

Course-Section: STAT 121 1
 Title Intro Statistics:Soc S
 Instructor: Slowikowski,Wil
 Enrollment: 142
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1462
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	5	12	13	3.97	1144/1509	4.09	4.34	4.31	4.18	3.97
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	9	20	4.41	683/1509	4.50	4.43	4.26	4.25	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	10	19	4.35	688/1287	4.54	4.50	4.30	4.24	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	2	1	4	7	5	3.63	1254/1459	3.99	4.39	4.22	4.11	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	6	6	17	4.27	575/1406	4.28	4.13	4.09	4.02	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	28	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/1384	4.01	4.23	4.11	3.98	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	7	23	4.53	434/1489	4.50	4.52	4.17	4.20	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	20	14	4.41	1156/1506	4.68	4.70	4.67	4.66	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	0	5	16	5	3.89	998/1463	4.11	4.02	4.09	4.02	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	10	20	4.52	787/1438	4.67	4.64	4.46	4.44	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	9	21	4.55	1130/1421	4.68	4.73	4.73	4.66	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	6	8	18	4.30	841/1411	4.44	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	6	21	4.36	798/1405	4.50	4.46	4.32	4.27	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	25	2	1	1	2	2	3.13	****/1236	4.05	4.04	4.00	3.87	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	2	6	6	13	3.63	1001/1260	3.93	3.86	4.14	3.95	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	4	4	4	8	12	3.63	1097/1255	3.80	4.04	4.33	4.15	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	4	3	6	7	12	3.63	1118/1258	3.89	4.12	4.38	4.18	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	2	23	2	1	2	3	1	3.00	801/ 873	3.39	3.87	4.03	3.89	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	2	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	4	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: STAT 121 1
 Title Intro Statistics:Soc S
 Instructor: Slowikowski,Wil
 Enrollment: 142
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1462
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	15	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	7	C	2	General	13	Under-grad	34	Non-major	34
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	3	14	36	39	4.21	931/1509	4.09	4.34	4.31	4.18	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	28	60	4.59	435/1509	4.50	4.43	4.26	4.25	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	19	71	4.73	282/1287	4.54	4.50	4.30	4.24	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	10	1	2	13	18	48	4.34	676/1459	3.99	4.39	4.22	4.11	4.34
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	1	3	14	22	48	4.28	551/1406	4.28	4.13	4.09	4.02	4.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	13	3	4	14	26	32	4.01	801/1384	4.01	4.23	4.11	3.98	4.01
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	10	20	58	4.46	513/1489	4.50	4.52	4.17	4.20	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	4	87	4.96	292/1506	4.68	4.70	4.67	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	3	0	0	4	40	28	4.33	545/1463	4.11	4.02	4.09	4.02	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	1	8	79	4.82	334/1438	4.67	4.64	4.46	4.44	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	14	74	4.82	742/1421	4.68	4.73	4.73	4.66	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	5	24	59	4.58	520/1411	4.44	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	2	2	19	65	4.63	513/1405	4.50	4.46	4.32	4.27	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	16	5	4	10	17	37	4.05	640/1236	4.05	4.04	4.00	3.87	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	2	2	12	14	38	4.24	637/1260	3.93	3.86	4.14	3.95	4.24
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	7	2	12	11	35	3.97	930/1255	3.80	4.04	4.33	4.15	3.97
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	3	2	10	19	33	4.15	878/1258	3.89	4.12	4.38	4.18	4.15
4. Were special techniques successful	28	30	2	3	10	7	14	3.78	600/ 873	3.39	3.87	4.03	3.89	3.78
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	80	5	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	82	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	82	3	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	83	4	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	84	5	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	86	2	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	86	1	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	88	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	90	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	90	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	88	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	88	0	1	0	0	4	1	3.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	88	1	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	89	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	89	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	86	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	86	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	87	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	88	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	88	3	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: STAT 121 4
 Title Intro Statistics:Soc S
 Instructor: Kegan,Bonnie E
 Enrollment: 264
 Questionnaires: 94

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1463
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	34	Required for Majors	40	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	1	B	27						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	8	C	9	General	29	Under-grad	94	Non-major	94
