

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 100 01
Title:	Intro To Contemp Math
Instructor:	Slowikowski,Wil

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	64
Questionnaires:	35

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	5	3	8	11	8	3.40	1497/1560	3.40	4.34	4.35	4.17	3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	7	13	10	3.71	1373/1559	3.71	4.34	4.31	4.25	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	4	8	17	3.97	1091/1371	3.97	4.41	4.38	4.27	3.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	1	1	6	2	7	3.76	1288/1519	3.76	4.29	4.27	4.13	3.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	17	2	1	0	7	8	4.00	948/1452	4.00	4.12	4.18	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	26	2	1	1	2	3	3.33	1320/1430	3.33	4.22	4.16	3.98	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	6	23	4.44	622/1539	4.44	4.36	4.23	4.18	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	31	4.86	574/1560	4.86	4.79	4.64	4.57	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	2	4	10	11	0	3.11	1470/1545	3.11	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	3	6	8	16	4.03	1274/1496	4.03	4.49	4.49	4.43	4.03
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	7	8	17	4.15	1423/1498	4.15	4.70	4.75	4.67	4.15
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	4	3	13	9	3.58	1362/1496	3.58	4.17	4.37	4.31	3.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	5	2	8	16	3.85	1256/1494	3.85	4.28	4.37	4.28	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	26	4	0	0	1	3	2.88	****/1352	****	3.96	4.12	3.98	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	5	3	4	4	5	3.05	1185/1248	3.05	3.93	4.23	3.95	3.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	4	3	2	6	6	3.33	1189/1250	3.33	3.91	4.39	4.13	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	6	3	1	5	5	3.00	1217/1239	3.00	4.13	4.45	4.18	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 100 01
Title:	Intro To Contemp Math
Instructor:	Slowikowski,Wil

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	64
Questionnaires:	35

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	14	16	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	****/906	****	3.95	4.13	3.98	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 6	C 7	General 29	Under-grad 35
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 4	D 1		Non-major 35
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 15	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 2		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 106 01
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Baradwaj,Rajala

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	44
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	3	10	18	4.48	692/1560	4.36	4.34	4.35	4.17	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	10	17	4.42	760/1559	4.74	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	25	4.71	395/1371	4.73	4.41	4.38	4.27	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	0	4	17	4.68	330/1519	4.65	4.29	4.27	4.13	4.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	2	4	1	8	4.00	948/1452	4.18	4.12	4.18	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	0	2	0	2	7	4.27	682/1430	4.59	4.22	4.16	3.98	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	6	20	4.45	608/1539	4.68	4.36	4.23	4.18	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	0	4	24	4.76	776/1560	4.71	4.79	4.64	4.57	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	2	12	10	4.24	744/1545	4.28	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	627/1496	4.79	4.49	4.49	4.43	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	445/1498	4.86	4.70	4.75	4.67	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	2	6	18	4.43	805/1496	4.70	4.17	4.37	4.31	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	6	19	4.54	690/1494	4.65	4.28	4.37	4.28	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	697/1352	4.15	3.96	4.12	3.98	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	4	12	4.53	455/1248	4.28	3.93	4.23	3.95	4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	2	1	3	11	4.35	741/1250	4.35	3.91	4.39	4.13	4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	528/1239	4.43	4.13	4.45	4.18	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	15	12	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/906	3.95	3.95	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 106 01
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Baradwaj,Rajala

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	44
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/206	4.76	4.48	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/214	4.76	4.51	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/204	4.84	4.84	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	4.93	4.93	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	4.79	4.79	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	4.50	4.50	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	5.00	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/63	5.00	5.00	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.64	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	4.50	4.75	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	4.50	4.75	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	4.50	4.75	4.41	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 106 01
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Baradwaj,Rajala

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	44
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 9	General 11	Under-grad 31
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 31
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 7		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 106 02
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Webb,Deborah P.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	60
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	1	3	3	9	4.06	1164/1560	4.36	4.34	4.35	4.17	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	357/1559	4.74	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	735/1371	4.73	4.41	4.38	4.27	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	3	8	4.06	1032/1519	4.65	4.29	4.27	4.13	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	681/1452	4.18	4.12	4.18	4.04	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	3	1	7	4.17	778/1430	4.59	4.22	4.16	3.98	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	378/1539	4.68	4.36	4.23	4.18	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	877/1560	4.71	4.79	4.64	4.57	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	788/1545	4.28	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	769/1496	4.79	4.49	4.49	4.43	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	1175/1498	4.86	4.70	4.75	4.67	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	677/1496	4.70	4.17	4.37	4.31	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	632/1494	4.65	4.28	4.37	4.28	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	3	0	5	0	6	3.43	1193/1352	4.15	3.96	4.12	3.98	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	5	2	5	3.64	1027/1248	4.28	3.93	4.23	3.95	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	4	2	3	5	3.64	1122/1250	4.35	3.91	4.39	4.13	3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	3	1	3	6	3.71	1114/1239	4.43	4.13	4.45	4.18	3.71

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 106 02
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Webb,Deborah P.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	60
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	1	3	2	0	4	3.30	824/906	3.95	3.95	4.13	3.98	3.30

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 1	A 9	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		Major 1
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 3	General 7	Under-grad 17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 1		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 106 03
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Riley,Samantha

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	1193/1560	4.36	4.34	4.35	4.17	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1559	4.74	4.34	4.31	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1371	4.73	4.41	4.38	4.27	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	294/1519	4.65	4.29	4.27	4.13	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1349/1452	4.18	4.12	4.18	4.04	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1430	4.59	4.22	4.16	3.98	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	153/1539	4.68	4.36	4.23	4.18	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	1146/1560	4.71	4.79	4.64	4.57	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	314/1545	4.28	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	280/1496	4.79	4.49	4.49	4.43	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	644/1498	4.86	4.70	4.75	4.67	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	200/1496	4.70	4.17	4.37	4.31	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	880/1494	4.65	4.28	4.37	4.28	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	994/1352	4.15	3.96	4.12	3.98	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	348/1248	4.28	3.93	4.23	3.95	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	479/1250	4.35	3.91	4.39	4.13	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	563/1239	4.43	4.13	4.45	4.18	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	311/906	3.95	3.95	4.13	3.98	4.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 106 03
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Riley,Samantha

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	54/206	4.76	4.48	4.25	4.15	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	105/214	4.76	4.51	4.31	4.30	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	56/204	4.84	4.84	4.52	4.54	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/207	4.93	4.93	4.44	4.50	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/199	4.79	4.79	4.27	4.31	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	42/64	4.50	4.50	4.44	4.50	4.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/58	5.00	5.00	4.37	4.32	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/52	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.33	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/66	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.53	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/63	5.00	5.00	4.09	4.17	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	19/31	4.50	4.75	4.35	4.54	4.50
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	11/22	4.50	4.75	4.13	4.42	4.50
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	16/29	4.50	4.75	4.41	4.61	4.50
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 106 03
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Riley,Samantha

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Major 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 8
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 106 04
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Riley,Samantha

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	5

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	4.36	4.34	4.35	4.17	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	236/1559	4.74	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	261/1371	4.73	4.41	4.38	4.27	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1519	4.65	4.29	4.27	4.13	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1452	4.18	4.12	4.18	4.04	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1430	4.59	4.22	4.16	3.98	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	193/1539	4.68	4.36	4.23	4.18	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	4.71	4.79	4.64	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1212/1545	4.28	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1496	4.79	4.49	4.49	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1498	4.86	4.70	4.75	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	294/1496	4.70	4.17	4.37	4.31	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1494	4.65	4.28	4.37	4.28	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1352	4.15	3.96	4.12	3.98	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1248	4.28	3.93	4.23	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1250	4.35	3.91	4.39	4.13	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1239	4.43	4.13	4.45	4.18	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	360/906	3.95	3.95	4.13	3.98	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 106 04
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Riley,Samantha

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	5

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/206	4.76	4.48	4.25	4.15	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/214	4.76	4.51	4.31	4.30	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/204	4.84	4.84	4.52	4.54	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/207	4.93	4.93	4.44	4.50	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 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 5 Non-major 5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	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 0	
			? 3		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 106 05
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Riley,Samantha

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	5	5	13	4.25	983/1560	4.36	4.34	4.35	4.17	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	248/1559	4.74	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	20	4.75	328/1371	4.73	4.41	4.38	4.27	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	197/1519	4.65	4.29	4.27	4.13	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	1	0	3	9	4.29	670/1452	4.18	4.12	4.18	4.04	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	406/1430	4.59	4.22	4.16	3.98	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	5	18	4.67	349/1539	4.68	4.36	4.23	4.18	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	16	4.67	898/1560	4.71	4.79	4.64	4.57	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	294/1545	4.28	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	367/1496	4.79	4.49	4.49	4.43	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	556/1498	4.86	4.70	4.75	4.67	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	213/1496	4.70	4.17	4.37	4.31	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	18	4.73	451/1494	4.65	4.28	4.37	4.28	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	579/1352	4.15	3.96	4.12	3.98	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	5	2	5	3.57	1052/1248	4.28	3.93	4.23	3.95	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	926/1250	4.35	3.91	4.39	4.13	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	952/1239	4.43	4.13	4.45	4.18	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	10	6	1	0	3	0	4	3.75	697/906	3.95	3.95	4.13	3.98	3.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 106 05
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Riley,Samantha

