

Course-Section: STAT 121 0101
 Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S
 Instructor: BEBU, IONUT I
 Enrollment: 52
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1451
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	4	3	10	7	3.72	1280/1504	3.68	4.30	4.27	4.13	3.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	10	11	4.12	972/1503	4.09	4.41	4.20	4.16	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	16	4.40	642/1290	4.28	4.50	4.28	4.19	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	440/1453	4.23	4.34	4.21	4.11	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	3	7	7	4.06	712/1421	3.91	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	2	1	1	1	4	3.44	1181/1365	3.64	4.20	4.08	3.96	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	10	12	4.28	727/1485	4.29	4.53	4.16	4.13	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	329/1504	4.76	4.81	4.69	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	1	3	13	1	3.78	1111/1483	3.66	4.17	4.06	3.97	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	587/1425	4.53	4.63	4.41	4.36	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	8	14	4.50	1128/1426	4.55	4.69	4.69	4.56	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	4	9	8	3.88	1110/1418	4.03	4.34	4.25	4.20	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	1	8	11	4.00	1029/1416	4.07	4.49	4.26	4.21	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	18	3	0	1	1	1	2.50	****/1199	3.48	3.88	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	3	6	6	3	3.37	1062/1312	3.14	3.90	4.00	3.69	3.37
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	2	5	5	5	3.76	1044/1303	3.35	4.02	4.24	3.93	3.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	2	4	6	4	3.75	1053/1299	3.46	4.07	4.25	3.94	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	7	17	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	3.76	4.42	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: STAT 121 0101
 Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S
 Instructor: BEBU, IONUT I
 Enrollment: 52
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1451
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 121 0201
 Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S
 Instructor: KHALATBARI, FAR
 Enrollment: 80
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1452
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	8	10	12	12	3.43	1380/1504	3.68	4.30	4.27	4.13	3.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	4	11	10	17	3.70	1235/1503	4.09	4.41	4.20	4.16	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	5	8	13	18	3.87	1038/1290	4.28	4.50	4.28	4.19	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	28	1	1	3	8	5	3.83	1148/1453	4.23	4.34	4.21	4.11	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	3	4	9	10	8	3.47	1131/1421	3.91	4.08	4.00	3.91	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	27	4	2	3	5	4	3.17	1271/1365	3.64	4.20	4.08	3.96	3.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	4	14	23	4.22	795/1485	4.29	4.53	4.16	4.13	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	0	28	15	4.35	1214/1504	4.76	4.81	4.69	4.66	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	3	6	11	14	2	3.17	1352/1483	3.66	4.17	4.06	3.97	3.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	2	6	9	24	4.26	1029/1425	4.53	4.63	4.41	4.36	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	3	12	26	4.48	1148/1426	4.55	4.69	4.69	4.56	4.48
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	2	10	13	14	3.79	1150/1418	4.03	4.34	4.25	4.20	3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	4	8	9	17	3.74	1175/1416	4.07	4.49	4.26	4.21	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	9	2	6	6	8	11	3.61	884/1199	3.48	3.88	3.97	3.82	3.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	18	4	7	2	4	2.14	1283/1312	3.14	3.90	4.00	3.69	2.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	14	8	5	4	5	2.39	1252/1303	3.35	4.02	4.24	3.93	2.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	10	6	11	3	5	2.63	1242/1299	3.46	4.07	4.25	3.94	2.63
4. Were special techniques successful	10	30	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	****/ 758	3.76	4.42	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	44	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: STAT 121 0201
 Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S
 Instructor: KHALATBARI, FAR
 Enrollment: 80
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1452
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B	17						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	4	Under-grad	46	Non-major	21
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 121 0301
 Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S
 Instructor: KEGAN, BONNIE E
 Enrollment: 76
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1453
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	5	9	19	16	3.88	1204/1504	3.68	4.30	4.27	4.13	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	3	15	30	4.44	587/1503	4.09	4.41	4.20	4.16	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	3	6	38	4.56	450/1290	4.28	4.50	4.28	4.19	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	0	7	14	22	4.35	668/1453	4.23	4.34	4.21	4.11	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	2	4	14	24	4.22	579/1421	3.91	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	13	0	1	3	17	16	4.30	536/1365	3.64	4.20	4.08	3.96	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	4	11	31	4.36	636/1485	4.29	4.53	4.16	4.13	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	1	48	4.98	197/1504	4.76	4.81	4.69	4.66	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	1	1	3	24	9	4.03	838/1483	3.66	4.17	4.06	3.97	4.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	1	0	9	37	4.67	572/1425	4.53	4.63	4.41	4.36	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	1	10	36	4.69	940/1426	4.55	4.69	4.69	4.56	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	5	10	31	4.44	669/1418	4.03	4.34	4.25	4.20	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	2	1	1	4	9	31	4.48	662/1416	4.07	4.49	4.26	4.21	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	10	4	3	13	8	8	3.36	977/1199	3.48	3.88	3.97	3.82	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	4	2	5	7	18	3.92	804/1312	3.14	3.90	4.00	3.69	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	4	1	7	7	17	3.89	1000/1303	3.35	4.02	4.24	3.93	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	4	2	3	8	19	4.00	922/1299	3.46	4.07	4.25	3.94	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	16	15	2	3	3	3	10	3.76	506/ 758	3.76	4.42	4.01	3.80	3.76
