

Course-Section: STAT 121 0101
 Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S
 Instructor: MARFANI, ERUM F
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1601
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	8	7	5	3.64	1498/1670	3.96	4.13	4.31	4.23	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	13	4.36	833/1666	4.29	4.11	4.27	4.30	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	4	13	4.36	763/1406	4.23	4.18	4.32	4.31	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	2	0	1	4	7	4.00	1083/1615	4.12	4.17	4.24	4.17	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	5	6	6	3.94	946/1566	4.13	3.90	4.07	4.03	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/1528	3.94	4.12	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	1	6	12	4.29	867/1650	4.27	4.23	4.22	4.28	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	4	4.18	1416/1667	4.76	4.66	4.67	4.61	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	4	8	3	3.81	1210/1626	3.85	3.92	4.11	4.07	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	784/1559	4.46	4.50	4.46	4.47	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	1248/1560	4.36	4.55	4.72	4.68	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	7	11	4.32	924/1549	4.22	4.18	4.31	4.32	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	14	4.45	782/1546	4.27	4.24	4.32	4.32	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	16	2	1	2	1	0	2.33	1284/1323	3.94	3.73	4.00	3.91	2.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	1	2	3	3	3.17	1231/1384	3.79	3.72	4.10	3.92	3.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	0	9	2	3.77	1106/1378	3.64	3.76	4.29	4.09	3.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	2	2	3	3	3.25	1276/1378	3.85	3.88	4.31	4.08	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	9	8	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	****/ 904	3.91	3.28	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.67	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	4.75	****

Course-Section: STAT 121 0101
 Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S
 Instructor: MARFANI, ERUM F
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1601
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	3	3	10	15	4.09	1167/1670	3.96	4.13	4.31	4.23	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	3	5	21	4.31	895/1666	4.29	4.11	4.27	4.30	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	7	19	4.27	860/1406	4.23	4.18	4.32	4.31	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	922/1615	4.12	4.17	4.24	4.17	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	3	3	8	13	3.93	962/1566	4.13	3.90	4.07	4.03	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	1	0	2	1	9	4.31	662/1528	3.94	4.12	4.12	4.00	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	8	19	4.30	844/1650	4.27	4.23	4.22	4.28	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	28	5	4.15	1437/1667	4.76	4.66	4.67	4.61	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	2	6	13	6	3.75	1254/1626	3.85	3.92	4.11	4.07	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	2	5	24	4.52	883/1559	4.46	4.50	4.46	4.47	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	2	2	28	4.70	1054/1560	4.36	4.55	4.72	4.68	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	4	7	20	4.36	864/1549	4.22	4.18	4.31	4.32	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	8	20	4.44	808/1546	4.27	4.24	4.32	4.32	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	23	3	0	0	1	5	3.56	1015/1323	3.94	3.73	4.00	3.91	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	5	3	3	0	9	3.25	1200/1384	3.79	3.72	4.10	3.92	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	3	3	2	5	7	3.50	1193/1378	3.64	3.76	4.29	4.09	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	4	1	2	2	11	3.75	1110/1378	3.85	3.88	4.31	4.08	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	12	18	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 904	3.91	3.28	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	5.00	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	1	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: STAT 121 0102
 Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S
 Instructor: MARFANI, ERUM F
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1602
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	13	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	7	General	4	Under-grad	33	Non-major	33
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	1						

Course-Section: STAT 121 0201
 Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S
 Instructor: KEGAN, BONNIE
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1603
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	2	3	2	4	5	3.44	1557/1670	3.96	4.13	4.31	4.23	3.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	5	5	3.75	1409/1666	4.29	4.11	4.27	4.30	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	0	5	7	3.81	1180/1406	4.23	4.18	4.32	4.31	3.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	2	4	7	4.00	1083/1615	4.12	4.17	4.24	4.17	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	3	2	3	6	3.86	1059/1566	4.13	3.90	4.07	4.03	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	1	5	5	3.79	1134/1528	3.94	4.12	4.12	4.00	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	1	5	6	3.87	1298/1650	4.27	4.23	4.22	4.28	3.87
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	946/1667	4.76	4.66	4.67	4.61	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1289/1626	3.85	3.92	4.11	4.07	3.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	1	4	7	3.93	1330/1559	4.46	4.50	4.46	4.47	3.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	2	2	3	6	3.79	1501/1560	4.36	4.55	4.72	4.68	3.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	0	2	4	6	3.86	1261/1549	4.22	4.18	4.31	4.32	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	0	2	2	7	3.92	1213/1546	4.27	4.24	4.32	4.32	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	692/1323	3.94	3.73	4.00	3.91	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	5	3	4	3.33	1171/1384	3.79	3.72	4.10	3.92	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	4	3	5	2	1	2.53	1345/1378	3.64	3.76	4.29	4.09	2.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	4	0	4	2	5	3.27	1274/1378	3.85	3.88	4.31	4.08	3.27
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	3	0	2	0	2	2.71	857/ 904	3.91	3.28	4.03	3.94	2.71
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: STAT 121 0201
 Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S
 Instructor: KEGAN, BONNIE
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1603
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 121 0202
 Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S
 Instructor: KEGAN, BONNIE
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1604
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	5	3	3.67	1486/1670	3.96	4.13	4.31	4.23	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	1363/1666	4.29	4.11	4.27	4.30	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	1057/1406	4.23	4.18	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1234/1615	4.12	4.17	4.24	4.17	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	851/1566	4.13	3.90	4.07	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1113/1528	3.94	4.12	4.12	4.00	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	1008/1650	4.27	4.23	4.22	4.28	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1667	4.76	4.66	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	2	0	2	3	2	3.33	1462/1626	3.85	3.92	4.11	4.07	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	1143/1559	4.46	4.50	4.46	4.47	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	1438/1560	4.36	4.55	4.72	4.68	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	1227/1549	4.22	4.18	4.31	4.32	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	1056/1546	4.27	4.24	4.32	4.32	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	283/1323	3.94	3.73	4.00	3.91	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	1	4	1	3.10	1255/1384	3.79	3.72	4.10	3.92	3.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	1	3	4	0	2.90	1325/1378	3.64	3.76	4.29	4.09	2.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	2	1	5	0	2.90	1321/1378	3.85	3.88	4.31	4.08	2.90
4. Were special techniques successful	2	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 904	3.91	3.28	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: STAT 121 0202
 Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S
 Instructor: KEGAN, BONNIE
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1604
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 121 0203
 Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S
 Instructor: KEGAN, BONNIE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1605
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	809/1670	3.96	4.13	4.31	4.23	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	686/1666	4.29	4.11	4.27	4.30	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	644/1406	4.23	4.18	4.32	4.31	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	606/1615	4.12	4.17	4.24	4.17	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	610/1566	4.13	3.90	4.07	4.03	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	0	4	8	4.07	864/1528	3.94	4.12	4.12	4.00	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	361/1650	4.27	4.23	4.22	4.28	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1667	4.76	4.66	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1191/1626	3.85	3.92	4.11	4.07	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	772/1559	4.46	4.50	4.46	4.47	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	3	1	9	4.13	1449/1560	4.36	4.55	4.72	4.68	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	816/1549	4.22	4.18	4.31	4.32	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	2	0	10	4.46	768/1546	4.27	4.24	4.32	4.32	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1323	3.94	3.73	4.00	3.91	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	0	11	4.75	257/1384	3.79	3.72	4.10	3.92	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	603/1378	3.64	3.76	4.29	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	439/1378	3.85	3.88	4.31	4.08	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	305/ 904	3.91	3.28	4.03	3.94	4.38