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	13	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	0	3	8	13	4.15	987/1509	4.03	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	7	16	4.30	817/1509	4.28	4.43	4.26	4.25	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	17	4.62	414/1287	4.47	4.50	4.30	4.33	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	5	7	12	4.29	726/1459	4.15	4.39	4.22	4.26	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	3	3	6	10	4.05	783/1406	3.58	4.13	4.09	4.12	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	1	2	4	4	5	3.63	1132/1384	3.61	4.23	4.11	4.15	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	8	13	4.27	749/1489	4.39	4.52	4.17	4.14	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	15	4.58	1014/1506	4.78	4.70	4.67	4.67	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	3	10	5	3.85	1021/1463	3.62	4.02	4.09	4.08	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	7	18	4.52	787/1438	4.46	4.64	4.46	4.43	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	10	15	4.44	1195/1421	4.37	4.73	4.73	4.73	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	1	5	17	4.31	841/1411	4.19	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	8	14	4.31	859/1405	4.30	4.46	4.32	4.32	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	21	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1236	3.05	4.04	4.00	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	6	4	2	5	6	3.04	1156/1260	2.56	3.86	4.14	4.22	3.04
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	1	5	8	7	3.74	1060/1255	3.10	4.04	4.33	4.37	3.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	4	1	4	7	7	3.52	1139/1258	3.19	4.12	4.38	4.42	3.52
4. Were special techniques successful	3	12	2	1	3	2	4	3.42	734/ 873	3.42	3.87	4.03	4.08	3.42
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: STAT 350 1
 Title Stat W/App In Biol Sci
 Instructor: Sharma, Gaurav
 Enrollment: 138
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1464
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	20	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	27
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 350 4
 Title Stat W/App In Biol Sci
 Instructor: Abercrombie,Mar
 Enrollment: 160
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1465
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	13	10	14	3.90	1221/1509	4.03	4.34	4.31	4.32	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	15	18	4.26	859/1509	4.28	4.43	4.26	4.25	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	9	23	4.33	708/1287	4.47	4.50	4.30	4.33	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	1	8	10	16	4.00	979/1459	4.15	4.39	4.22	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	5	4	7	7	5	3.11	1319/1406	3.58	4.13	4.09	4.12	3.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	3	2	6	11	7	3.59	1154/1384	3.61	4.23	4.11	4.15	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	3	6	26	4.51	446/1489	4.39	4.52	4.17	4.14	4.51
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	37	4.97	175/1506	4.78	4.70	4.67	4.67	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	16	16	0	3.38	1300/1463	3.62	4.02	4.09	4.08	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	12	21	4.41	930/1438	4.46	4.64	4.46	4.43	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	2	16	17	4.30	1278/1421	4.37	4.73	4.73	4.73	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	10	8	17	4.08	1010/1411	4.19	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	5	13	18	4.30	866/1405	4.30	4.46	4.32	4.32	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	4	2	6	3	4	3.05	1123/1236	3.05	4.04	4.00	4.07	3.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	16	4	3	3	3	2.07	1256/1260	2.56	3.86	4.14	4.22	2.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	11	2	9	3	3	2.46	1243/1255	3.10	4.04	4.33	4.37	2.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	8	3	8	3	6	2.86	1240/1258	3.19	4.12	4.38	4.42	2.86
4. Were special techniques successful	11	20	2	3	1	1	1	2.50	****/ 873	3.42	3.87	4.03	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	21	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	38	Non-major	39
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: STAT 351 1
 Title Applied Stat/Bus & Eco
 Instructor: Dasgupta,Nandit
 Enrollment: 192
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1466
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	4	31	4.62	470/1509	4.24	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	35	4.85	167/1509	4.48	4.43	4.26	4.25	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	2	34	4.72	304/1287	4.54	4.50	4.30	4.33	4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	1	1	2	3	24	4.55	410/1459	4.24	4.39	4.22	4.26	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	3	3	1	22	4.33	502/1406	4.32	4.13	4.09	4.12	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	1	2	5	22	4.38	479/1384	4.21	4.23	4.11	4.15	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	5	32	4.69	243/1489	4.45	4.52	4.17	4.14	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	9	23	5	3.82	1463/1506	4.03	4.70	4.67	4.67	3.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	1	13	15	4.48	353/1463	3.99	4.02	4.09	4.08	4.48
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	1	34	4.82	348/1438	4.49	4.64	4.46	4.43	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	33	4.82	768/1421	4.70	4.73	4.73	4.73	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	4	31	4.76	303/1411	4.50	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	33	4.84	239/1405	4.53	4.46	4.32	4.32	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	21	1	1	2	1	10	4.20	536/1236	4.18	4.04	4.00	4.07	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	2	2	7	21	4.26	613/1260	4.32	3.86	4.14	4.22	4.26
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	4	5	23	4.52	568/1255	4.43	4.04	4.33	4.37	4.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	1	3	5	23	4.35	756/1258	4.39	4.12	4.38	4.42	4.35
4. Were special techniques successful	5	19	0	4	0	1	10	4.13	400/ 873	4.18	3.87	4.03	4.08	4.13
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: STAT 351 1