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	47/206	4.76	4.48	4.25	4.15	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	16/214	4.76	4.51	4.31	4.30	4.89
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	50/204	4.84	4.84	4.52	4.54	4.78
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	51/207	4.93	4.93	4.44	4.50	4.78
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	2	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	59/199	4.79	4.79	4.27	4.31	4.57
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	4.50	4.50	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/58	5.00	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/52	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	5.00	5.00	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	4.50	4.75	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	4.50	4.75	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	4.50	4.75	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 106 05
Title:	Algebra & Element Funct
Instructor:	Riley,Samantha

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 1	B 6		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 7	General 10	Under-grad 24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Non-major 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 2		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 132 01
Title:	Math For Elem Tchrs II
Instructor:	Tighe,Bonny J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	0	2	11	4.64	486/1560	4.64	4.34	4.35	4.17	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	534/1559	4.57	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	465/1371	4.64	4.41	4.38	4.27	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	207/1519	4.80	4.29	4.27	4.13	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	0	9	4.50	433/1452	4.50	4.12	4.18	4.04	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	532/1430	4.43	4.22	4.16	3.98	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	283/1539	4.71	4.36	4.23	4.18	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	988/1560	4.57	4.79	4.64	4.57	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	284/1545	4.64	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	832/1496	4.54	4.49	4.49	4.43	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	733/1498	4.85	4.70	4.75	4.67	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	574/1496	4.62	4.17	4.37	4.31	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	493/1494	4.69	4.28	4.37	4.28	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	266/1352	4.60	3.96	4.12	3.98	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1248	****	3.93	4.23	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1250	****	3.91	4.39	4.13	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1239	****	4.13	4.45	4.18	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 132 01
Title:	Math For Elem Tchrs II
Instructor:	Tighe, Bonny J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/906	****	3.95	4.13	3.98	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 150 01
Title:	Precalculus Mathematics
Instructor:	Baradwaj,Rajala

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	140
Questionnaires:	53

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	3	3	4	10	33	4.26	970/1560	4.23	4.34	4.35	4.17	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	9	37	4.47	671/1559	4.46	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	6	12	32	4.34	810/1371	4.34	4.41	4.38	4.27	4.34
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	19	1	3	4	11	15	4.06	1032/1519	4.18	4.29	4.27	4.13	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	14	5	2	11	7	14	3.59	1259/1452	3.56	4.12	4.18	4.04	3.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	33	2	0	4	4	9	3.95	959/1430	4.02	4.22	4.16	3.98	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	6	10	35	4.45	608/1539	4.46	4.36	4.23	4.18	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	17	34	4.63	929/1560	4.75	4.79	4.64	4.57	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	2	1	6	17	19	4.11	876/1545	4.17	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	3	4	42	4.72	542/1496	4.71	4.49	4.49	4.43	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	5	46	4.83	792/1498	4.87	4.70	4.75	4.67	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	7	12	27	4.20	1035/1496	4.30	4.17	4.37	4.31	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	7	39	4.64	557/1494	4.63	4.28	4.37	4.28	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	12	2	1	5	12	14	4.03	813/1352	4.06	3.96	4.12	3.98	4.03
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	6	4	8	9	23	3.78	963/1248	3.25	3.93	4.23	3.95	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	4	1	5	17	23	4.08	924/1250	3.60	3.91	4.39	4.13	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	7	4	9	15	14	3.51	1161/1239	3.43	4.13	4.45	4.18	3.51
4. Were special techniques successful	3	12	6	3	8	7	14	3.53	770/906	3.53	3.95	4.13	3.98	3.53

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 150 01
Title:	Precalculus Mathematics
Instructor:	Baradwaj,Rajala

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	140
Questionnaires:	53

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/206	****	4.48	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/214	****	4.51	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	50	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/204	****	4.84	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/207	****	4.93	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	50	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/199	****	4.79	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	5.00	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	52	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	****	4.75	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/22	****	4.75	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	4.75	4.41	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	51	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 150 01
Title:	Precalculus Mathematics
Instructor:	Baradwaj,Rajala

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	140
Questionnaires:	53

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	37	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	12						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	18	General	5	Under-grad	53	Non-major	53
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	4						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	1	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 150 04
Title:	Precalculus Mathematics
Instructor:	Kelly,Brian

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	138
Questionnaires:	71

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	2	4	7	23	35	4.20	1055/1560	4.23	4.34	4.35	4.17	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	4	22	41	4.44	715/1559	4.46	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	1	6	16	44	4.34	810/1371	4.34	4.41	4.38	4.27	4.34
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	25	1	1	8	9	27	4.30	817/1519	4.18	4.29	4.27	4.13	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	27	6	3	11	8	15	3.53	1278/1452	3.56	4.12	4.18	4.04	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	45	2	2	2	4	14	4.08	840/1430	4.02	4.22	4.16	3.98	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	4	20	43	4.47	581/1539	4.46	4.36	4.23	4.18	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	7	62	4.87	526/1560	4.75	4.79	4.64	4.57	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	1	0	9	22	25	4.23	766/1545	4.17	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	4	10	56	4.69	593/1496	4.71	4.49	4.49	4.43	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	66	4.92	500/1498	4.87	4.70	4.75	4.67	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	5	22	41	4.41	832/1496	4.30	4.17	4.37	4.31	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	15	51	4.62	596/1494	4.63	4.28	4.37	4.28	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	17	2	1	12	12	25	4.10	778/1352	4.06	3.96	4.12	3.98	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	23	6	10	7	14	2.72	1222/1248	3.25	3.93	4.23	3.95	2.72
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	14	8	12	9	17	3.12	1215/1250	3.60	3.91	4.39	4.13	3.12
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	9	9	12	7	20	3.35	1194/1239	3.43	4.13	4.45	4.18	3.35
4. Were special techniques successful	12	47	3	2	1	0	6	3.33	****/906	3.53	3.95	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 150 04
Title:	Precalculus Mathematics
Instructor:	Kelly,Brian

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	138
Questionnaires:	71

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	64	5	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/206	****	4.48	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	67	0	2	1	0	1	0	2.00	****/214	****	4.51	4.31	4.30	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	65	4	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/64	****	4.50	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	68	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	69	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	69	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	68	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	68	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	69	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/25	****	****	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	69	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	4.75	4.35	4.54	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 150 04
Title:	Precalculus Mathematics
Instructor:	Kelly,Brian

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	138
Questionnaires:	71

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	69	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27 16	0.00-0.99 1	A 12	Required for Majors 44	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55 7	1.00-1.99 2	B 32			
56-83 4	2.00-2.99 3	C 19	General 15	Under-grad 71	Non-major 71
84-150 4	3.00-3.49 12	D 3			
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00 11	F 1	Electives 4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
		P 0			
		I 0	Other 0		
		? 4			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 151 01
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I
Instructor:	Tighe,Bonny J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	144
Questionnaires:	67

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	0	0	0	5	19	42	4.56	590/1560	4.53	4.34	4.35	4.17	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	18	45	4.60	508/1559	4.58	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	5	13	46	4.60	513/1371	4.60	4.41	4.38	4.27	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	24	3	1	6	9	24	4.16	952/1519	4.41	4.29	4.27	4.13	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	17	7	5	18	10	10	3.22	1371/1452	3.88	4.12	4.18	4.04	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	41	0	2	5	10	9	4.00	889/1430	4.19	4.22	4.16	3.98	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	13	12	40	4.34	749/1539	4.48	4.36	4.23	4.18	4.34
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	3	46	16	4.17	1364/1560	4.70	4.79	4.64	4.57	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	2	1	1	2	12	34	4.54	369/1545	4.47	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	1	5	55	4.79	419/1496	4.89	4.49	4.49	4.43	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	2	2	58	4.84	733/1498	4.74	4.70	4.75	4.67	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	3	2	14	44	4.57	621/1496	4.65	4.17	4.37	4.31	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	4	0	9	50	4.67	532/1494	4.74	4.28	4.37	4.28	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	15	1	5	3	11	26	4.22	669/1352	4.15	3.96	4.12	3.98	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	11	4	16	6	19	3.32	1140/1248	3.99	3.93	4.23	3.95	3.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	3	14	14	7	17	3.38	1179/1250	3.81	3.91	4.39	4.13	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	3	9	14	6	22	3.65	1132/1239	3.97	4.13	4.45	4.18	3.65
4. Were special techniques successful	13	35	5	2	6	0	6	3.00	852/906	3.00	3.95	4.13	3.98	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 151 01
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I
Instructor:	Tighe, Bonny J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	144
Questionnaires:	67