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 121 0203
 Title INTR0 STATISTICS:SOC S
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1606
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	809/1670	3.96	4.13	4.31	4.23	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	686/1666	4.29	4.11	4.27	4.30	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	644/1406	4.23	4.18	4.32	4.31	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	606/1615	4.12	4.17	4.24	4.17	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	610/1566	4.13	3.90	4.07	4.03	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	0	4	8	4.07	864/1528	3.94	4.12	4.12	4.00	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	361/1650	4.27	4.23	4.22	4.28	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1667	4.76	4.66	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1626	3.85	3.92	4.11	4.07	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1559	4.46	4.50	4.46	4.47	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1560	4.36	4.55	4.72	4.68	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1549	4.22	4.18	4.31	4.32	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1546	4.27	4.24	4.32	4.32	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	3.94	3.73	4.00	3.91	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	0	11	4.75	257/1384	3.79	3.72	4.10	3.92	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	603/1378	3.64	3.76	4.29	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	439/1378	3.85	3.88	4.31	4.08	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	305/ 904	3.91	3.28	4.03	3.94	4.38

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 16 Non-major 16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 6	
			? 0		

Course-Section: STAT 121 0204
 Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S
 Instructor: KEGAN, BONNIE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1607
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	9	2	4.00	1216/1670	3.96	4.13	4.31	4.23	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	686/1666	4.29	4.11	4.27	4.30	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	892/1406	4.23	4.18	4.32	4.31	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	7	4	4.00	1083/1615	4.12	4.17	4.24	4.17	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	589/1566	4.13	3.90	4.07	4.03	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	6	3	3.83	1097/1528	3.94	4.12	4.12	4.00	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	1008/1650	4.27	4.23	4.22	4.28	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	607/1667	4.76	4.66	4.67	4.61	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	953/1626	3.85	3.92	4.11	4.07	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	858/1559	4.46	4.50	4.46	4.47	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	1416/1560	4.36	4.55	4.72	4.68	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	736/1549	4.22	4.18	4.31	4.32	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	1064/1546	4.27	4.24	4.32	4.32	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	619/1323	3.94	3.73	4.00	3.91	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	909/1384	3.79	3.72	4.10	3.92	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	1131/1378	3.64	3.76	4.29	4.09	3.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	977/1378	3.85	3.88	4.31	4.08	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	1	0	6	2	4.00	461/ 904	3.91	3.28	4.03	3.94	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 14	Non-major 14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 5		
				? 0			

Course-Section: STAT 121 0204
 Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1608
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	9	2	4.00	1216/1670	3.96	4.13	4.31	4.23	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	686/1666	4.29	4.11	4.27	4.30	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	892/1406	4.23	4.18	4.32	4.31	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	7	4	4.00	1083/1615	4.12	4.17	4.24	4.17	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	589/1566	4.13	3.90	4.07	4.03	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	6	3	3.83	1097/1528	3.94	4.12	4.12	4.00	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	1008/1650	4.27	4.23	4.22	4.28	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	607/1667	4.76	4.66	4.67	4.61	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	563/1626	3.85	3.92	4.11	4.07	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1559	4.46	4.50	4.46	4.47	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1560	4.36	4.55	4.72	4.68	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1549	4.22	4.18	4.31	4.32	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1546	4.27	4.24	4.32	4.32	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1323	3.94	3.73	4.00	3.91	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	909/1384	3.79	3.72	4.10	3.92	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	1131/1378	3.64	3.76	4.29	4.09	3.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	977/1378	3.85	3.88	4.31	4.08	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	1	0	6	2	4.00	461/ 904	3.91	3.28	4.03	3.94	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 14	Non-major 14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 5		
				? 0			

Course-Section: STAT 121 0204
 Title INTR0 STATISTICS:SOC S
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1609
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	9	2	4.00	1216/1670	3.96	4.13	4.31	4.23	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	686/1666	4.29	4.11	4.27	4.30	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	892/1406	4.23	4.18	4.32	4.31	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	7	4	4.00	1083/1615	4.12	4.17	4.24	4.17	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	589/1566	4.13	3.90	4.07	4.03	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	6	3	3.83	1097/1528	3.94	4.12	4.12	4.00	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	1008/1650	4.27	4.23	4.22	4.28	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	607/1667	4.76	4.66	4.67	4.61	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	953/1626	3.85	3.92	4.11	4.07	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/1559	4.46	4.50	4.46	4.47	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1560	4.36	4.55	4.72	4.68	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1549	4.22	4.18	4.31	4.32	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1546	4.27	4.24	4.32	4.32	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1323	3.94	3.73	4.00	3.91	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	909/1384	3.79	3.72	4.10	3.92	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	1131/1378	3.64	3.76	4.29	4.09	3.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	977/1378	3.85	3.88	4.31	4.08	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	1	0	6	2	4.00	461/ 904	3.91	3.28	4.03	3.94	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 14	Non-major 14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 5		
				? 0			