 Title Applied Stat/Bus & Eco
 Instructor: Dasgupta,Nandit
 Enrollment: 192
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1466
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	28	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	39	Non-major	39
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	2	5	12	13	3.86	1251/1509	4.24	4.34	4.31	4.32	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	3	6	5	19	4.12	1002/1509	4.48	4.43	4.26	4.25	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	9	21	4.37	668/1287	4.54	4.50	4.30	4.33	4.37	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	3	1	6	5	15	3.93	1055/1459	4.24	4.39	4.22	4.26	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	6	6	19	4.31	518/1406	4.32	4.13	4.09	4.12	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	9	1	1	5	6	11	4.04	784/1384	4.21	4.23	4.11	4.15	4.04
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	4	10	18	4.20	823/1489	4.45	4.52	4.17	4.14	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	26	8	4.24	1273/1506	4.03	4.70	4.67	4.67	4.24
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	3	2	4	7	6	3.50	1241/1463	3.99	4.02	4.09	4.08	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	2	1	3	7	16	4.17	1128/1438	4.49	4.64	4.46	4.43	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	0	1	6	21	4.59	1099/1421	4.70	4.73	4.73	4.73	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	2	1	3	5	18	4.24	893/1411	4.50	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	2	2	0	4	5	16	4.22	919/1405	4.53	4.46	4.32	4.32	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	3	3	0	2	5	15	4.16	563/1236	4.18	4.04	4.00	4.07	4.16
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	3	5	15	4.38	528/1260	4.32	3.86	4.14	4.22	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	1	3	2	16	4.35	715/1255	4.43	4.04	4.33	4.37	4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	3	2	15	4.43	700/1258	4.39	4.12	4.38	4.42	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	15	12	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	350/ 873	4.18	3.87	4.03	4.08	4.22
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.60	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	1	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: STAT 351 4
 Title Applied Stat/Bus & Eco
 Instructor: Roy, Atul N
 Enrollment: 148
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1467
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	36	Non-major	36
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 355 1
 Title Intro App Prob & Stat
 Instructor: Abercrombie,Mar
 Enrollment: 144
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1468
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	8	19	12	4.05	1079/1509	4.00	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	13	21	4.38	731/1509	4.34	4.43	4.26	4.25	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	29	4.63	403/1287	4.63	4.50	4.30	4.33	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	6	14	14	4.14	877/1459	4.29	4.39	4.22	4.26	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	17	3	0	4	8	8	3.78	1023/1406	3.67	4.13	4.09	4.12	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	2	10	13	6	3.66	1114/1384	3.79	4.23	4.11	4.15	3.66
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	12	25	4.55	399/1489	4.45	4.52	4.17	4.14	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	5.00	1/1506	4.94	4.70	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	13	15	5	3.71	1142/1463	3.80	4.02	4.09	4.08	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	12	24	4.54	762/1438	4.51	4.64	4.46	4.43	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	16	20	4.44	1200/1421	4.58	4.73	4.73	4.73	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	7	11	21	4.36	789/1411	4.25	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	6	15	17	4.29	874/1405	4.16	4.46	4.32	4.32	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	0	5	4	11	4	3.58	945/1236	3.68	4.04	4.00	4.07	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	3	6	11	11	3.63	1001/1260	3.67	3.86	4.14	4.22	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	2	12	8	10	3.65	1090/1255	3.56	4.04	4.33	4.37	3.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	3	9	8	10	3.58	1131/1258	3.73	4.12	4.38	4.42	3.58
4. Were special techniques successful	6	26	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	****/ 873	4.00	3.87	4.03	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 22	Required for Majors 35	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	9	2.00-2.99 6	C 6	General 1	Under-grad 40 Non-major 40
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		

Course-Section: STAT 355 4
 Title Intro App Prob & Stat
 Instructor: Abercrombie, Mar
 Enrollment: 138
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1469
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	9	15	10	3.92	1204/1509	4.00	4.34	4.31	4.32	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	11	17	4.19	932/1509	4.34	4.43	4.26	4.25	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	9	23	4.46	578/1287	4.63	4.50	4.30	4.33	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	8	20	4.22	814/1459	4.29	4.39	4.22	4.26	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	3	7	7	9	3.64	1116/1406	3.67	4.13	4.09	4.12	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	2	10	6	9	3.71	1076/1384	3.79	4.23	4.11	4.15	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	10	20	4.40	597/1489	4.45	4.52	4.17	4.14	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	0	33	4.83	722/1506	4.94	4.70	4.67	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	3	6	16	6	3.81	1060/1463	3.80	4.02	4.09	4.08	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	3	7	24	4.51	787/1438	4.51	4.64	4.46	4.43	4.51
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	4	7	22	4.44	1195/1421	4.58	4.73	4.73	4.73	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	5	12	16	4.24	902/1411	4.25	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	7	9	16	4.12	994/1405	4.16	4.46	4.32	4.32	4.12