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	66	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/206	****	4.48	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	66	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/214	****	4.51	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	66	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/204	****	4.84	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	66	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/207	****	4.93	4.44	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	2	A	17	Required for Majors	52	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	22						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	9	C	18	General	2	Under-grad	67	Non-major	66
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 151 06
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I
Instructor:	Dean,Brian J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	154
Questionnaires:	73

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	0	1	1	9	16	45	4.43	764/1560	4.53	4.34	4.35	4.17	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	7	18	46	4.50	627/1559	4.58	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	7	13	51	4.58	537/1371	4.60	4.41	4.38	4.27	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	27	0	0	7	8	30	4.51	537/1519	4.41	4.29	4.27	4.13	4.51
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	30	2	2	8	10	20	4.05	916/1452	3.88	4.12	4.18	4.04	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	42	0	1	8	7	14	4.13	803/1430	4.19	4.22	4.16	3.98	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	4	17	47	4.52	519/1539	4.48	4.36	4.23	4.18	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	3	67	4.93	363/1560	4.70	4.79	4.64	4.57	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	3	0	1	2	25	30	4.45	490/1545	4.47	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	64	4.89	262/1496	4.89	4.49	4.49	4.43	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	9	6	56	4.66	1077/1498	4.74	4.70	4.75	4.67	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	6	12	51	4.60	588/1496	4.65	4.17	4.37	4.31	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	4	9	55	4.66	545/1494	4.74	4.28	4.37	4.28	4.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	32	1	3	6	7	17	4.06	798/1352	4.15	3.96	4.12	3.98	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	6	2	6	18	31	4.05	810/1248	3.99	3.93	4.23	3.95	4.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	7	6	14	13	23	3.62	1129/1250	3.81	3.91	4.39	4.13	3.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	4	3	14	13	27	3.92	1037/1239	3.97	4.13	4.45	4.18	3.92
4. Were special techniques successful	11	46	2	2	2	3	7	3.69	****/906	3.00	3.95	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 151 06
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I
Instructor:	Dean,Brian J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	154
Questionnaires:	73

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	72	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	4.75	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	72	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	4.75	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	72	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.75	4.41	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	72	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	72	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	1	A	26	Required for Majors	Graduate	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	B	27			Major
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	9	C	7	General	Under-grad	73
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	2			Non-major
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	1	Electives		73
				P	1			
				I	0	Other		
				?	7			

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 151 11
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I
Instructor:	Dean,Brian J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	82
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	3	9	25	4.59	554/1560	4.53	4.34	4.35	4.17	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	28	4.65	439/1559	4.58	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	7	26	4.61	501/1371	4.60	4.41	4.38	4.27	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	1	1	6	16	4.54	503/1519	4.41	4.29	4.27	4.13	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	573/1452	3.88	4.12	4.18	4.04	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	506/1430	4.19	4.22	4.16	3.98	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	7	26	4.57	477/1539	4.48	4.36	4.23	4.18	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	5.00	1/1560	4.70	4.79	4.64	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	0	0	1	13	12	4.42	518/1545	4.47	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1496	4.89	4.49	4.49	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	6	26	4.71	1023/1498	4.74	4.70	4.75	4.67	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	4	28	4.76	355/1496	4.65	4.17	4.37	4.31	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	31	4.88	219/1494	4.74	4.28	4.37	4.28	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	18	2	0	0	5	9	4.19	697/1352	4.15	3.96	4.12	3.98	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	4	19	4.60	398/1248	3.99	3.93	4.23	3.95	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	2	7	15	4.44	667/1250	3.81	3.91	4.39	4.13	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	4	5	14	4.33	812/1239	3.97	4.13	4.45	4.18	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	12	17	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	****/906	3.00	3.95	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 151 11
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I
Instructor:	Dean,Brian J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	82
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/206	****	4.48	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/214	****	4.51	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/204	****	4.84	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.93	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.79	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.50	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	5.00	4.41	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	5.00	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	4.75	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	4.75	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.75	4.41	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 151 11
Title:	Calc & Analy Geomtry I
Instructor:	Dean,Brian J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	82
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors 23	Graduate 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		Major 3
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 3	C 4	General 2	Under-grad 37
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		Non-major 34
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 8		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 152 01
Title:	Calc & Analy Geometry II
Instructor:	Tighe, Bonny J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	152
Questionnaires:	115

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	2	1	12	19	81	4.53	627/1560	4.57	4.34	4.35	4.17	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	32	74	4.53	587/1559	4.60	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	7	17	86	4.58	537/1371	4.58	4.41	4.38	4.27	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	45	1	2	3	20	42	4.47	592/1519	4.42	4.29	4.27	4.13	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	48	10	10	13	16	17	3.30	1357/1452	3.82	4.12	4.18	4.04	3.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	83	3	1	4	10	14	3.97	936/1430	4.11	4.22	4.16	3.98	3.97
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	6	27	79	4.58	456/1539	4.63	4.36	4.23	4.18	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	68	46	4.40	1170/1560	4.77	4.79	4.64	4.57	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	2	1	11	29	54	4.36	599/1545	4.39	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	5	16	92	4.75	507/1496	4.82	4.49	4.49	4.43	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	12	99	4.83	763/1498	4.85	4.70	4.75	4.67	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	3	11	31	68	4.42	805/1496	4.60	4.17	4.37	4.31	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	3	7	17	82	4.50	726/1494	4.66	4.28	4.37	4.28	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	31	3	1	10	15	48	4.35	526/1352	4.54	3.96	4.12	3.98	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	10	7	14	24	50	3.92	897/1248	3.85	3.93	4.23	3.95	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	7	17	24	21	34	3.56	1140/1250	3.64	3.91	4.39	4.13	3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	3	13	21	22	42	3.86	1063/1239	3.97	4.13	4.45	4.18	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	14	71	4	4	5	5	12	3.57	755/906	3.99	3.95	4.13	3.98	3.57

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 152 01
Title:	Calc & Analy Geometry II
Instructor:	Tighe, Bonny J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	152
Questionnaires:	115

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	114	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.50	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	114	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	114	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	5.00	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	114	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	114	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	5.00	4.09	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	29	0.00-0.99 0	A 58	Required for Majors 103	Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	41	1.00-1.99 0	B 34		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 7	C 12	General 1	Under-grad 115 Non-major 109
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 17	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 57	F 1	Electives 2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 7		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 152 06
Title:	Calc & Analy Geometry II
Instructor:	Nanes,Kalman M

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	137
Questionnaires:	67

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	2	0	0	0	3	20	42	4.60	542/1560	4.57	4.34	4.35	4.17	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	13	48	4.66	412/1559	4.60	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.66
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	20	43	4.63	477/1371	4.58	4.41	4.38	4.27	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	22	1	1	5	10	26	4.37	730/1519	4.42	4.29	4.27	4.13	4.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	15	2	3	6	15	21	4.06	900/1452	3.82	4.12	4.18	4.04	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	24	3	2	4	11	19	4.05	858/1430	4.11	4.22	4.16	3.98	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	12	49	4.72	283/1539	4.63	4.36	4.23	4.18	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	0	0	0	2	60	4.97	182/1560	4.77	4.79	4.64	4.57	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	0	0	2	22	27	4.49	420/1545	4.39	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.49
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	59	4.91	228/1496	4.82	4.49	4.49	4.43	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	6	58	4.91	556/1498	4.85	4.70	4.75	4.67	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	12	50	4.75	371/1496	4.60	4.17	4.37	4.31	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	0	2	8	51	4.74	421/1494	4.66	4.28	4.37	4.28	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	7	0	1	3	7	44	4.71	182/1352	4.54	3.96	4.12	3.98	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	10	2	4	14	25	3.76	974/1248	3.85	3.93	4.23	3.95	3.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	8	4	8	14	20	3.63	1127/1250	3.64	3.91	4.39	4.13	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	6	2	9	8	29	3.96	1000/1239	3.97	4.13	4.45	4.18	3.96
4. Were special techniques successful	13	32	0	1	2	6	13	4.41	311/906	3.99	3.95	4.13	3.98	4.41

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 152 06
Title:	Calc & Analy Geometry II
Instructor:	Nanes,Kalman M

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	137
Questionnaires:	67

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	65	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/206	****	4.48	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	64	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/214	****	4.51	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	64	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/204	****	4.84	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	64	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/207	****	4.93	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	64	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/199	****	4.79	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	66	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.50	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	66	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	66	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	5.00	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	66	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.41	4.53	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	66	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	66	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	66	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	66	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	66	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	66	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	4.75	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	66	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	4.75	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	66	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.75	4.41	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	66	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 152 06
Title:	Calc & Analy Geometry II
Instructor:	Nanes,Kalman M