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	3	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	1	1	0	0	5	4.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	2	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	46	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	46	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	46	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	4	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	4	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	48	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	48	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	2	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: STAT 121 0301
 Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S
 Instructor: KEGAN, BONNIE E
 Enrollment: 76
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1453
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	2	B	24						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	14	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	52	Non-major	11
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	28				
				?	1						

Course-Section: STAT 350 0101
 Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI
 Instructor: SVERDLOV, OLEKS
 Enrollment: 62
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1454
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	8	13	13	4.03	1083/1504	3.83	4.30	4.27	4.27	4.03
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	12	17	4.19	910/1503	3.79	4.41	4.20	4.22	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	9	19	4.28	766/1290	3.74	4.50	4.28	4.31	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	0	8	8	12	4.03	984/1453	3.84	4.34	4.21	4.23	4.03
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	3	5	11	11	3.81	935/1421	3.60	4.08	4.00	4.01	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	3	2	1	9	11	3.88	915/1365	3.66	4.20	4.08	4.08	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	17	12	4.03	979/1485	3.86	4.53	4.16	4.17	4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	2	32	4.94	394/1504	4.97	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	2	5	16	6	3.90	999/1483	3.55	4.17	4.06	4.08	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	5	10	20	4.43	876/1425	4.32	4.63	4.41	4.43	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	11	23	4.63	1022/1426	4.34	4.69	4.69	4.71	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	9	11	13	4.06	997/1418	3.82	4.34	4.25	4.26	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	4	8	20	4.29	845/1416	4.01	4.49	4.26	4.27	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	22	7	0	1	0	4	2.50	1138/1199	3.18	3.88	3.97	4.02	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	5	4	6	7	6	3.18	1114/1312	3.27	3.90	4.00	4.09	3.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	7	2	6	5	9	3.24	1169/1303	3.29	4.02	4.24	4.27	3.24
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	2	7	5	10	3.63	1087/1299	3.47	4.07	4.25	4.30	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	7	25	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/ 758	****	4.42	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: STAT 350 0101
 Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI
 Instructor: SVERDLOV, OLEKS
 Enrollment: 62
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1454
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	35	Non-major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	1						

Course-Section: STAT 350 0201
 Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI
 Instructor: WILSON, MARY C
 Enrollment: 76
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1455
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	2	10	18	10	3.64	1312/1504	3.83	4.30	4.27	4.27	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	6	9	11	12	3.39	1353/1503	3.79	4.41	4.20	4.22	3.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	10	10	9	10	3.20	1219/1290	3.74	4.50	4.28	4.31	3.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	3	3	11	10	12	3.64	1237/1453	3.84	4.34	4.21	4.23	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	5	5	7	6	11	3.38	1184/1421	3.60	4.08	4.00	4.01	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	14	4	4	5	6	9	3.43	1191/1365	3.66	4.20	4.08	4.08	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	5	10	13	13	3.70	1210/1485	3.86	4.53	4.16	4.17	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	41	5.00	1/1504	4.97	4.81	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	5	3	11	14	3	3.19	1343/1483	3.55	4.17	4.06	4.08	3.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	3	2	12	23	4.21	1064/1425	4.32	4.63	4.41	4.43	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	3	4	3	10	22	4.05	1315/1426	4.34	4.69	4.69	4.71	4.05
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	3	6	8	9	13	3.59	1230/1418	3.82	4.34	4.25	4.26	3.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	2	6	2	5	9	17	3.74	1171/1416	4.01	4.49	4.26	4.27	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	19	3	0	3	6	9	3.86	771/1199	3.18	3.88	3.97	4.02	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	7	4	8	6	13	3.37	1062/1312	3.27	3.90	4.00	4.09	3.37