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	9	1	2	8	7	5	3.57	955/1236	3.68	4.04	4.00	4.07	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	3	4	8	15	3.97	795/1260	3.67	3.86	4.14	4.22	3.97
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	4	9	8	8	3.44	1145/1255	3.56	4.04	4.33	4.37	3.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	2	10	8	10	3.77	1063/1258	3.73	4.12	4.38	4.42	3.77
4. Were special techniques successful	5	17	0	0	7	1	7	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	3.87	4.03	4.08	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 13	Required for Majors	Graduate	0	Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 11				
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	5	C 7	General	Under-grad	37	Non-major 37
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D 0				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0				
				I 0	Other			
				? 3				

Course-Section: STAT 355 7
 Title Intro App Prob & Stat
 Instructor: Glezen, John
 Enrollment: 158
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1470
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	6	19	18	4.02	1100/1509	4.00	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.02
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	11	31	4.46	621/1509	4.34	4.43	4.26	4.25	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	41	4.79	218/1287	4.63	4.50	4.30	4.33	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	3	11	27	4.52	432/1459	4.29	4.39	4.22	4.26	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	17	4	1	7	11	8	3.58	1147/1406	3.67	4.13	4.09	4.12	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	2	2	8	4	18	4.00	807/1384	3.79	4.23	4.11	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	14	28	4.40	608/1489	4.45	4.52	4.17	4.14	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	47	4.98	175/1506	4.94	4.70	4.67	4.67	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	1	1	6	21	7	3.89	998/1463	3.80	4.02	4.09	4.08	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	5	14	28	4.49	826/1438	4.51	4.64	4.46	4.43	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	42	4.87	614/1421	4.58	4.73	4.73	4.73	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	10	14	21	4.15	971/1411	4.25	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	11	11	22	4.06	1019/1405	4.16	4.46	4.32	4.32	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	2	4	8	10	17	3.88	789/1236	3.68	4.04	4.00	4.07	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	9	1	5	8	13	3.42	1086/1260	3.67	3.86	4.14	4.22	3.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	5	4	4	8	13	3.59	1108/1255	3.56	4.04	4.33	4.37	3.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	2	1	10	7	13	3.85	1037/1258	3.73	4.12	4.38	4.42	3.85
4. Were special techniques successful	15	23	2	2	2	2	2	3.00	****/ 873	4.00	3.87	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 21	Required for Majors 43	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 17		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 4	C 6	General 0	Under-grad 48 Non-major 48
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: STAT 433 1
 Title Statistical Computing
 Instructor: Klein, Martin D
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1471
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.34	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.43	4.26	4.26	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.50	4.30	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.39	4.22	4.32	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.13	4.09	4.11	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.23	4.11	4.23	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.52	4.17	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.70	4.67	4.67	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.64	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.73	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.39	4.31	4.35	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.46	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.04	4.00	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	5.00	3.86	4.14	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.04	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.12	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	3.87	4.03	4.26	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

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

Course-Section: STAT 451 1
 Title Intro Probability Theo
 Instructor: Stanwyck, Elizab
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1472
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	635/1509	4.47	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	223/1509	4.79	4.43	4.26	4.26	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	229/1287	4.79	4.50	4.30	4.38	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.39	4.22	4.32	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	377/1406	4.46	4.13	4.09	4.11	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	107/1384	4.80	4.23	4.11	4.23	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	103/1489	4.89	4.52	4.17	4.18	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	820/1506	4.78	4.70	4.67	4.67	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	438/1463	4.43	4.02	4.09	4.18	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	131/1438	4.94	4.64	4.46	4.50	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.73	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	291/1411	4.76	4.39	4.31	4.35	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	205/1405	4.88	4.46	4.32	4.34	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	877/1236	3.71	4.04	4.00	4.03	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	0	0	6	4.00	746/1260	4.00	3.86	4.14	4.25	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	690/1255	4.38	4.04	4.33	4.46	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	742/1258	4.38	4.12	4.38	4.51	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 873	****	3.87	4.03	4.26	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.37	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.19	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 2	Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 17	Non-major 17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D 1			