Course-Section: STAT 350 0101
 Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI
 Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1610
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	3	2	2	2	3.10	1616/1670	3.64	4.13	4.31	4.24	3.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	2	3	4	0	3.00	1603/1666	3.76	4.11	4.27	4.18	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	2	3	1	3	3.30	1317/1406	3.91	4.18	4.32	4.22	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	2	2	4	0	3.25	1531/1615	3.65	4.17	4.24	4.18	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	3	2	0	1	0	1.83	1561/1566	3.31	3.90	4.07	4.04	1.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	3	0	2	2	1	2.75	1494/1528	3.45	4.12	4.12	4.07	2.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1503/1650	3.99	4.23	4.22	4.12	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	4.87	4.66	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	3	0	4	1	0	2.38	1603/1626	3.45	3.92	4.11	4.06	2.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	1421/1559	4.31	4.50	4.46	4.40	3.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	5	1	3	3.50	1524/1560	4.10	4.55	4.72	4.67	3.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	0	5	1	3.10	1483/1549	3.70	4.18	4.31	4.25	3.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	1	4	1	3.00	1473/1546	3.84	4.24	4.32	4.24	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1323	2.76	3.73	4.00	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	1	3	2	3.33	1171/1384	2.45	3.72	4.10	4.12	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	0	1	1	3	3.13	1289/1378	2.63	3.76	4.29	4.30	3.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	0	2	2	1	3.00	1304/1378	2.75	3.88	4.31	4.33	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

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

Course-Section: STAT 350 0102
 Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI
 Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1611
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	4	6	6	3.94	1292/1670	3.64	4.13	4.31	4.24	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	6	4	3.76	1403/1666	3.76	4.11	4.27	4.18	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	1027/1406	3.91	4.18	4.32	4.22	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	5	4	6	4.07	1050/1615	3.65	4.17	4.24	4.18	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	715/1566	3.31	3.90	4.07	4.04	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	3	2	2	6	3.85	1088/1528	3.45	4.12	4.12	4.07	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	6	6	3.94	1220/1650	3.99	4.23	4.22	4.12	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	712/1667	4.87	4.66	4.67	4.67	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	9	2	2	3.46	1405/1626	3.45	3.92	4.11	4.06	3.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	1157/1559	4.31	4.50	4.46	4.40	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	8	2	5	3.69	1510/1560	4.10	4.55	4.72	4.67	3.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	6	6	3	3.69	1338/1549	3.70	4.18	4.31	4.25	3.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	1087/1546	3.84	4.24	4.32	4.24	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	0	8	1	0	2.90	1227/1323	2.76	3.73	4.00	3.99	2.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	2	4	2	2	2.60	1327/1384	2.45	3.72	4.10	4.12	2.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	7	2	3	0	3	2.33	1358/1378	2.63	3.76	4.29	4.30	2.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	7	1	5	1	1	2.20	1357/1378	2.75	3.88	4.31	4.33	2.20
4. Were special techniques successful	3	13	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 904	1.33	3.28	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 350 0201
 Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI
 Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1612
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	2	2	8	7	2	3.24	1598/1670	3.64	4.13	4.31	4.24	3.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	3	9	3	3.38	1549/1666	3.76	4.11	4.27	4.18	3.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	7	7	3	3.43	1301/1406	3.91	4.18	4.32	4.22	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	4	5	4	5	3.42	1486/1615	3.65	4.17	4.24	4.18	3.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	8	4	4	3.42	1335/1566	3.31	3.90	4.07	4.04	3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	7	4	3	3.71	1176/1528	3.45	4.12	4.12	4.07	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	7	9	4.14	1032/1650	3.99	4.23	4.22	4.12	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1667	4.87	4.66	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	4	11	2	1	2.80	1574/1626	3.45	3.92	4.11	4.06	2.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	5	4	8	3.80	1396/1559	4.31	4.50	4.46	4.40	3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	4	6	2	7	3.50	1524/1560	4.10	4.55	4.72	4.67	3.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	4	6	4	2	2.89	1508/1549	3.70	4.18	4.31	4.25	2.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	3	7	2	4	3.05	1471/1546	3.84	4.24	4.32	4.24	3.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	5	1	0	0	2	2.13	1293/1323	2.76	3.73	4.00	3.99	2.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	4	3	3	3	2.72	1318/1384	2.45	3.72	4.10	4.12	2.72
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	5	1	4	5	3	3.00	1297/1378	2.63	3.76	4.29	4.30	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	4	2	6	2	4	3.00	1304/1378	2.75	3.88	4.31	4.33	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	14	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 904	1.33	3.28	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	18
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: STAT 350 0202
 Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI
 Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1613
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	2	0	7	3	3	3.33	1583/1670	3.64	4.13	4.31	4.24	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	3	3	3.33	1564/1666	3.76	4.11	4.27	4.18	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	5	4	3.67	1235/1406	3.91	4.18	4.32	4.22	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	4	4	2	3.50	1448/1615	3.65	4.17	4.24	4.18	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	1	3	2	3	2.92	1506/1566	3.31	3.90	4.07	4.04	2.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	4	2	2	3.00	1447/1528	3.45	4.12	4.12	4.07	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	5	2	5	3.60	1430/1650	3.99	4.23	4.22	4.12	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1667	4.87	4.66	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	3	4	3	1	3.00	1534/1626	3.45	3.92	4.11	4.06	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	1	11	4.53	858/1559	4.31	4.50	4.46	4.40	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	7	6	4.20	1427/1560	4.10	4.55	4.72	4.67	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	5	4	3	3.40	1431/1549	3.70	4.18	4.31	4.25	3.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	2	5	3.53	1371/1546	3.84	4.24	4.32	4.24	3.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	1125/1323	2.76	3.73	4.00	3.99	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	7	1	1	1	1	1.91	1372/1384	2.45	3.72	4.10	4.12	1.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	6	0	2	2	0	2.00	1368/1378	2.63	3.76	4.29	4.30	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	1	3	1	3	3.20	1287/1378	2.75	3.88	4.31	4.33	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	5	8	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 904	1.33	3.28	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: STAT 350 0301
 Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI
 Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1614
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	996/1670	3.64	4.13	4.31	4.24	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	622/1666	3.76	4.11	4.27	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	799/1406	3.91	4.18	4.32	4.22	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	4	0	2	3	4	2	3.55	1436/1615	3.65	4.17	4.24	4.18	3.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	771/1566	3.31	3.90	4.07	4.04	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	1	3	1	6	3.83	1097/1528	3.45	4.12	4.12	4.07	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	705/1650	3.99	4.23	4.22	4.12	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	909/1667	4.87	4.66	4.67	4.67	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	371/1626	3.45	3.92	4.11	4.06	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	673/1559	4.31	4.50	4.46	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	673/1560	4.10	4.55	4.72	4.67	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	610/1549	3.70	4.18	4.31	4.25	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	495/1546	3.84	4.24	4.32	4.24	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	8	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1143/1323	2.76	3.73	4.00	3.99	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	1	2	1	2	2.45	1341/1384	2.45	3.72	4.10	4.12	2.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	1	2	3	2	3.20	1275/1378	2.63	3.76	4.29	4.30	3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	3	0	3	2	2	3.00	1304/1378	2.75	3.88	4.31	4.33	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 904	1.33	3.28	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	2.63	****