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	6	4	10	4	12	3.33	1153/1303	3.29	4.02	4.24	4.27	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	5	5	9	6	10	3.31	1157/1299	3.47	4.07	4.25	4.30	3.31
4. Were special techniques successful	8	26	2	0	3	0	5	3.60	****/ 758	****	4.42	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	21	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	6	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	43	Non-major	3
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	8	D	2						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	36				
				?	2						

Course-Section: STAT 351 0101
 Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO
 Instructor: PALMATEER, JASO
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1456
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	11	20	4.55	495/1504	4.44	4.30	4.27	4.27	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	12	20	4.55	449/1503	4.52	4.41	4.20	4.22	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	22	4.61	412/1290	4.58	4.50	4.28	4.31	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	11	18	4.48	470/1453	4.35	4.34	4.21	4.23	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	2	1	6	7	8	3.75	967/1421	3.93	4.08	4.00	4.01	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	7	7	16	4.30	525/1365	4.25	4.20	4.08	4.08	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	7	21	4.48	482/1485	4.58	4.53	4.16	4.17	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	1	10	14	7	3.84	1458/1504	4.61	4.81	4.69	4.65	3.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	2	13	9	4.20	700/1483	4.46	4.17	4.06	4.08	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	6	24	4.80	331/1425	4.66	4.63	4.41	4.43	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	7	22	4.70	926/1426	4.75	4.69	4.69	4.71	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	7	20	4.62	426/1418	4.55	4.34	4.25	4.26	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	6	23	4.73	352/1416	4.67	4.49	4.26	4.27	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	6	2	19	4.48	290/1199	4.07	3.88	3.97	4.02	4.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	530/1312	4.23	3.90	4.00	4.09	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	675/1303	4.34	4.02	4.24	4.27	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	876/1299	4.27	4.07	4.25	4.30	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	18	3	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	343/ 758	4.17	4.42	4.01	4.00	4.17
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: STAT 351 0101
 Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO
 Instructor: PALMATEER, JASO
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1456
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	15	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	10	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	33	Non-major	8
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	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	26				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 351 0201
 Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO
 Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI
 Enrollment: 63
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1457
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	10	23	4.56	482/1504	4.44	4.30	4.27	4.27	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	9	24	4.63	357/1503	4.52	4.41	4.20	4.22	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	9	25	4.64	378/1290	4.58	4.50	4.28	4.31	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	1	0	5	5	12	4.17	867/1453	4.35	4.34	4.21	4.23	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	1	5	6	10	4.14	651/1421	3.93	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	603/1365	4.25	4.20	4.08	4.08	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	6	28	4.69	260/1485	4.58	4.53	4.16	4.17	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	35	5.00	1/1504	4.61	4.81	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	10	22	4.69	195/1483	4.46	4.17	4.06	4.08	4.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	6	27	4.67	572/1425	4.66	4.63	4.41	4.43	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	5	29	4.75	825/1426	4.75	4.69	4.69	4.71	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	6	28	4.68	366/1418	4.55	4.34	4.25	4.26	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	8	26	4.67	446/1416	4.67	4.49	4.26	4.27	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	23	1	0	3	1	8	4.15	568/1199	4.07	3.88	3.97	4.02	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	****/1312	4.23	3.90	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	****/1303	4.34	4.02	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	****/1299	4.27	4.07	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	29	2	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	****/ 758	4.17	4.42	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: STAT 351 0201
 Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO
 Instructor: SLOWIKOWSKI, WI
 Enrollment: 63
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1457
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	22	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	1	B	12						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	11	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	37	Non-major	5
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	33				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 351 0301
 Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI
 Enrollment: 77
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1458