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: STAT 454 1
 Title Applied Statistics
 Instructor: Park,DoHwan
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1473
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	800/1509	4.33	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	10	6	4.00	1086/1509	4.00	4.43	4.26	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	10	8	4.19	826/1287	4.19	4.50	4.30	4.38	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	6	8	3.95	1033/1459	3.95	4.39	4.22	4.32	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	3	2	7	6	3.89	949/1406	3.89	4.13	4.09	4.11	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	2	8	6	4.12	742/1384	4.12	4.23	4.11	4.23	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	8	10	4.24	781/1489	4.24	4.52	4.17	4.18	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	292/1506	4.95	4.70	4.67	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	6	9	4	3.80	1060/1463	3.80	4.02	4.09	4.18	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	675/1438	4.60	4.64	4.46	4.50	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	794/1421	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.76	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	5	5	8	3.90	1145/1411	3.90	4.39	4.31	4.35	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	7	9	4.20	940/1405	4.20	4.46	4.32	4.34	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	752/1236	3.93	4.04	4.00	4.03	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1260	****	3.86	4.14	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1255	****	4.04	4.33	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1258	****	4.12	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 873	****	3.87	4.03	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	1	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	18
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	1				
			? 1						

Course-Section: STAT 602 1
 Title Applied Statistics II
 Instructor: Mathew, Thomas
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1474
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	210/1509	4.84	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	589/1509	4.47	4.43	4.26	4.25	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	554/1287	4.47	4.50	4.30	4.22	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	191/1459	4.75	4.39	4.22	4.16	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	665/1406	4.19	4.13	4.09	4.12	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	182/1384	4.71	4.23	4.11	4.16	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	3	12	4.42	569/1489	4.42	4.52	4.17	4.14	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.70	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	241/1463	4.62	4.02	4.09	4.15	4.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	131/1438	4.94	4.64	4.46	4.49	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.73	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	482/1411	4.61	4.39	4.31	4.33	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	103/1405	4.94	4.46	4.32	4.33	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	147/1236	4.71	4.04	4.00	3.98	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	528/1260	4.38	3.86	4.14	4.21	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	629/1255	4.44	4.04	4.33	4.43	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	507/1258	4.67	4.12	4.38	4.50	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 873	****	3.87	4.03	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	3	A 6	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 8	Major 13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 3	General 1	Under-grad 11	Non-major 6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 1			

Course-Section: STAT 611 1
 Title Mathematical Stat I
 Instructor: Roy, Anindya
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1475
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.34	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	952/1509	4.17	4.43	4.26	4.25	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	924/1287	4.00	4.50	4.30	4.22	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.39	4.22	4.16	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	986/1406	3.83	4.13	4.09	4.12	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1017/1384	3.80	4.23	4.11	4.16	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	458/1489	4.50	4.52	4.17	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1070/1506	4.50	4.70	4.67	4.71	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	853/1463	4.00	4.02	4.09	4.15	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	800/1438	4.50	4.64	4.46	4.49	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1014/1421	4.67	4.73	4.73	4.78	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1174/1411	3.83	4.39	4.31	4.33	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	251/1405	4.83	4.46	4.32	4.33	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1236	****	4.04	4.00	3.98	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	746/1260	4.00	3.86	4.14	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1054/1255	3.75	4.04	4.33	4.43	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	932/1258	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.50	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	3.87	4.03	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 6	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 0	Under-grad 2	Non-major 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: STAT 618 1