Course-Section: STAT 350 0301
 Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI
 Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1614
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	1216/1670	3.64	4.13	4.31	4.24	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	516/1666	3.76	4.11	4.27	4.18	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	423/1406	3.91	4.18	4.32	4.22	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	990/1615	3.65	4.17	4.24	4.18	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	5	4	1	3.36	1362/1566	3.31	3.90	4.07	4.04	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1245/1528	3.45	4.12	4.12	4.07	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	705/1650	3.99	4.23	4.22	4.12	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1097/1667	4.87	4.66	4.67	4.67	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	403/1626	3.45	3.92	4.11	4.06	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	248/1559	4.31	4.50	4.46	4.40	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	777/1560	4.10	4.55	4.72	4.67	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	586/1549	3.70	4.18	4.31	4.25	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	520/1546	3.84	4.24	4.32	4.24	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1284/1323	2.76	3.73	4.00	3.99	2.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	3	2	0	0	1.70	1375/1384	2.45	3.72	4.10	4.12	1.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	3	4	2	1	0	2.10	1367/1378	2.63	3.76	4.29	4.30	2.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	4	2	1	0	2.10	1361/1378	2.75	3.88	4.31	4.33	2.10
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	897/ 904	1.33	3.28	4.03	4.03	1.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: STAT 350 0302
 Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI
 Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1615
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	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	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	643/1670	3.89	4.13	4.31	4.24	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	18	4.76	301/1666	3.99	4.11	4.27	4.18	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	2	18	4.71	363/1406	4.18	4.18	4.32	4.22	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	446/1615	3.97	4.17	4.24	4.18	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	389/1566	3.87	3.90	4.07	4.04	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	421/1528	3.88	4.12	4.12	4.07	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	361/1650	4.02	4.23	4.22	4.12	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	13	7	4.35	1295/1667	4.49	4.66	4.67	4.67	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	278/1626	3.81	3.92	4.11	4.06	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	435/1559	4.04	4.50	4.46	4.40	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	0	19	4.85	725/1560	4.26	4.55	4.72	4.67	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	220/1549	4.00	4.18	4.31	4.25	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	288/1546	3.91	4.24	4.32	4.24	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	0	2	1	0	5	4.00	692/1323	3.21	3.73	4.00	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	3	4	11	4.20	712/1384	4.21	3.72	4.10	4.12	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	5	3	12	4.35	774/1378	3.95	3.76	4.29	4.30	4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	653/1378	4.07	3.88	4.31	4.33	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	11	0	2	1	1	5	4.00	461/ 904	3.53	3.28	4.03	4.03	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: STAT 351 0101
 Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI
 Enrollment: 54
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1616
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	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	16				
				?	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	0	0	1	0	0	3	13	4.59	578/1670	3.89	4.13	4.31	4.24	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	312/1666	3.99	4.11	4.27	4.18	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	212/1406	4.18	4.18	4.32	4.22	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	660/1615	3.97	4.17	4.24	4.18	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	559/1566	3.87	3.90	4.07	4.04	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	391/1528	3.88	4.12	4.12	4.07	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	570/1650	4.02	4.23	4.22	4.12	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	2	9	5	4.00	1524/1667	4.49	4.66	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	316/1626	3.81	3.92	4.11	4.06	4.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	221/1559	4.04	4.50	4.46	4.40	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	725/1560	4.26	4.55	4.72	4.67	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	488/1549	4.00	4.18	4.31	4.25	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	1	12	4.53	679/1546	3.91	4.24	4.32	4.24	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	8	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	1264/1323	3.21	3.73	4.00	3.99	2.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	415/1384	4.21	3.72	4.10	4.12	4.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	1	6	5	4.08	943/1378	3.95	3.76	4.29	4.30	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	768/1378	4.07	3.88	4.31	4.33	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	864/ 904	3.53	3.28	4.03	4.03	2.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	3.99	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	3.93	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 351 0201
 Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO
 Instructor: ROY, ATUL
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1618
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	4	2	1	8	3	3.22	1599/1670	3.89	4.13	4.31	4.24	3.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	5	6	2	3.11	1595/1666	3.99	4.11	4.27	4.18	3.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	0	5	6	4	3.44	1294/1406	4.18	4.18	4.32	4.22	3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	0	7	4	3	3.24	1536/1615	3.97	4.17	4.24	4.18	3.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	4	2	4	4	3.00	1478/1566	3.87	3.90	4.07	4.04	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	1	3	6	2	2.94	1464/1528	3.88	4.12	4.12	4.07	2.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	0	5	8	2	3.47	1472/1650	4.02	4.23	4.22	4.12	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	958/1667	4.49	4.66	4.67	4.67	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	5	2	6	0	2	2.47	1597/1626	3.81	3.92	4.11	4.06	2.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	5	3	4	4	2	2.72	1533/1559	4.04	4.50	4.46	4.40	2.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	2	6	5	3	3.41	1533/1560	4.26	4.55	4.72	4.67	3.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	3	4	4	3	2.94	1500/1549	4.00	4.18	4.31	4.25	2.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	6	3	3	3	2	2.53	1522/1546	3.91	4.24	4.32	4.24	2.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	7	1	3	2	2	2.40	1279/1323	3.21	3.73	4.00	3.99	2.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	3	4	7	3.88	940/1384	4.21	3.72	4.10	4.12	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	4	5	1	7	3.65	1145/1378	3.95	3.76	4.29	4.30	3.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	2	4	4	7	3.94	1023/1378	4.07	3.88	4.31	4.33	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	1	12	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	461/ 904	3.53	3.28	4.03	4.03	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: STAT 351 0201
 Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO
 Instructor: ROY, ATUL
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1618
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	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	0	0	1	3	5	7	1	3.24	1598/1670	3.89	4.13	4.31	4.24	3.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	4	3	3.35	1558/1666	3.99	4.11	4.27	4.18	3.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	1	7	5	3.71	1226/1406	4.18	4.18	4.32	4.22	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	4	3	4	3.62	1411/1615	3.97	4.17	4.24	4.18	3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	6	3	4	3.64	1210/1566	3.87	3.90	4.07	4.04	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	1	3	2	5	3.54	1261/1528	3.88	4.12	4.12	4.07	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	4	6	3	3.44	1490/1650	4.02	4.23	4.22	4.12	3.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	712/1667	4.49	4.66	4.67	4.67	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	3	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1384/1626	3.81	3.92	4.11	4.06	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	4	5	3	3.69	1423/1559	4.04	4.50	4.46	4.40	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	1490/1560	4.26	4.55	4.72	4.67	3.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	1389/1549	4.00	4.18	4.31	4.25	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	1305/1546	3.91	4.24	4.32	4.24	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	0	1	0	5	1	3.86	857/1323	3.21	3.73	4.00	3.99	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	696/1384	4.21	3.72	4.10	4.12	4.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	2	7	3	3.71	1125/1378	3.95	3.76	4.29	4.30	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	3	2	3	4	3.46	1205/1378	4.07	3.88	4.31	4.33	3.46
4. Were special techniques successful	4	9	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 904	3.53	3.28	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	3.97	3.76	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 3	General 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Non-major 17
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Other 14