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	3	3	10	16	4.22	940/1504	4.44	4.30	4.27	4.27	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	8	19	4.38	692/1503	4.52	4.41	4.20	4.22	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	8	20	4.50	507/1290	4.58	4.50	4.28	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	1	2	5	17	4.38	618/1453	4.35	4.34	4.21	4.23	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	1	2	5	5	10	3.91	851/1421	3.93	4.08	4.00	4.01	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	4	9	9	4.23	614/1365	4.25	4.20	4.08	4.08	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	3	24	4.56	391/1485	4.58	4.53	4.16	4.17	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1504	4.61	4.81	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	5	3	18	4.50	338/1483	4.46	4.17	4.06	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	1	6	22	4.52	772/1425	4.66	4.63	4.41	4.43	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	26	4.81	738/1426	4.75	4.69	4.69	4.71	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	0	3	6	20	4.35	754/1418	4.55	4.34	4.25	4.26	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	5	23	4.61	511/1416	4.67	4.49	4.26	4.27	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	19	3	0	1	3	5	3.58	891/1199	4.07	3.88	3.97	4.02	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	1	4	3	15	4.12	676/1312	4.23	3.90	4.00	4.09	4.12
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	2	2	4	16	4.28	776/1303	4.34	4.02	4.24	4.27	4.28
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	4	4	16	4.40	678/1299	4.27	4.07	4.25	4.30	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	8	13	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	343/ 758	4.17	4.42	4.01	4.00	4.17
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: STAT 351 0301
 Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI
 Enrollment: 77
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1458
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	33	Non-major	10
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	28				
				?	1						

Course-Section: STAT 355 0101
 Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT
 Instructor: WU, YANPING
 Enrollment: 77
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1459
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	6	10	18	15	3.86	1219/1504	4.19	4.30	4.27	4.27	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	13	27	4.35	736/1503	4.52	4.41	4.20	4.22	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	14	31	4.56	450/1290	4.57	4.50	4.28	4.31	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	2	6	15	16	4.07	963/1453	4.16	4.34	4.21	4.23	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	15	3	1	5	13	9	3.77	957/1421	3.58	4.08	4.00	4.01	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	17	1	1	7	13	7	3.83	954/1365	3.66	4.20	4.08	4.08	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	6	12	28	4.48	495/1485	4.66	4.53	4.16	4.17	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	1	44	4.98	197/1504	4.98	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	0	7	16	16	4.15	741/1483	4.19	4.17	4.06	4.08	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	7	35	4.71	492/1425	4.73	4.63	4.41	4.43	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	9	35	4.76	825/1426	4.82	4.69	4.69	4.71	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	12	29	4.50	578/1418	4.46	4.34	4.25	4.26	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	3	5	8	30	4.41	740/1416	4.58	4.49	4.26	4.27	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	32	4	2	2	1	3	2.75	****/1199	3.50	3.88	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	16	3	9	4	6	2.50	1247/1312	2.80	3.90	4.00	4.09	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	8	7	10	6	7	2.92	1217/1303	3.41	4.02	4.24	4.27	2.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	8	1	10	7	11	3.32	1155/1299	3.55	4.07	4.25	4.30	3.32
4. Were special techniques successful	10	32	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	****/ 758	****	4.42	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: STAT 355 0101
 Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT
 Instructor: WU, YANPING
 Enrollment: 77
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1459
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	22	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	10	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	49	Non-major	32
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	37				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 355 0201
 Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT
 Instructor: NIE, LEI
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1460
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	549/1504	4.19	4.30	4.27	4.27	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	312/1503	4.52	4.41	4.20	4.22	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	507/1290	4.57	4.50	4.28	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	924/1453	4.16	4.34	4.21	4.23	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	5	4	4	3.79	952/1421	3.58	4.08	4.00	4.01	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1065/1365	3.66	4.20	4.08	4.08	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	230/1485	4.66	4.53	4.16	4.17	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1504	4.98	4.81	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	7	5	4.06	815/1483	4.19	4.17	4.06	4.08	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	541/1425	4.73	4.63	4.41	4.43	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	690/1426	4.82	4.69	4.69	4.71	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	867/1418	4.46	4.34	4.25	4.26	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	472/1416	4.58	4.49	4.26	4.27	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1199	3.50	3.88	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	1	4	3	3	3.00	1149/1312	2.80	3.90	4.00	4.09	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	910/1303	3.41	4.02	4.24	4.27	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	6	2	6	3.87	1012/1299	3.55	4.07	4.25	4.30	3.87
4. Were special techniques successful	3	13	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 758	****	4.42	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: STAT 355 0201
 Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT
 Instructor: NIE, LEI
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1460
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	18	Non-major	7
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	8	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	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 355 0301
 Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT
 Instructor: HEINZ, FEDERICO
 Enrollment: 58
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1461
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	12	15	4.21	940/1504	4.19	4.30	4.27	4.27	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	22	4.55	449/1503	4.52	4.41	4.20	4.22	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	23	4.64	378/1290	4.57	4.50	4.28	4.31	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	4	7	13	4.28	741/1453	4.16	4.34	4.21	4.23	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	13	2	4	4	5	3	3.17	1269/1421	3.58	4.08	4.00	4.01	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	2	2	5	5	5	3.47	1167/1365	3.66	4.20	4.08	4.08	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	5	25	4.77	180/1485	4.66	4.53	4.16	4.17	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	263/1504	4.98	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	12	11	4.36	506/1483	4.19	4.17	4.06	4.08	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	27	4.79	366/1425	4.73	4.63	4.41	4.43	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	29	4.88	572/1426	4.82	4.69	4.69	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	9	22	4.66	390/1418	4.46	4.34	4.25	4.26	4.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	24	4.67	446/1416	4.58	4.49	4.26	4.27	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	19	2	0	3	4	3	3.50	919/1199	3.50	3.88	3.97	4.02	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	10	0	3	2	8	2.91	1182/1312	2.80	3.90	4.00	4.09	2.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	5	1	8	0	9	3.30	1159/1303	3.41	4.02	4.24	4.27	3.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	4	0	8	2	8	3.45	1123/1299	3.55	4.07	4.25	4.30	3.45
4. Were special techniques successful	11	18	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/ 758	****	4.42	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	1	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors 1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 14					

56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	33	Non-major	3
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	10	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	32				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 405 0101
 Title SURVEY SAMPLING
 Instructor: MATHEW, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1462
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	295/1504	4.73	4.30	4.27	4.33	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	248/1503	4.73	4.41	4.20	4.18	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	280/1290	4.73	4.50	4.28	4.32	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	331/1453	4.60	4.34	4.21	4.22	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	229/1421	4.64	4.08	4.00	4.02	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	223/1365	4.60	4.20	4.08	4.09	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	230/1485	4.73	4.53	4.16	4.14	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	187/1483	4.70	4.17	4.06	4.11	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.63	4.41	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	502/1426	4.91	4.69	4.69	4.72	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	142/1416	4.91	4.49	4.26	4.26	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1199	****	3.88	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	947/1312	3.67	3.90	4.00	4.07	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	910/1303	4.00	4.02	4.24	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	922/1299	4.00	4.07	4.25	4.38	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 414 0101
 Title ENVIRONMENTAL STATISTI
 Instructor: SWAN, CHRIS
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1463
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	10	11	4.39	712/1504	4.39	4.30	4.27	4.33	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	10	11	4.39	663/1503	4.39	4.41	4.20	4.18	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	11	11	4.43	601/1290	4.43	4.50	4.28	4.32	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	418/1453	4.52	4.34	4.21	4.22	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	2	7	5	6	3.39	1179/1421	3.39	4.08	4.00	4.02	3.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	430/1365	4.39	4.20	4.08	4.09	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	7	13	4.38	625/1485	4.38	4.53	4.16	4.14	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	18	2	3.92	1449/1504	3.92	4.81	4.69	4.73	3.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	8	8	7	3.96	919/1483	3.96	4.17	4.06	4.11	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	9	15	4.63	634/1425	4.63	4.63	4.41	4.38	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	9	13	4.46	1162/1426	4.46	4.69	4.69	4.72	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	7	8	9	4.08	987/1418	4.08	4.34	4.25	4.25	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	8	12	4.33	806/1416	4.33	4.49	4.26	4.26	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	177/1199	4.67	3.88	3.97	4.05	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	716/1312	4.00	3.90	4.00	4.07	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	839/1303	4.18	4.02	4.24	4.34	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	714/1299	4.36	4.07	4.25	4.38	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	13	8	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 758	****	4.42	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	3.69	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.83	****