 Title Appl Multivariate Meth
 Instructor: Park,Junyong
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1476
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	942/1509	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1290/1509	3.70	4.43	4.26	4.25	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1134/1287	3.60	4.50	4.30	4.22	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	834/1459	4.20	4.39	4.22	4.16	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	971/1406	3.86	4.13	4.09	4.12	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	5	4	4.10	751/1384	4.10	4.23	4.11	4.16	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	986/1489	4.00	4.52	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.70	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1194/1463	3.63	4.02	4.09	4.15	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	545/1438	4.70	4.64	4.46	4.49	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	1217/1421	4.40	4.73	4.73	4.78	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1000/1411	4.10	4.39	4.31	4.33	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	3	4	3.90	1132/1405	3.90	4.46	4.32	4.33	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	0	4	4	4.00	664/1236	4.00	4.04	4.00	3.98	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1260	****	3.86	4.14	4.21	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1255	****	4.04	4.33	4.43	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1258	****	4.12	4.38	4.50	****
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	3.87	4.03	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 633 1
 Title Stat Computing
 Instructor: Klein,Martin D
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1477
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	235/1509	4.82	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	289/1509	4.73	4.43	4.26	4.25	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	199/1287	4.82	4.50	4.30	4.22	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	111/1459	4.88	4.39	4.22	4.16	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	253/1406	4.63	4.13	4.09	4.12	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	320/1384	4.55	4.23	4.11	4.16	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	216/1489	4.73	4.52	4.17	4.14	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	2	4.18	1305/1506	4.18	4.70	4.67	4.71	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	658/1463	4.22	4.02	4.09	4.15	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	219/1438	4.90	4.64	4.46	4.49	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	768/1421	4.82	4.73	4.73	4.78	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	138/1411	4.91	4.39	4.31	4.33	4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	273/1405	4.82	4.46	4.32	4.33	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	664/1236	4.00	4.04	4.00	3.98	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	352/1260	4.60	3.86	4.14	4.21	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	665/1255	4.40	4.04	4.33	4.43	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.12	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 873	****	3.87	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.11	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.36	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.03	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.45	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.16	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.11	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	3.69	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.26	****

Course-Section: STAT 633 1
 Title Stat Computing
 Instructor: Klein, Martin D
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1477
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	9	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	2	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Course-Section: STAT 651 1
 Title Basic Probability
 Instructor: Park,Junyong
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1478
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	605/1509	4.47	4.43	4.26	4.25	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	602/1287	4.44	4.50	4.30	4.22	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	1	1	9	4.31	715/1459	4.31	4.39	4.22	4.16	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	665/1406	4.18	4.13	4.09	4.12	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	292/1384	4.58	4.23	4.11	4.16	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	387/1489	4.56	4.52	4.17	4.14	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	642/1506	4.88	4.70	4.67	4.71	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1060/1463	3.80	4.02	4.09	4.15	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	262/1438	4.88	4.64	4.46	4.49	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	881/1421	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.78	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	768/1411	4.38	4.39	4.31	4.33	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	720/1405	4.44	4.46	4.32	4.33	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	229/1236	4.57	4.04	4.00	3.98	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	1	0	3	3.33	1102/1260	3.33	3.86	4.14	4.21	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	723/1255	4.33	4.04	4.33	4.43	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	932/1258	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.50	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	585/ 873	3.80	3.87	4.03	4.01	3.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.11	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.36	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.03	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.45	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.16	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.11	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	3.69	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.26	****