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: STAT 355 0201
 Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT
 Instructor: PARK, JUNYONG
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1620
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	0	1	3	6	4.18	1071/1670	4.16	4.13	4.31	4.24	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	908/1666	4.35	4.11	4.27	4.18	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	352/1406	4.61	4.18	4.32	4.22	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	874/1615	4.18	4.17	4.24	4.18	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1406/1566	3.73	3.90	4.07	4.04	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	532/1528	4.16	4.12	4.12	4.07	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	973/1650	4.42	4.23	4.22	4.12	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	842/1667	4.88	4.66	4.67	4.67	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	670/1626	3.97	3.92	4.11	4.06	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	276/1559	4.76	4.50	4.46	4.40	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	829/1560	4.66	4.55	4.72	4.67	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	294/1549	4.41	4.18	4.31	4.25	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	231/1546	4.36	4.24	4.32	4.24	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1323	3.25	3.73	4.00	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	5	0	3	3.20	1216/1384	3.21	3.72	4.10	4.12	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1228/1378	3.32	3.76	4.29	4.30	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	5	0	3	3.30	1266/1378	3.64	3.88	4.31	4.33	3.30
4. Were special techniques successful	1	9	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 904	3.69	3.28	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	3.93	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C 3	General 0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Non-major 11
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 0
					Other 11

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

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	2	1	4	8	4.20	1060/1670	4.16	4.13	4.31	4.24	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	686/1666	4.35	4.11	4.27	4.18	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	423/1406	4.61	4.18	4.32	4.22	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	552/1615	4.18	4.17	4.24	4.18	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	1108/1566	3.73	3.90	4.07	4.04	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	706/1528	4.16	4.12	4.12	4.07	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	690/1650	4.42	4.23	4.22	4.12	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	970/1667	4.88	4.66	4.67	4.67	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	831/1626	3.97	3.92	4.11	4.06	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	339/1559	4.76	4.50	4.46	4.40	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	699/1560	4.66	4.55	4.72	4.67	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	646/1549	4.41	4.18	4.31	4.25	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	768/1546	4.36	4.24	4.32	4.24	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1179/1323	3.25	3.73	4.00	3.99	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	2	3	2	2	2.69	1321/1384	3.21	3.72	4.10	4.12	2.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	4	1	3	2	3	2.92	1319/1378	3.32	3.76	4.29	4.30	2.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	1	3	2	4	3.42	1225/1378	3.64	3.88	4.31	4.33	3.42
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	718/ 904	3.69	3.28	4.03	4.03	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	3.93	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****