Course-Section: STAT 414 0101
 Title ENVIRONMENTAL STATISTI
 Instructor: SWAN, CHRIS
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1463
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	8	Under-grad	24	Non-major	0
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: STAT 432 0101
 Title STAT COMPUTER PACKAGES
 Instructor: WU, YANPING
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1464
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	737/1504	4.38	4.30	4.27	4.33	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	219/1503	4.75	4.41	4.20	4.18	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.50	4.28	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	140/1453	4.83	4.34	4.21	4.22	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.08	4.00	4.02	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	114/1365	4.80	4.20	4.08	4.09	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	113/1485	4.88	4.53	4.16	4.14	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1020/1483	3.88	4.17	4.06	4.11	3.88

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	224/1425	4.88	4.63	4.41	4.38	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	825/1426	4.75	4.69	4.69	4.72	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	736/1418	4.38	4.34	4.25	4.25	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.49	4.26	4.26	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	149/1199	4.71	3.88	3.97	4.05	4.71

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1312	5.00	3.90	4.00	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	737/1303	4.33	4.02	4.24	4.34	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	741/1299	4.33	4.07	4.25	4.38	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.42	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	8	Non-major	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 453 0101
 Title INTRO MATHEMATICAL STA
 Instructor: ROY, ANINDYA
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1465
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	4	1	3.50	1353/1504	3.50	4.30	4.27	4.33	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	1	1	3.20	1390/1503	3.20	4.41	4.20	4.18	3.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	3	0	3.00	1236/1290	3.00	4.50	4.28	4.32	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1404/1453	3.00	4.34	4.21	4.22	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	669/1421	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.02	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1003/1365	3.75	4.20	4.08	4.09	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	705/1485	4.30	4.53	4.16	4.14	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	4	0	3.44	1258/1483	3.44	4.17	4.06	4.11	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	1076/1425	4.20	4.63	4.41	4.38	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1319/1426	4.00	4.69	4.69	4.72	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	6	1	0	2.89	1355/1418	2.89	4.34	4.25	4.25	2.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	1	4	1	3.20	1304/1416	3.20	4.49	4.26	4.26	3.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1199	****	3.88	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1312	****	3.90	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1303	****	4.02	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1299	****	4.07	4.25	4.38	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 758	****	4.42	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 602 0101
 Title APPLIED STATISTICS II
 Instructor: NIE, LEI
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1466
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.30	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.41	4.20	4.28	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.50	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.34	4.21	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.08	4.00	4.27	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.20	4.08	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.53	4.16	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	119/1483	4.80	4.17	4.06	4.20	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	331/1425	4.80	4.63	4.41	4.51	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	450/1418	4.60	4.34	4.25	4.36	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	255/1416	4.80	4.49	4.26	4.38	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1312	5.00	3.90	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.02	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.07	4.25	4.56	5.00

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

Course-Section: STAT 603 0101
 Title CATEGOR DATA ANAL
 Instructor: ROSENBERGER, WI
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1467
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.30	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.41	4.20	4.28	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.50	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.34	4.21	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.08	4.00	4.27	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.20	4.08	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.53	4.16	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.17	4.06	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.63	4.41	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.49	4.26	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1199	5.00	3.88	3.97	4.04	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1312	5.00	3.90	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.02	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.07	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.42	4.01	4.24	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: STAT 612 0101
 Title MATHEMATICAL STAT II
 Instructor: SINHA, BIMAL