Course-Section: STAT 651 1
 Title Basic Probability
 Instructor: Park, Junyong
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1478
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	3	A	12	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	6	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 700 2
 Title Top:Stat Mthd/Data Ana
 Instructor: Roy,Anindya
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1479
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	446/1509	4.32	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	495/1509	4.60	4.43	4.26	4.25	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	359/1287	4.58	4.50	4.30	4.22	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	218/1459	4.62	4.39	4.22	4.16	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	446/1406	4.38	4.13	4.09	4.12	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	599/1384	4.54	4.23	4.11	4.16	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	527/1489	4.65	4.52	4.17	4.14	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	1222/1506	4.63	4.70	4.67	4.71	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	151/1463	4.36	4.02	4.09	4.15	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	800/1438	4.49	4.64	4.46	4.49	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1421	4.94	4.73	4.73	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	556/1411	4.45	4.39	4.31	4.33	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	540/1405	4.38	4.46	4.32	4.33	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	421/1236	4.08	4.04	4.00	3.98	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	666/1260	3.85	3.86	4.14	4.21	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	505/1255	4.50	4.04	4.33	4.43	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	549/1258	4.40	4.12	4.38	4.50	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	705/ 873	3.50	3.87	4.03	4.01	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	3	3	3	3.50	1399/1509	4.32	4.34	4.31	4.39	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	683/1509	4.60	4.43	4.26	4.25	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	708/1287	4.58	4.50	4.30	4.22	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	715/1459	4.62	4.39	4.22	4.16	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	6	2	3	3.73	1067/1406	4.38	4.13	4.09	4.12	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	531/1384	4.54	4.23	4.11	4.16	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	276/1489	4.65	4.52	4.17	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	845/1506	4.63	4.70	4.67	4.71	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	2	7	2	3.83	1036/1463	4.36	4.02	4.09	4.15	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	1135/1438	4.49	4.64	4.46	4.49	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	716/1421	4.94	4.73	4.73	4.78	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1051/1411	4.45	4.39	4.31	4.33	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	2	5	3.75	1191/1405	4.38	4.46	4.32	4.33	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	4	3	3	0	2.90	1164/1236	4.08	4.04	4.00	3.98	2.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	2	2	3	3.50	1045/1260	3.85	3.86	4.14	4.21	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	665/1255	4.50	4.04	4.33	4.43	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	850/1258	4.40	4.12	4.38	4.50	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	2	8	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 873	3.50	3.87	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.11	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.36	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.03	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.45	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.16	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.11	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	3.69	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.26	****

Course-Section: STAT 700 3
 Title Top:Stat Mthd/Data Ana
 Instructor: Huang,Yi
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1480
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 700 4
 Title Top:Stat Mthd/Data Ana
 Instructor: Sinha,Bimal K
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1481
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	218/1509	4.32	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	175/1509	4.60	4.43	4.26	4.25	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1287	4.58	4.50	4.30	4.22	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	131/1459	4.62	4.39	4.22	4.16	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1406	4.38	4.13	4.09	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1384	4.54	4.23	4.11	4.16	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	133/1489	4.65	4.52	4.17	4.14	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	722/1506	4.63	4.70	4.67	4.71	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	325/1463	4.36	4.02	4.09	4.15	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	363/1438	4.49	4.64	4.46	4.49	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	4.94	4.73	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1411	4.45	4.39	4.31	4.33	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	285/1405	4.38	4.46	4.32	4.33	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1236	4.08	4.04	4.00	3.98	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1260	3.85	3.86	4.14	4.21	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1255	4.50	4.04	4.33	4.43	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1258	4.40	4.12	4.38	4.50	****
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 873	3.50	3.87	4.03	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

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