Frequency Distribution

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

I	0	Other	15
?	1		

Course-Section: STAT 355 0301
 Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT
 Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1622
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	0	2	4	5	4.00	1216/1670	4.16	4.13	4.31	4.24	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	967/1666	4.35	4.11	4.27	4.18	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	597/1406	4.61	4.18	4.32	4.22	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	1234/1615	4.18	4.17	4.24	4.18	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	790/1566	3.73	3.90	4.07	4.04	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	5	4	3.75	1152/1528	4.16	4.12	4.12	4.07	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	272/1650	4.42	4.23	4.22	4.12	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1667	4.88	4.66	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	2	0	3	5	2	3.42	1432/1626	3.97	3.92	4.11	4.06	3.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	896/1559	4.76	4.50	4.46	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	1248/1560	4.66	4.55	4.72	4.67	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	1146/1549	4.41	4.18	4.31	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	1139/1546	4.36	4.24	4.32	4.24	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	6	0	2	3.22	1135/1323	3.25	3.73	4.00	3.99	3.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1070/1384	3.21	3.72	4.10	4.12	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	1221/1378	3.32	3.76	4.29	4.30	3.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	1070/1378	3.64	3.88	4.31	4.33	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	779/ 904	3.69	3.28	4.03	4.03	3.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.04	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.11	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 355 0302
 Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT
 Instructor: ABERCROMBIE, MA
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1623
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	996/1670	4.16	4.13	4.31	4.24	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	821/1666	4.35	4.11	4.27	4.18	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	535/1406	4.61	4.18	4.32	4.22	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	5	4.06	1050/1615	4.18	4.17	4.24	4.18	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	2	3	5	3.75	1144/1566	3.73	3.90	4.07	4.04	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	3	1	9	4.21	742/1528	4.16	4.12	4.12	4.07	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	831/1650	4.42	4.23	4.22	4.12	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1667	4.88	4.66	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	4	2	6	4.00	953/1626	3.97	3.92	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	521/1559	4.76	4.50	4.46	4.40	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	5	10	4.44	1302/1560	4.66	4.55	4.72	4.67	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	924/1549	4.41	4.18	4.31	4.25	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	0	3	10	4.06	1117/1546	4.36	4.24	4.32	4.24	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	7	2	3	3.54	1025/1323	3.25	3.73	4.00	3.99	3.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	2	5	3	3.38	1149/1384	3.21	3.72	4.10	4.12	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	2	4	1	5	3.54	1181/1378	3.32	3.76	4.29	4.30	3.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	977/1378	3.64	3.88	4.31	4.33	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	9	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	373/ 904	3.69	3.28	4.03	4.03	4.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	Under-grad 16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 2	Non-major 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0

- Means there are not enough

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	14	
?	0			

Course-Section: STAT 418 0101
 Title APPL MULTIVARIATE METH
 Instructor: PARK, JUNYONG
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1624
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	2	2	4	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.13	4.31	4.45	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	4	2	3.56	1493/1666	3.56	4.11	4.27	4.35	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	715/1406	4.40	4.18	4.32	4.48	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1312/1615	3.78	4.17	4.24	4.37	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1108/1566	3.80	3.90	4.07	4.17	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1063/1528	3.88	4.12	4.12	4.26	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.23	4.22	4.28	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.66	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1254/1626	3.75	3.92	4.11	4.28	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	1280/1559	4.00	4.50	4.46	4.58	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	1411/1560	4.25	4.55	4.72	4.80	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	0	5	1	3.50	1389/1549	3.50	4.18	4.31	4.43	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	1379/1546	3.50	4.24	4.32	4.43	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	326/1323	4.50	3.73	4.00	4.10	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	608/1384	4.33	3.72	4.10	4.32	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	797/1378	4.33	3.76	4.29	4.55	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	813/1378	4.33	3.88	4.31	4.60	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 904	****	3.28	4.03	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	531/1670	4.63	4.13	4.31	4.45	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	312/1666	4.75	4.11	4.27	4.35	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	****	4.18	4.32	4.48	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	290/1615	4.75	4.17	4.24	4.37	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	1059/1566	3.86	3.90	4.07	4.17	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	147/1528	4.86	4.12	4.12	4.26	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	757/1650	4.38	4.23	4.22	4.28	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.66	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	953/1626	4.00	3.92	4.11	4.28	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	521/1559	4.75	4.50	4.46	4.58	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	673/1560	4.88	4.55	4.72	4.80	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	683/1549	4.50	4.18	4.31	4.43	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	288/1546	4.86	4.24	4.32	4.43	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	545/1323	4.25	3.73	4.00	4.10	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1384	4.67	3.72	4.10	4.32	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	3.76	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	531/1378	4.67	3.88	4.31	4.60	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	3.28	4.03	4.22	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.30	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.24	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	4.09	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.80	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	3.97	3.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.02	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: STAT 433 0101
 Title STATISTICAL COMPUTING
 Instructor: ROY, ANINDYA
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1625
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	8	Non-major	6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	2						

Course-Section: STAT 453 0101
 Title INTRO MATHEMATICAL STA
 Instructor: WANG, XIAO
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1626
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	780/1670	4.43	4.13	4.31	4.45	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	751/1666	4.43	4.11	4.27	4.35	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	775/1406	4.36	4.18	4.32	4.48	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	737/1615	4.36	4.17	4.24	4.37	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	851/1566	4.00	3.90	4.07	4.17	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	706/1528	4.25	4.12	4.12	4.26	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	194/1650	4.86	4.23	4.22	4.28	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	1157/1667	4.50	4.66	4.67	4.73	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1365/1626	3.56	3.92	4.11	4.28	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	589/1559	4.71	4.50	4.46	4.58	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	1188/1560	4.57	4.55	4.72	4.80	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	3	3	6	3.93	1218/1549	3.93	4.18	4.31	4.43	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	1139/1546	4.00	4.24	4.32	4.43	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1323	****	3.73	4.00	4.10	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	670/1384	4.25	3.72	4.10	4.32	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	894/1378	4.20	3.76	4.29	4.55	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1110/1378	3.75	3.88	4.31	4.60	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.28	4.03	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 4	General 2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D 1	Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Non-major 8
				P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				I 0	
				Other 8	
				? 0	