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1468
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	416/1504	4.60	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	171/1503	4.80	4.41	4.20	4.28	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1290	4.80	4.50	4.28	4.36	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.34	4.21	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	410/1421	4.40	4.08	4.00	4.27	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	139/1365	4.75	4.20	4.08	4.35	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	150/1485	4.80	4.53	4.16	4.24	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	119/1483	4.80	4.17	4.06	4.20	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	665/1425	4.60	4.63	4.41	4.51	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	191/1418	4.80	4.34	4.25	4.36	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.49	4.26	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1199	****	3.88	3.97	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	364/1312	4.50	3.90	4.00	4.31	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	356/1303	4.75	4.02	4.24	4.58	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	570/1299	4.50	4.07	4.25	4.56	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 758	****	4.42	4.01	4.24	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.57	****

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: STAT 617 0101
 Title TIME SERIES ANALYSIS
 Instructor: ROY, ANINDYA
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1469
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	549/1504	4.50	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	751/1503	4.33	4.41	4.20	4.28	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1290	4.80	4.50	4.28	4.36	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1148/1453	3.83	4.34	4.21	4.34	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	0	4	3.83	919/1421	3.83	4.08	4.00	4.27	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	297/1365	4.50	4.20	4.08	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	670/1485	4.33	4.53	4.16	4.24	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1221/1504	4.33	4.81	4.69	4.79	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1061/1483	3.83	4.17	4.06	4.20	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	971/1425	4.33	4.63	4.41	4.51	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	967/1426	4.67	4.69	4.69	4.80	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	772/1418	4.33	4.34	4.25	4.36	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.49	4.26	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	636/1199	4.00	3.88	3.97	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	364/1312	4.50	3.90	4.00	4.31	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	910/1303	4.00	4.02	4.24	4.58	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	922/1299	4.00	4.07	4.25	4.56	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 758	****	4.42	4.01	4.24	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 625 0101
 Title SPATIAL STAT
 Instructor: RUKHIN, ANDREW
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1470
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1504	4.75	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.41	4.20	4.28	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.50	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	270/1453	4.67	4.34	4.21	4.34	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	158/1421	4.75	4.08	4.00	4.27	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	297/1365	4.50	4.20	4.08	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.53	4.16	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	891/1504	4.75	4.81	4.69	4.79	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	338/1483	4.50	4.17	4.06	4.20	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	784/1425	4.50	4.63	4.41	4.51	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	825/1426	4.75	4.69	4.69	4.80	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	848/1418	4.25	4.34	4.25	4.36	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.49	4.26	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1050/1199	3.00	3.88	3.97	4.04	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	364/1312	4.50	3.90	4.00	4.31	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.02	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.07	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.42	4.01	4.24	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 653 0101
 Title BASIC MATH STAT
 Instructor: RUKHIN, ANDREW
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1471
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	168/1504	4.86	4.30	4.27	4.44	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.41	4.20	4.28	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.50	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	140/1453	4.83	4.34	4.21	4.34	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.08	4.00	4.27	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.20	4.08	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	124/1485	4.86	4.53	4.16	4.24	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	211/1483	4.67	4.17	4.06	4.20	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	255/1425	4.86	4.63	4.41	4.51	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.49	4.26	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1199	****	3.88	3.97	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1312	5.00	3.90	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.02	4.24	4.58	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.07	4.25	4.56	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.42	4.01	4.24	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 1 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0 Under-grad 6 Non-major 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant