes: 1
   - No: 0
   - NA: 0
   - Total: 4
   - Average: 5.00
   - Shell: 1/1583

5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned
   - Yes: 1
   - No: 0
   - NA: 0
   - Total: 3
   - Average: 5.00
   - Shell: 1/1532

6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned
   - Yes: 1
   - No: 0
   - NA: 0
   - Total: 3
   - Average: 5.00
   - Shell: 1/1612

7. Was the grading system clearly explained
   - Yes: 1
   - No: 0
   - NA: 0
   - Total: 3
   - Average: 5.00
   - Shell: 1/1635

8. How many times was class cancelled
   - Yes: 1
   - No: 0
   - NA: 0
   - Total: 1
   - Average: 4.50
   - Shell: 1135/1635

9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness
   - Yes: 1
   - No: 0
   - NA: 0
   - Total: 4
   - Average: 5.00
   - Shell: 1/1579

Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared
   - Yes: 1
   - No: 0
   - NA: 0
   - Total: 4
   - Average: 5.00
   - Shell: 1/1518

2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject
   - Yes: 1
   - No: 0
   - NA: 0
   - Total: 4
   - Average: 5.00
   - Shell: 1/1520

3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly
   - Yes: 1
   - No: 0
   - NA: 0
   - Total: 4
   - Average: 5.00
   - Shell: 1/1517

4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned
   - Yes: 1
   - No: 0
   - NA: 0
   - Total: 4
   - Average: 5.00
   - Shell: 1/1550

Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned
   - Yes: 3
   - No: 0
   - NA: 0
   - Total: 1
   - Average: 4.50
   - Shell: 426/1398

2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate
   - Yes: 3
   - No: 0
   - NA: 0
   - Total: 2
   - Average: 5.00
   - Shell: 1/1391

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion
   - Yes: 3
   - No: 0
   - NA: 0
   - Total: 2
   - Average: 5.00
   - Shell: 1/1388

Frequency Distribution

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