Course-Section: STAT 470 0101
 Title PROB ACTUARIAL SCIENCE
 Instructor: KLEIN, MARTIN D
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1627
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	0	1	3	4	4.38	849/1670	4.38	4.13	4.31	4.45	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1114/1666	4.13	4.11	4.27	4.35	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	876/1406	4.25	4.18	4.32	4.48	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	972/1615	4.17	4.17	4.24	4.37	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	346/1528	4.60	4.12	4.12	4.26	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	1	2	1	1	2.50	1624/1650	2.50	4.23	4.22	4.28	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.66	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	324/1626	4.60	3.92	4.11	4.28	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	589/1559	4.71	4.50	4.46	4.58	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.55	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.18	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	631/1546	4.57	4.24	4.32	4.43	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	****	3.73	4.00	4.10	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1384	****	3.72	4.10	4.32	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1378	****	3.76	4.29	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1378	****	3.88	4.31	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 904	****	3.28	4.03	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	440/1670	4.69	4.13	4.31	4.46	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	582/1666	4.54	4.11	4.27	4.34	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	739/1406	4.38	4.18	4.32	4.36	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	1018/1615	4.11	4.17	4.24	4.33	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	2	7	4.08	808/1566	4.08	3.90	4.07	4.20	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	157/1528	4.83	4.12	4.12	4.33	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	806/1650	4.33	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	3	4.23	1381/1667	4.23	4.66	4.67	4.74	4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	605/1626	4.36	3.92	4.11	4.20	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	221/1559	4.92	4.50	4.46	4.49	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	751/1560	4.85	4.55	4.72	4.81	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	451/1549	4.69	4.18	4.31	4.37	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	582/1546	4.62	4.24	4.32	4.40	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1323	****	3.73	4.00	4.03	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	0	3	0	3	3.00	1260/1384	3.00	3.72	4.10	4.21	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1064/1378	3.89	3.76	4.29	4.42	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	926/1378	4.14	3.88	4.31	4.51	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 904	****	3.28	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.53	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.69	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.58	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.61	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	3.97	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.65	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.59	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	4.90	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	5.00	****

Course-Section: STAT 602 0101
 Title APPLIED STATISTICS II
 Instructor: MATHEW, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1628
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	8	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 607 0101
 Title BAYESIAN INFERENCE
 Instructor: CHOI, TAERYON
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1629
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.13	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.11	4.27	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.18	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.17	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1566	5.00	3.90	4.07	4.20	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.12	4.12	4.33	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.23	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1022/1667	4.67	4.66	4.67	4.74	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	278/1626	4.67	3.92	4.11	4.20	4.67

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.50	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.55	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.18	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.24	4.32	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1323	5.00	3.73	4.00	4.03	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 612 0101
 Title MATHEMATICAL STAT II
 Instructor: SINHA, BIMAL
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1630
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	253/1670	4.86	4.13	4.31	4.46	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	355/1666	4.71	4.11	4.27	4.34	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.18	4.32	4.36	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.17	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	339/1566	4.60	3.90	4.07	4.20	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	147/1528	4.86	4.12	4.12	4.33	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	1032/1650	4.14	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	768/1667	4.86	4.66	4.67	4.74	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	151/1626	4.83	3.92	4.11	4.20	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.50	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.55	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	424/1549	4.71	4.18	4.31	4.37	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	457/1546	4.71	4.24	4.32	4.40	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1323	5.00	3.73	4.00	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.72	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	3.76	4.29	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	3.88	4.31	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	3.28	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.53	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.69	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.58	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 621 0101
 Title PROB THRY/STOCH PROC I
 Instructor: RATHINAM, MURUH
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1631
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	253/1670	4.86	4.13	4.31	4.46	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	529/1666	4.57	4.11	4.27	4.34	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	691/1406	4.43	4.18	4.32	4.36	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.17	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1566	5.00	3.90	4.07	4.20	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.12	4.12	4.33	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.23	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1104/1667	4.57	4.66	4.67	4.74	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	403/1626	4.50	3.92	4.11	4.20	4.50

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	673/1559	4.67	4.50	4.46	4.49	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	777/1560	4.83	4.55	4.72	4.81	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	900/1549	4.33	4.18	4.31	4.37	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	715/1546	4.50	4.24	4.32	4.40	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	****	3.73	4.00	4.03	****

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1384	****	3.72	4.10	4.21	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	3.76	4.29	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	3.88	4.31	4.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

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

Course-Section: STAT 653 0101
 Title BASIC MATH STAT
 Instructor: CHOI, TAERYON
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1632
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	6	4.33	902/1670	4.33	4.13	4.31	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	556/1666	4.56	4.11	4.27	4.34	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	667/1406	4.44	4.18	4.32	4.36	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	660/1615	4.43	4.17	4.24	4.33	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	324/1566	4.63	3.90	4.07	4.20	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	330/1528	4.63	4.12	4.12	4.33	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	255/1650	4.78	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1310/1667	4.33	4.66	4.67	4.74	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	728/1626	4.25	3.92	4.11	4.20	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	739/1559	4.63	4.50	4.46	4.49	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	673/1560	4.88	4.55	4.72	4.81	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1146/1549	4.00	4.18	4.31	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	987/1546	4.25	4.24	4.32	4.40	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	137/1323	4.86	3.73	4.00	4.03	4.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	434/1384	4.50	3.72	4.10	4.21	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	481/1378	4.67	3.76	4.29	4.42	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	354/1378	4.83	3.88	4.31	4.51	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	146/ 904	4.75	3.28	4.03	4.04	4.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.53	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.69	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.58	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.61	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	3.97	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.65	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.59	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	4.90	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	5.00	****

Course-Section: STAT 653 0101
 Title BASIC MATH STAT
 Instructor: CHOI, TAERYON
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1632
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	5	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 700A 0101
 Title SURVEY SAMPLING
 Instructor: ROY, ANINDYA
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1633
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	224/1670	4.89	4.13	4.31	4.46	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	719/1666	4.44	4.11	4.27	4.34	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	876/1406	4.25	4.18	4.32	4.36	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	724/1615	4.38	4.17	4.24	4.33	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	559/1566	4.33	3.90	4.07	4.20	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	590/1528	4.38	4.12	4.12	4.33	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	867/1650	4.29	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	712/1667	4.89	4.66	4.67	4.74	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	151/1626	4.83	3.92	4.11	4.20	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.50	4.46	4.49	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.55	4.72	4.81	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	220/1549	4.89	4.18	4.31	4.37	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	382/1546	4.78	4.24	4.32	4.40	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1323	****	3.73	4.00	4.03	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1384	****	3.72	4.10	4.21	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1378	****	3.76	4.29	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	3.88	4.31	4.51	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 904	****	3.28	4.03	4.04	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.30	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.53	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.69	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.58	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	4.47	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 700B 0101
 Title MODELING/SPATIAL STATS
 Instructor: NEERCHAL, NAGAR (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1634
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.13	4.31	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1603/1666	3.00	4.11	4.27	4.34	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	1343/1406	3.00	4.18	4.32	4.36	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.17	4.24	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1478/1566	3.00	3.90	4.07	4.20	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.12	4.12	4.33	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.66	4.67	4.74	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1594/1626	3.44	3.92	4.11	4.20	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1461/1559	4.25	4.50	4.46	4.49	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1248/1560	4.81	4.55	4.72	4.81	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1526/1549	3.81	4.18	4.31	4.37	3.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1442/1546	4.06	4.24	4.32	4.40	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1179/1323	3.81	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	820/1384	4.00	3.72	4.10	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	603/1378	4.50	3.76	4.29	4.42	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	653/1378	4.50	3.88	4.31	4.51	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	892/ 904	1.50	3.28	4.03	4.04	1.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 700B 0101
 Title MODELING/SPATIAL STATS
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1635
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.13	4.31	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1603/1666	3.00	4.11	4.27	4.34	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	1343/1406	3.00	4.18	4.32	4.36	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.17	4.24	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1478/1566	3.00	3.90	4.07	4.20	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.12	4.12	4.33	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.66	4.67	4.74	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1254/1626	3.44	3.92	4.11	4.20	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	896/1559	4.25	4.50	4.46	4.49	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	4.81	4.55	4.72	4.81	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	683/1549	3.81	4.18	4.31	4.37	3.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	987/1546	4.06	4.24	4.32	4.40	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	692/1323	3.81	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	820/1384	4.00	3.72	4.10	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	603/1378	4.50	3.76	4.29	4.42	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	653/1378	4.50	3.88	4.31	4.51	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	892/ 904	1.50	3.28	4.03	4.04	1.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 700B 0101
 Title MODELING/SPATIAL STATS
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1636
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.13	4.31	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1603/1666	3.00	4.11	4.27	4.34	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	1343/1406	3.00	4.18	4.32	4.36	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.17	4.24	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1478/1566	3.00	3.90	4.07	4.20	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.12	4.12	4.33	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.66	4.67	4.74	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1491/1626	3.44	3.92	4.11	4.20	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	896/1559	4.25	4.50	4.46	4.49	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	948/1560	4.81	4.55	4.72	4.81	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1146/1549	3.81	4.18	4.31	4.37	3.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	987/1546	4.06	4.24	4.32	4.40	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	692/1323	3.81	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	820/1384	4.00	3.72	4.10	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	603/1378	4.50	3.76	4.29	4.42	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	653/1378	4.50	3.88	4.31	4.51	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	892/ 904	1.50	3.28	4.03	4.04	1.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 700B 0101
 Title MODELING/SPATIAL STATS
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1637
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.13	4.31	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1603/1666	3.00	4.11	4.27	4.34	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	1343/1406	3.00	4.18	4.32	4.36	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.17	4.24	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1478/1566	3.00	3.90	4.07	4.20	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.12	4.12	4.33	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.66	4.67	4.74	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	728/1626	3.44	3.92	4.11	4.20	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	896/1559	4.25	4.50	4.46	4.49	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	4.81	4.55	4.72	4.81	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	977/1549	3.81	4.18	4.31	4.37	3.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	715/1546	4.06	4.24	4.32	4.40	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	545/1323	3.81	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	820/1384	4.00	3.72	4.10	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	603/1378	4.50	3.76	4.29	4.42	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	653/1378	4.50	3.88	4.31	4.51	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	892/ 904	1.50	3.28	4.03	4.04	1.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 710A 0101
 Title ADVANCED INFERENCE
 Instructor: SINHA, BIMAL
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1638
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	0	3	4.50	665/1670	4.50	4.13	4.31	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	312/1666	4.75	4.11	4.27	4.34	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.18	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.17	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1566	5.00	3.90	4.07	4.20	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.12	4.12	4.33	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.23	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	922/1667	4.75	4.66	4.67	4.74	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	207/1626	4.75	3.92	4.11	4.20	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.50	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.55	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.18	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.24	4.32	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1323	5.00	3.73	4.00	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.72	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	3.76	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	3.88	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	3.28	4.03	4.04	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 232	5.00	5.00	4.19	4.30	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 239	5.00	5.00	4.21	4.53	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 230	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.69	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 231	5.00	5.00	4.31	4.58	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 218	5.00	5.00	4.18	4.47	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors				

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

Course-Section: STAT 710B 0101
 Title RELIABILITY
 Instructor: WANG, XIAO
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1639
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	363/1670	4.75	4.13	4.31	4.46	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.11	4.27	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.18	4.32	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.17	4.24	4.33	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	389/1566	4.50	3.90	4.07	4.20	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	221/1528	4.75	4.12	4.12	4.33	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	361/1650	4.67	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1157/1667	4.50	4.66	4.67	4.74	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	403/1626	4.50	3.92	4.11	4.20	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	521/1559	4.75	4.50	4.46	4.49	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.55	4.72	4.81	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	683/1549	4.50	4.18	4.31	4.37	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.24	4.32	4.40	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	481/1323	4.33	3.73	4.00	4.03	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.72	4.10	4.21	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	3.76	4.29	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	3.88	4.31	4.51	5.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 239	5.00	5.00	4.21	4.53	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 230	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.69	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 218	5.00	5.00	4.18	4.47	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	3.97	4.32	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.82	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	13/ 16	4.00	4.00	4.67	4.60	4.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	21/ 27	4.00	4.00	4.54	4.67	4.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 10	5.00	5.00	4.84	4.90	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 6	5.00	5.00	4.92	5.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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