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	137
Questionnaires:	67

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	65	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	1	A	21	Required for Majors	48	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	24						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	67	Non-major	64
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	11	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	11						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 152 11
Title:	Calc & Analy Geometry II
Instructor:	Nanes,Kalman M

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	140
Questionnaires:	74

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	6	20	48	4.57	590/1560	4.57	4.34	4.35	4.17	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	16	52	4.62	467/1559	4.60	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	7	18	47	4.52	609/1371	4.58	4.41	4.38	4.27	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	30	0	0	5	15	23	4.42	678/1519	4.42	4.29	4.27	4.13	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	34	1	2	6	11	17	4.11	868/1452	3.82	4.12	4.18	4.04	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	43	0	1	5	7	16	4.31	645/1430	4.11	4.22	4.16	3.98	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	7	11	53	4.60	445/1539	4.63	4.36	4.23	4.18	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	4	67	4.94	272/1560	4.77	4.79	4.64	4.57	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	2	0	7	18	33	4.33	639/1545	4.39	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	12	60	4.81	402/1496	4.82	4.49	4.49	4.43	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	4	6	62	4.81	852/1498	4.85	4.70	4.75	4.67	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	7	13	53	4.63	546/1496	4.60	4.17	4.37	4.31	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	13	55	4.73	436/1494	4.66	4.28	4.37	4.28	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	1	0	5	15	44	4.55	309/1352	4.54	3.96	4.12	3.98	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	6	9	22	22	3.87	926/1248	3.85	3.93	4.23	3.95	3.87
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	3	6	17	14	21	3.72	1100/1250	3.64	3.91	4.39	4.13	3.72
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	3	4	10	12	32	4.08	949/1239	3.97	4.13	4.45	4.18	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	13	22	1	3	9	8	18	4.00	519/906	3.99	3.95	4.13	3.98	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 152 11
Title:	Calc & Analy Geometry II
Instructor:	Nanes,Kalman M

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	140
Questionnaires:	74

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	69	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/206	****	4.48	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	69	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/214	****	4.51	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	69	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/204	****	4.84	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	69	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/207	****	4.93	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	69	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/199	****	4.79	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	72	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/64	****	4.50	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	72	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	72	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/52	****	5.00	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	72	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	72	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/63	****	5.00	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	72	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	72	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	72	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	72	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	72	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	72	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	****	4.75	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	72	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/22	****	4.75	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	72	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	4.75	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 152 11
Title:	Calc & Analy Geometry II
Instructor:	Nanes,Kalman M

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	140
Questionnaires:	74

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	72	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	72	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	19	0.00-0.99	1	A	28	Required for Majors	61	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	1	B	26						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	11	General	0	Under-grad	74	Non-major	71
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	16	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 152H 01
Title:	Calc/Analy Geom II-Honrs
Instructor:	Hoffman,Kathlee

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	4
Questionnaires:	4

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	1	0	3	4.50	664/1560	4.50	4.34	4.35	4.17	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	296/1559	4.75	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1371	5.00	4.41	4.38	4.27	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	255/1519	4.75	4.29	4.27	4.13	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	948/1452	4.00	4.12	4.18	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	427/1430	4.50	4.22	4.16	3.98	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.36	4.23	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.79	4.64	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	255/1545	4.67	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1496	5.00	4.49	4.49	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.70	4.75	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	371/1496	4.75	4.17	4.37	4.31	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1494	5.00	4.28	4.37	4.28	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1277/1352	3.00	3.96	4.12	3.98	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	679/1248	4.25	3.93	4.23	3.95	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	815/1250	4.25	3.91	4.39	4.13	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1239	5.00	4.13	4.45	4.18	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 152H 01
Title:	Calc/Analy Geom II-Honrs
Instructor:	Hoffman,Kathlee

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	4
Questionnaires:	4

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	778/906	3.50	3.95	4.13	3.98	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Major 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Non-major 4
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 155 01
Title:	Applied Calculus
Instructor:	Baradwaj,Rajala

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	124
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	3	7	8	17	3.79	1355/1560	4.18	4.34	4.35	4.17	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	11	10	13	3.79	1348/1559	4.28	4.34	4.31	4.25	3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	4	10	11	11	3.59	1271/1371	4.19	4.41	4.38	4.27	3.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	4	5	6	14	8	3.46	1427/1519	4.02	4.29	4.27	4.13	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	6	3	10	6	11	3.36	1341/1452	3.73	4.12	4.18	4.04	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	9	4	8	5	7	2.91	1397/1430	3.38	4.22	4.16	3.98	2.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	5	6	9	16	3.84	1220/1539	4.34	4.36	4.23	4.18	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	1	15	22	4.46	1098/1560	4.51	4.79	4.64	4.57	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	4	4	1	15	1	3.20	1457/1545	4.00	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	2	2	6	26	4.37	1047/1496	4.63	4.49	4.49	4.43	4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	2	5	8	21	4.24	1395/1498	4.62	4.70	4.75	4.67	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	6	4	7	8	12	3.43	1401/1496	4.11	4.17	4.37	4.31	3.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	7	3	3	8	14	3.54	1374/1494	4.17	4.28	4.37	4.28	3.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	18	2	1	3	6	5	3.65	1106/1352	4.12	3.96	4.12	3.98	3.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	4	5	6	12	3.50	1079/1248	3.60	3.93	4.23	3.95	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	6	4	5	4	12	3.39	1179/1250	3.56	3.91	4.39	4.13	3.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	5	3	6	6	11	3.48	1169/1239	3.74	4.13	4.45	4.18	3.48
4. Were special techniques successful	8	10	5	1	8	1	6	3.10	848/906	3.35	3.95	4.13	3.98	3.10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 155 01
Title:	Applied Calculus
Instructor:	Baradwaj,Rajala

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	124
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/206	3.67	4.48	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/214	3.75	4.51	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/204	****	4.84	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/207	****	4.93	4.44	4.50	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/64	****	4.50	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/52	****	5.00	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.41	4.53	****
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	4.75	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/22	****	4.75	4.13	4.42	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 155 01
Title:	Applied Calculus
Instructor:	Baradwaj,Rajala

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	124
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	13	General	3	Under-grad	39	Non-major	39
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	8						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 155 04
Title:	Applied Calculus
Instructor:	Stanwyck, Elizab

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	121
Questionnaires:	48

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	0	0	0	4	12	31	4.57	578/1560	4.18	4.34	4.35	4.17	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	38	4.77	284/1559	4.28	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	6	38	4.78	287/1371	4.19	4.41	4.38	4.27	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	5	8	29	4.57	469/1519	4.02	4.29	4.27	4.13	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	16	2	1	4	8	15	4.10	868/1452	3.73	4.12	4.18	4.04	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	20	4	1	4	3	14	3.85	1039/1430	3.38	4.22	4.16	3.98	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	41	4.83	177/1539	4.34	4.36	4.23	4.18	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	21	26	4.55	1006/1560	4.51	4.79	4.64	4.57	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	0	0	1	5	28	4.79	150/1545	4.00	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	42	4.89	245/1496	4.63	4.49	4.49	4.43	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	46	5.00	1/1498	4.62	4.70	4.75	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	4	38	4.78	340/1496	4.11	4.17	4.37	4.31	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	7	38	4.80	332/1494	4.17	4.28	4.37	4.28	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	1	1	2	4	29	4.59	274/1352	4.12	3.96	4.12	3.98	4.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	7	3	13	16	3.70	1011/1248	3.60	3.93	4.23	3.95	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	4	3	11	6	18	3.74	1097/1250	3.56	3.91	4.39	4.13	3.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	3	8	9	20	4.00	971/1239	3.74	4.13	4.45	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	13	3	4	5	5	11	3.61	741/906	3.35	3.95	4.13	3.98	3.61

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 155 04
Title:	Applied Calculus
Instructor:	Stanwyck, Elizab

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	121
Questionnaires:	48

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	0	1	1	4	1	5	3.67	183/206	3.67	4.48	4.25	4.15	3.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	190/214	3.75	4.51	4.31	4.30	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	36	2	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	****/204	****	4.84	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	1	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	****/207	****	4.93	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	****/199	****	4.79	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/64	****	4.50	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/52	****	5.00	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/66	****	5.00	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/63	****	5.00	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	44	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/24	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	44	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/26	****	****	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	44	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/25	****	****	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/31	****	4.75	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/22	****	4.75	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/29	****	4.75	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 155 04
Title:	Applied Calculus
Instructor:	Stanwyck, Elizab

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	121
Questionnaires:	48

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	42	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B	16						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	14	General	1	Under-grad	47	Non-major	48
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0		0				
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 215 01
Title:	Appl. Finite Mathematics
Instructor:	Kapoor,Jagmohan

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	100
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	3	3	10	12	4.00	1193/1560	4.00	4.34	4.35	4.37	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	2	8	14	4.11	1087/1559	4.11	4.34	4.31	4.33	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	9	13	4.21	927/1371	4.21	4.41	4.38	4.40	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	1	2	1	3	5	3.75	1294/1519	3.75	4.29	4.27	4.29	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	530/1452	4.43	4.12	4.18	4.22	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	2	0	2	2	5	3.73	1117/1430	3.73	4.22	4.16	4.15	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	0	3	6	17	4.17	944/1539	4.17	4.36	4.23	4.25	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	550/1560	4.86	4.79	4.64	4.61	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	2	1	5	8	4	3.55	1318/1545	3.55	4.01	4.14	4.09	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	7	17	4.52	858/1496	4.52	4.49	4.49	4.52	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	3	3	5	17	4.29	1378/1498	4.29	4.70	4.75	4.78	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	2	7	14	4.11	1114/1496	4.11	4.17	4.37	4.36	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	3	9	13	4.22	1017/1494	4.22	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	1	0	4	5	8	4.06	798/1352	4.06	3.96	4.12	4.14	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	3	1	3	1	6	3.43	1111/1248	3.43	3.93	4.23	4.25	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	4	0	5	2	4	3.13	1213/1250	3.13	3.91	4.39	4.40	3.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	6	0	1	2	5	3.00	1217/1239	3.00	4.13	4.45	4.45	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	16	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/906	****	3.95	4.13	4.19	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 215 01
Title:	Appl. Finite Mathematics
Instructor:	Kapoor,Jagmohan

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	100
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/206	****	4.48	4.25	4.58	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/214	****	4.51	4.31	4.60	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/204	****	4.84	4.52	4.64	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/207	****	4.93	4.44	4.67	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	3	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/64	****	4.50	4.44	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/52	****	5.00	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.41	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/63	****	5.00	4.09	3.65	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/29	****	****	4.19	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/24	****	****	4.25	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/26	****	****	3.89	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/25	****	****	4.01	4.75	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/31	****	4.75	4.35	4.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/22	****	4.75	4.13	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/29	****	4.75	4.41	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.75	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 215 01
Title:	Appl. Finite Mathematics
Instructor:	Kapoor,Jagmohan

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	100
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	4.75	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 221 01
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Nanes,Kalman M

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	53
Questionnaires:	42

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	1	8	33	4.76	326/1560	4.24	4.34	4.35	4.37	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	34	4.79	260/1559	4.31	4.34	4.31	4.33	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	36	4.83	233/1371	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.40	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	2	8	25	4.66	369/1519	4.12	4.29	4.27	4.29	4.66
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	4	6	29	4.51	422/1452	4.17	4.12	4.18	4.22	4.51
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	13	0	0	3	2	22	4.70	228/1430	4.22	4.22	4.16	4.15	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	6	32	4.62	420/1539	4.52	4.36	4.23	4.25	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	38	4.93	363/1560	4.92	4.79	4.64	4.61	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	7	25	4.78	157/1545	4.08	4.01	4.14	4.09	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	34	4.78	437/1496	4.44	4.49	4.49	4.52	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	39	4.93	445/1498	4.78	4.70	4.75	4.78	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	4	34	4.73	401/1496	4.07	4.17	4.37	4.36	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	38	4.93	153/1494	4.19	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	23	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	401/1352	3.82	3.96	4.12	4.14	4.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	389/1248	4.01	3.93	4.23	4.25	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	295/1250	4.10	3.91	4.39	4.40	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	347/1239	4.47	4.13	4.45	4.45	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	30	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	80/906	4.87	3.95	4.13	4.19	4.92

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 221 01
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Nanes,Kalman M

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	53
Questionnaires:	42

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/206	****	4.48	4.25	4.58	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/214	****	4.51	4.31	4.60	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	29	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	42	Non-major	37
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 221 02
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Nanes,Kalman M

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	58
Questionnaires:	47

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	6	11	29	4.45	750/1560	4.24	4.34	4.35	4.37	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	12	29	4.45	715/1559	4.31	4.34	4.31	4.33	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	11	30	4.43	724/1371	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.40	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	1	1	7	6	19	4.21	917/1519	4.12	4.29	4.27	4.29	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	9	8	26	4.19	771/1452	4.17	4.12	4.18	4.22	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	22	2	0	1	4	17	4.42	545/1430	4.22	4.22	4.16	4.15	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	12	29	4.43	635/1539	4.52	4.36	4.23	4.25	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	7	38	4.84	598/1560	4.92	4.79	4.64	4.61	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	2	1	5	10	20	4.18	807/1545	4.08	4.01	4.14	4.09	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	5	8	29	4.43	967/1496	4.44	4.49	4.49	4.52	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	5	37	4.80	869/1498	4.78	4.70	4.75	4.78	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	3	3	9	27	4.27	972/1496	4.07	4.17	4.37	4.36	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	7	9	24	4.16	1069/1494	4.19	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.16
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	28	2	2	1	5	6	3.69	1091/1352	3.82	3.96	4.12	4.14	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	527/1248	4.01	3.93	4.23	4.25	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	479/1250	4.10	3.91	4.39	4.40	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	607/1239	4.47	4.13	4.45	4.45	4.61

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 221 02
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Nanes,Kalman M

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	58
Questionnaires:	47

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	29	1	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	105/906	4.87	3.95	4.13	4.19	4.82

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 36	Graduate 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 20		Major 7
56-83	9	2.00-2.99 8	C 8	General 2	Under-grad 47
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		Non-major 40
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 15	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 8		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 221 03
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Muscedere,Micha

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	55
Questionnaires:	32

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	1	4	5	21	4.38	841/1560	4.24	4.34	4.35	4.37	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	4	23	4.56	547/1559	4.31	4.34	4.31	4.33	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	25	4.69	418/1371	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.40	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	2	5	2	14	4.08	1016/1519	4.12	4.29	4.27	4.29	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	2	0	7	5	11	3.92	1034/1452	4.17	4.12	4.18	4.22	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	11	1	0	5	3	10	4.11	828/1430	4.22	4.22	4.16	4.15	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	5	23	4.61	420/1539	4.52	4.36	4.23	4.25	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1560	4.92	4.79	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	5	6	16	4.41	546/1545	4.08	4.01	4.14	4.09	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	9	22	4.63	710/1496	4.44	4.49	4.49	4.52	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	27	4.84	733/1498	4.78	4.70	4.75	4.78	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	12	17	4.48	726/1496	4.07	4.17	4.37	4.36	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	8	20	4.47	775/1494	4.19	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	2	3	11	12	4.07	793/1352	3.82	3.96	4.12	4.14	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	2	3	4	10	4.00	822/1248	4.01	3.93	4.23	4.25	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	2	2	4	10	3.90	1018/1250	4.10	3.91	4.39	4.40	3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	0	1	5	12	4.25	861/1239	4.47	4.13	4.45	4.45	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	12	14	1	1	0	0	4	3.83	****/906	4.87	3.95	4.13	4.19	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 221 03
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Muscedere,Micha

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	55
Questionnaires:	32

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/206	****	4.48	4.25	4.58	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/214	****	4.51	4.31	4.60	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/204	****	4.84	4.52	4.64	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/207	****	4.93	4.44	4.67	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/199	****	4.79	4.27	4.51	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/64	****	4.50	4.44	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.41	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	5.00	4.09	3.65	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	4.75	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	4.75	4.35	4.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	4.75	4.13	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.75	4.41	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 221 03
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Muscedere,Micha

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	55
Questionnaires:	32

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.75	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 26	Graduate 1 Major 4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 11	General 2	Under-grad 31 Non-major 28
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 3		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 221 04
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Peercy,Bradford

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	62
Questionnaires:	38

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	2	3	3	12	18	4.08	1153/1560	4.24	4.34	4.35	4.37	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	0	12	21	4.26	932/1559	4.31	4.34	4.31	4.33	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	6	7	21	4.11	1014/1371	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.40	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	1	1	4	7	12	4.12	987/1519	4.12	4.29	4.27	4.29	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	2	13	9	4.29	659/1452	4.17	4.12	4.18	4.22	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	1	1	1	10	10	4.17	770/1430	4.22	4.22	4.16	4.15	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	8	27	4.62	406/1539	4.52	4.36	4.23	4.25	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	5.00	1/1560	4.92	4.79	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	0	5	16	10	3.97	1010/1545	4.08	4.01	4.14	4.09	3.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	4	8	23	4.47	912/1496	4.44	4.49	4.49	4.52	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	31	4.84	763/1498	4.78	4.70	4.75	4.78	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	4	0	8	9	14	3.83	1285/1496	4.07	4.17	4.37	4.36	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	3	0	3	11	17	4.15	1076/1494	4.19	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	16	4	0	7	5	2	3.06	1273/1352	3.82	3.96	4.12	4.14	3.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1248	4.01	3.93	4.23	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	33	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1250	4.10	3.91	4.39	4.40	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1239	4.47	4.13	4.45	4.45	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 221 04
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Peercy,Bradford

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	62
Questionnaires:	38

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	33	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/906	4.87	3.95	4.13	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	31	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	19						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	3	Under-grad	38	Non-major	33
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 221 05
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Lo,James T

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	55
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	0	0	1	8	9	1	3.53	1467/1560	4.24	4.34	4.35	4.37	3.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	10	6	2	3.47	1457/1559	4.31	4.34	4.31	4.33	3.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	6	7	4.00	1066/1371	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.40	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	2	4	5	2	3.54	1399/1519	4.12	4.29	4.27	4.29	3.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	1034/1452	4.17	4.12	4.18	4.22	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	2	3	6	3	3.71	1124/1430	4.22	4.22	4.16	4.15	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	785/1539	4.52	4.36	4.23	4.25	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	598/1560	4.92	4.79	4.64	4.61	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	11	3	0	3.07	1476/1545	4.08	4.01	4.14	4.09	3.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	6	8	4	3.89	1348/1496	4.44	4.49	4.49	4.52	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	1239/1498	4.78	4.70	4.75	4.78	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	4	5	5	2	3.06	1451/1496	4.07	4.17	4.37	4.36	3.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	4	7	4	2	3.24	1429/1494	4.19	4.28	4.37	4.41	3.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	12	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/1352	3.82	3.96	4.12	4.14	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	1188/1248	4.01	3.93	4.23	4.25	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1221/1250	4.10	3.91	4.39	4.40	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	889/1239	4.47	4.13	4.45	4.45	4.20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 221 05
Title:	Intro To Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Lo,James T

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	55
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/906	4.87	3.95	4.13	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 225 01
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns
Instructor:	Bell,Jonathan

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	45
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	1	2	6	4.30	920/1560	4.28	4.34	4.35	4.37	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	1087/1559	4.26	4.34	4.31	4.33	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	747/1371	4.40	4.41	4.38	4.40	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	1344/1519	3.91	4.29	4.27	4.29	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1155/1452	3.90	4.12	4.18	4.22	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1124/1430	4.16	4.22	4.16	4.15	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	1077/1539	4.36	4.36	4.23	4.25	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	502/1560	4.89	4.79	4.64	4.61	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1309/1545	3.88	4.01	4.14	4.09	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	1009/1496	4.40	4.49	4.49	4.52	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	1318/1498	4.54	4.70	4.75	4.78	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	2	1	4	3.78	1304/1496	3.97	4.17	4.37	4.36	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	1241/1494	3.97	4.28	4.37	4.41	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	1342/1352	2.94	3.96	4.12	4.14	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1188/1248	3.00	3.93	4.23	4.25	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1248/1250	2.33	3.91	4.39	4.40	2.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1239	****	4.13	4.45	4.45	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 225 01
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns
Instructor:	Bell,Jonathan

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	45
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/906	****	3.95	4.13	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 10 Non-major 9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 2		
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 1	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 225 02
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns
Instructor:	Lo,James T

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	55
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	0	2	3	9	5	6	3.40	1497/1560	4.28	4.34	4.35	4.37	3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	1	2	13	5	3.56	1433/1559	4.26	4.34	4.31	4.33	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	7	10	4	3.52	1292/1371	4.40	4.41	4.38	4.40	3.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	1	2	7	2	0	2.83	1505/1519	3.91	4.29	4.27	4.29	2.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	1	1	4	5	5	3.75	1155/1452	3.90	4.12	4.18	4.22	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	8	3	5	3.71	1131/1430	4.16	4.22	4.16	4.15	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	6	3	14	4.04	1059/1539	4.36	4.36	4.23	4.25	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	3	21	4.72	824/1560	4.89	4.79	4.64	4.61	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	4	9	5	1	2.95	1492/1545	3.88	4.01	4.14	4.09	2.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	2	4	12	4	3.70	1402/1496	4.40	4.49	4.49	4.52	3.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	6	14	4.43	1294/1498	4.54	4.70	4.75	4.78	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	3	5	8	6	1	2.87	1470/1496	3.97	4.17	4.37	4.36	2.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	6	5	6	1	2.65	1475/1494	3.97	4.28	4.37	4.41	2.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	18	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	****/1352	2.94	3.96	4.12	4.14	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1248	3.00	3.93	4.23	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/1250	2.33	3.91	4.39	4.40	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 225 02
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns
Instructor:	Lo,James T

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	55
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1239	****	4.13	4.45	4.45	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	23
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 225 03
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns
Instructor:	Dean,Brian J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	58
Questionnaires:	50

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	0	0	0	2	5	42	4.82	264/1560	4.28	4.34	4.35	4.37	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	40	4.80	248/1559	4.26	4.34	4.31	4.33	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	46	4.92	153/1371	4.40	4.41	4.38	4.40	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	23	0	1	1	3	21	4.69	317/1519	3.91	4.29	4.27	4.29	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	18	1	2	8	5	14	3.97	991/1452	3.90	4.12	4.18	4.22	3.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	13	0	0	1	6	28	4.77	168/1430	4.16	4.22	4.16	4.15	4.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	3	43	4.85	153/1539	4.36	4.36	4.23	4.25	4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	48	5.00	1/1560	4.89	4.79	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	9	33	4.70	217/1545	3.88	4.01	4.14	4.09	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	43	4.86	315/1496	4.40	4.49	4.49	4.52	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	10	36	4.67	1064/1498	4.54	4.70	4.75	4.78	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	41	4.80	309/1496	3.97	4.17	4.37	4.36	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	8	38	4.69	493/1494	3.97	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	34	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	****/1352	2.94	3.96	4.12	4.14	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	****/1248	3.00	3.93	4.23	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	44	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/1250	2.33	3.91	4.39	4.40	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	44	0	2	0	2	0	2	3.00	****/1239	****	4.13	4.45	4.45	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 225 03
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns
Instructor:	Dean,Brian J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	58
Questionnaires:	50

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	4.75	4.35	4.75	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	31	Required for Majors	43	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	24	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	50	Non-major	39
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	22	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 225 04
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns
Instructor:	Soane,Ana Maria

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	48
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	2	8	21	4.61	528/1560	4.28	4.34	4.35	4.37	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	21	4.58	521/1559	4.26	4.34	4.31	4.33	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	25	4.74	341/1371	4.40	4.41	4.38	4.40	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	649/1519	3.91	4.29	4.27	4.29	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	14	2	0	2	3	10	4.12	857/1452	3.90	4.12	4.18	4.22	4.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	479/1430	4.16	4.22	4.16	4.15	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	9	19	4.57	477/1539	4.36	4.36	4.23	4.25	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	182/1560	4.89	4.79	4.64	4.61	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	10	13	4.29	700/1545	3.88	4.01	4.14	4.09	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	22	4.67	643/1496	4.40	4.49	4.49	4.52	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	5	23	4.65	1105/1498	4.54	4.70	4.75	4.78	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	5	4	21	4.45	766/1496	3.97	4.17	4.37	4.36	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	25	4.65	557/1494	3.97	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	22	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	963/1352	2.94	3.96	4.12	4.14	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	****/1248	3.00	3.93	4.23	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	****/1250	2.33	3.91	4.39	4.40	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	****/1239	****	4.13	4.45	4.45	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 225 04
Title:	Intro Differentl Equatns
Instructor:	Soane,Ana Maria

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	48
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	24	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/906	****	3.95	4.13	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 251 01
Title:	Multivariable Calculus
Instructor:	Budimirovic,Tat

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	34
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	1	9	11	4.48	707/1560	4.55	4.34	4.35	4.37	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	10	11	4.52	600/1559	4.58	4.34	4.31	4.33	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	314/1371	4.69	4.41	4.38	4.40	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	730/1519	4.52	4.29	4.27	4.29	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	5	3	3	3.67	1214/1452	4.07	4.12	4.18	4.22	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	354/1430	4.54	4.22	4.16	4.15	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	466/1539	4.68	4.36	4.23	4.25	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1560	4.94	4.79	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	14	1	3.89	1115/1545	4.16	4.01	4.14	4.09	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	643/1496	4.71	4.49	4.49	4.52	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	9	11	4.48	1262/1498	4.70	4.70	4.75	4.78	4.48
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	10	7	4.10	1128/1496	4.18	4.17	4.37	4.36	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	644/1494	4.44	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	3	9	5	4.12	763/1352	3.76	3.96	4.12	4.14	4.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/1248	4.04	3.93	4.23	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	****/1250	3.85	3.91	4.39	4.40	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/1239	3.97	4.13	4.45	4.45	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/906	****	3.95	4.13	4.19	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 251 01
Title:	Multivariable Calculus
Instructor:	Budimirovic,Tat

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	34
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/214	****	4.51	4.31	4.60	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.25	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	4.75	4.35	4.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	4.75	4.13	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27 1	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors	Graduate 0	Major 7
28-55 11	1.00-1.99 0	B 4			
56-83 0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General	Under-grad 21	Non-major 14
84-150 0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0			
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives		
		P 0			
		I 0	Other		
		? 4			

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 251 02
Title:	Multivariable Calculus
Instructor:	Glezen,John

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	55
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	0	1	8	21	4.55	615/1560	4.55	4.34	4.35	4.37	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	21	4.58	521/1559	4.58	4.34	4.31	4.33	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	20	4.61	501/1371	4.69	4.41	4.38	4.40	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	1	0	4	14	4.63	395/1519	4.52	4.29	4.27	4.29	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	4	3	13	4.33	620/1452	4.07	4.12	4.18	4.22	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	304/1430	4.54	4.22	4.16	4.15	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	26	4.84	169/1539	4.68	4.36	4.23	4.25	4.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	27	4.87	526/1560	4.94	4.79	4.64	4.61	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	448/1545	4.16	4.01	4.14	4.09	4.48
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	228/1496	4.71	4.49	4.49	4.52	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	223/1498	4.70	4.70	4.75	4.78	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	6	11	13	4.23	1008/1496	4.18	4.17	4.37	4.36	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	7	6	17	4.33	922/1494	4.44	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	12	1	1	8	2	4	3.44	1189/1352	3.76	3.96	4.12	4.14	3.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	****/1248	4.04	3.93	4.23	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	****/1250	3.85	3.91	4.39	4.40	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/1239	3.97	4.13	4.45	4.45	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 251 02
Title:	Multivariable Calculus
Instructor:	Glezen,John

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	55
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	26	1	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	****/906	****	3.95	4.13	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 24	Graduate 0 Major 10
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 4	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 31 Non-major 21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 3		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 251 03
Title:	Multivariable Calculus
Instructor:	Budimirovic,Tat

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	37
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	2	7	11	4.45	736/1560	4.55	4.34	4.35	4.37	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	821/1559	4.58	4.34	4.31	4.33	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	513/1371	4.69	4.41	4.38	4.40	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	817/1519	4.52	4.29	4.27	4.29	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	573/1452	4.07	4.12	4.18	4.22	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	354/1430	4.54	4.22	4.16	4.15	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	293/1539	4.68	4.36	4.23	4.25	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	272/1560	4.94	4.79	4.64	4.61	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	5	8	3	3.76	1206/1545	4.16	4.01	4.14	4.09	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	807/1496	4.71	4.49	4.49	4.52	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	1338/1498	4.70	4.70	4.75	4.78	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	7	8	3	3.55	1367/1496	4.18	4.17	4.37	4.36	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	3	10	3.95	1189/1494	4.44	4.28	4.37	4.41	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	3	2	3	7	3	3.28	1240/1352	3.76	3.96	4.12	4.14	3.28
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	1052/1248	4.04	3.93	4.23	4.25	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1138/1250	3.85	3.91	4.39	4.40	3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1148/1239	3.97	4.13	4.45	4.45	3.57

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 251 03
Title:	Multivariable Calculus
Instructor:	Budimirovic,Tat

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	37
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/906	****	3.95	4.13	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1 A 12	Required for Majors	18 Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0 B 6		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2 C 1	General	0 Under-grad 20 Non-major 19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9 F 0	Electives	0 **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 251 04
Title:	Multivariable Calculus
Instructor:	Harris,Christop

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	35
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	1	3	15	4.74	364/1560	4.55	4.34	4.35	4.37	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	189/1559	4.58	4.34	4.31	4.33	4.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	287/1371	4.69	4.41	4.38	4.40	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	255/1519	4.52	4.29	4.27	4.29	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	1056/1452	4.07	4.12	4.18	4.22	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	587/1430	4.54	4.22	4.16	4.15	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	420/1539	4.68	4.36	4.23	4.25	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	272/1560	4.94	4.79	4.64	4.61	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	406/1545	4.16	4.01	4.14	4.09	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	524/1496	4.71	4.49	4.49	4.52	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1498	4.70	4.70	4.75	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	240/1496	4.18	4.17	4.37	4.36	4.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	205/1494	4.44	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	679/1352	3.76	3.96	4.12	4.14	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	470/1248	4.04	3.93	4.23	4.25	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	905/1250	3.85	3.91	4.39	4.40	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	785/1239	3.97	4.13	4.45	4.45	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	11	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/906	****	3.95	4.13	4.19	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 251 04
Title:	Multivariable Calculus
Instructor:	Harris,Christop

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	35
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/214	****	4.51	4.31	4.60	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.93	4.44	4.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	4.75	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/31	****	4.75	4.35	4.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	4.75	4.13	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 251 04
Title:	Multivariable Calculus
Instructor:	Harris,Christop

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	35
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.75	4.41	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	0	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	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 301 01
Title:	Intro Math Analysis I
Instructor:	Potra, Florian A

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	36
Questionnaires:	27

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	3	6	4	6	8	3.37	1503/1560	3.80	4.34	4.35	4.42	3.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	6	7	6	5	3.15	1515/1559	3.30	4.34	4.31	4.35	3.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	8	5	8	3.44	1307/1371	3.61	4.41	4.38	4.41	3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	4	2	5	2	3	2.88	1504/1519	3.34	4.29	4.27	4.33	2.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	5	7	10	4.13	835/1452	3.99	4.12	4.18	4.21	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	5	3	5	1	3	2.65	1415/1430	2.65	4.22	4.16	4.20	2.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	3	8	5	8	3.54	1378/1539	3.64	4.36	4.23	4.27	3.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	695/1560	4.85	4.79	4.64	4.66	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	8	2	5	6	1	2.55	1517/1545	3.02	4.01	4.14	4.19	2.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	10	3	6	5	2	2.46	1489/1496	3.29	4.49	4.49	4.54	2.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	7	4	12	4.00	1440/1498	4.39	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	9	4	9	3	0	2.24	1490/1496	2.73	4.17	4.37	4.43	2.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	7	5	8	3	2	2.52	1482/1494	3.32	4.28	4.37	4.43	2.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	21	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/1352	****	3.96	4.12	4.23	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/1248	4.33	3.93	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/1250	4.00	3.91	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1239	****	4.13	4.45	4.53	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 301 01
Title:	Intro Math Analysis I
Instructor:	Potra, Florian A

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	36
Questionnaires:	27

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	23	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/906	****	3.95	4.13	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	11
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 301 02
Title:	Intro Math Analysis I
Instructor:	Kogan,Jacob

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	3	1	5	4.22	1021/1560	3.80	4.34	4.35	4.42	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	2	1	3.44	1467/1559	3.30	4.34	4.31	4.35	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1213/1371	3.61	4.41	4.38	4.41	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1263/1519	3.34	4.29	4.27	4.33	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	4	0	3	3.86	1088/1452	3.99	4.12	4.18	4.21	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1430	2.65	4.22	4.16	4.20	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	0	4	3.75	1278/1539	3.64	4.36	4.23	4.27	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	502/1560	4.85	4.79	4.64	4.66	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	4	0	3.50	1342/1545	3.02	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1243/1496	3.29	4.49	4.49	4.54	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	903/1498	4.39	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	4	2	1	3.22	1435/1496	2.73	4.17	4.37	4.43	3.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1098/1494	3.32	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1352	****	3.96	4.12	4.23	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	618/1248	4.33	3.93	4.23	4.33	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	945/1250	4.00	3.91	4.39	4.47	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 301 02
Title:	Intro Math Analysis I
Instructor:	Kogan,Jacob

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1239	****	4.13	4.45	4.53	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 0	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		Major 3
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Non-major 6
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 302 01
Title:	Intro Math Analysis II
Instructor:	Gowda,Muddappa

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	0	0	3	25	4.76	339/1560	4.76	4.34	4.35	4.42	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	131/1559	4.90	4.34	4.31	4.35	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	28	4.93	119/1371	4.93	4.41	4.38	4.41	4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	236/1519	4.77	4.29	4.27	4.33	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	433/1452	4.50	4.12	4.18	4.21	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	185/1430	4.75	4.22	4.16	4.20	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	6	20	4.59	456/1539	4.59	4.36	4.23	4.27	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	318/1560	4.93	4.79	4.64	4.66	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	1	2	20	4.71	217/1545	4.71	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1496	5.00	4.49	4.49	4.54	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	704/1498	4.86	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	128/1496	4.93	4.17	4.37	4.43	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	25	4.75	406/1494	4.75	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	18	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	579/1352	4.30	3.96	4.12	4.23	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1248	****	3.93	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1250	****	3.91	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1239	****	4.13	4.45	4.53	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 302 01
Title:	Intro Math Analysis II
Instructor:	Gowda,Muddappa

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	25	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/906	****	3.95	4.13	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 18	Required for Majors 24	Graduate 0 Major 24
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 29 Non-major 5
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 14	F 0	Electives 1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 3		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 306 01
Title:	Geometry
Instructor:	Seidman,Thomas

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	5

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	2	2	1	3.80	1349/1560	3.80	4.34	4.35	4.42	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1526/1559	3.00	4.34	4.31	4.35	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1340/1371	3.20	4.41	4.38	4.41	3.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1060/1519	4.00	4.29	4.27	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1366/1452	3.25	4.12	4.18	4.21	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1373/1430	3.00	4.22	4.16	4.20	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	0	0	1	2.20	1530/1539	2.20	4.36	4.23	4.27	2.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	1560/1560	2.80	4.79	4.64	4.66	2.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	1505/1545	2.80	4.01	4.14	4.19	2.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1465/1496	3.20	4.49	4.49	4.54	3.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1160/1498	4.60	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	1411/1496	3.40	4.17	4.37	4.43	3.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1407/1494	3.40	4.28	4.37	4.43	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1335/1352	2.33	3.96	4.12	4.23	2.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1248	****	3.93	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1250	****	3.91	4.39	4.47	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 306 01
Title:	Geometry
Instructor:	Seidman,Thomas

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	5

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1239	****	4.13	4.45	4.53	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 341 01
Title:	Computational Methods
Instructor:	Soane,Ana Maria

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	3	4	19	4.62	528/1560	4.62	4.34	4.35	4.42	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	426/1559	4.65	4.34	4.31	4.35	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	16	4.54	597/1371	4.54	4.41	4.38	4.41	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	717/1519	4.38	4.29	4.27	4.33	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	4	5	11	4.24	727/1452	4.24	4.12	4.18	4.21	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	466/1430	4.47	4.22	4.16	4.20	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	20	4.62	420/1539	4.62	4.36	4.23	4.27	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	502/1560	4.88	4.79	4.64	4.66	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	1	3	11	8	4.00	952/1545	4.00	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	593/1496	4.69	4.49	4.49	4.54	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	1091/1498	4.65	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	8	14	4.31	946/1496	4.31	4.17	4.37	4.43	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	7	15	4.36	891/1494	4.36	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	697/1352	4.19	3.96	4.12	4.23	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/1248	****	3.93	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/1250	****	3.91	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/1239	****	4.13	4.45	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	21	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/906	****	3.95	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 341 01
Title:	Computational Methods
Instructor:	Soane,Ana Maria

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/206	****	4.48	4.25	4.22	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/214	****	4.51	4.31	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/204	****	4.84	4.52	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/207	****	4.93	4.44	4.42	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/199	****	4.79	4.27	4.17	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/64	****	4.50	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	5.00	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.41	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	5.00	4.09	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	3.58	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	3.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	4.75	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	4.75	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.75	4.41	4.78	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 341 01
Title:	Computational Methods
Instructor:	Soane,Ana Maria

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	26	Non-major	10
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 385 01
Title:	Intro To Math Modeling
Instructor:	Kang,Weining

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	55
Questionnaires:	33

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	4	10	9	10	3.76	1380/1560	3.76	4.34	4.35	4.42	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	4	8	8	11	3.75	1359/1559	3.75	4.34	4.31	4.35	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	8	10	11	3.88	1167/1371	3.88	4.41	4.38	4.41	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	2	3	3	4	9	3.71	1319/1519	3.71	4.29	4.27	4.33	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	8	2	2	10	4	5	3.35	1346/1452	3.35	4.12	4.18	4.21	3.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	4	4	8	6	3.73	1117/1430	3.73	4.22	4.16	4.20	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	5	8	16	4.19	923/1539	4.19	4.36	4.23	4.27	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.79	4.64	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	3	11	10	2	3.42	1382/1545	3.42	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	7	7	17	4.25	1144/1496	4.25	4.49	4.49	4.54	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	8	20	4.55	1207/1498	4.55	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	10	6	12	3.87	1265/1496	3.87	4.17	4.37	4.43	3.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	3	4	12	11	4.03	1134/1494	4.03	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	4	2	4	7	6	3.39	1206/1352	3.39	3.96	4.12	4.23	3.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/1248	****	3.93	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/1250	****	3.91	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/1239	****	4.13	4.45	4.53	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 385 01
Title:	Intro To Math Modeling
Instructor:	Kang,Weining

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	55
Questionnaires:	33

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	28	2	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/906	****	3.95	4.13	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1 A 13	Required for Majors	20 Graduate 0 Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 13		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4 C 3	General	2 Under-grad 33 Non-major 24
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	4 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7 F 0	Electives	7 **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 404 01
Title:	Intro Part Diff Eq I
Instructor:	Peercy,Bradford

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	34
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	0	0	1	1	9	13	4.42	793/1560	4.41	4.34	4.35	4.45	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	13	7	4.13	1058/1559	4.22	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	10	11	4.39	756/1371	4.51	4.41	4.38	4.46	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	779/1519	4.35	4.29	4.27	4.33	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	2	0	6	5	4.08	892/1452	4.32	4.12	4.18	4.25	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	532/1430	4.43	4.22	4.16	4.25	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	4	17	4.58	456/1539	4.29	4.36	4.23	4.21	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	408/1560	4.91	4.79	4.64	4.68	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	13	4	3.95	1025/1545	4.04	4.01	4.14	4.21	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	8	13	4.42	995/1496	4.61	4.49	4.49	4.50	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	763/1498	4.92	4.70	4.75	4.77	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	2	13	7	4.04	1154/1496	3.77	4.17	4.37	4.40	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	4	6	12	4.26	985/1494	4.03	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	0	4	5	10	4.15	726/1352	3.08	3.96	4.12	4.16	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1248	3.60	3.93	4.23	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1250	3.20	3.91	4.39	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1239	4.80	4.13	4.45	4.61	****
4. Were special techniques successful	22	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/906	****	3.95	4.13	4.28	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 404 01
Title:	Intro Part Diff Eq I
Instructor:	Peercy,Bradford

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	34
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/206	****	4.48	4.25	4.48	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/204	****	4.84	4.52	4.39	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/199	****	4.79	4.27	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.50	4.44	4.65	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.41	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	5.00	4.09	4.18	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	4.50	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.35	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	5.00	4.75	4.35	4.64	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	5.00	4.75	4.13	3.97	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	5.00	4.75	4.41	4.52	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 404 01
Title:	Intro Part Diff Eq I
Instructor:	Peercy,Bradford

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	34
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	1	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	14
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 404 02
Title:	Intro Part Diff Eq I
Instructor:	Bell,Jonathan

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	2	2	6	4.40	808/1560	4.41	4.34	4.35	4.45	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	892/1559	4.22	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	489/1371	4.51	4.41	4.38	4.46	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	730/1519	4.35	4.29	4.27	4.33	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	381/1452	4.32	4.12	4.18	4.25	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	532/1430	4.43	4.22	4.16	4.25	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1077/1539	4.29	4.36	4.23	4.21	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	454/1560	4.91	4.79	4.64	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	866/1545	4.04	4.01	4.14	4.21	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	402/1496	4.61	4.49	4.49	4.50	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1498	4.92	4.70	4.75	4.77	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	1	3	3	3.50	1378/1496	3.77	4.17	4.37	4.40	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1281/1494	4.03	4.28	4.37	4.41	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	2	2	2	0	0	2.00	1342/1352	3.08	3.96	4.12	4.16	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1041/1248	3.60	3.93	4.23	4.39	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1204/1250	3.20	3.91	4.39	4.55	3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	388/1239	4.80	4.13	4.45	4.61	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/906	****	3.95	4.13	4.28	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 404 02
Title:	Intro Part Diff Eq I
Instructor:	Bell,Jonathan

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/214	****	4.51	4.31	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	4.50	4.44	4.65	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	****	4.19	4.50	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.35	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/31	5.00	4.75	4.35	4.64	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/22	5.00	4.75	4.13	3.97	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/29	5.00	4.75	4.41	4.52	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.47	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 404 02
Title:	Intro Part Diff Eq I
Instructor:	Bell,Jonathan

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 407 01
Title:	Modern Algebra & No.Theo
Instructor:	Armstrong,Thoma

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1525/1560	3.25	4.34	4.35	4.45	3.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1515/1559	3.14	4.34	4.31	4.34	3.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	4	0	3.00	1350/1371	3.00	4.41	4.38	4.46	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1344/1519	3.67	4.29	4.27	4.33	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1452	5.00	4.12	4.18	4.25	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	427/1430	4.50	4.22	4.16	4.25	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	1347/1539	3.63	4.36	4.23	4.21	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1051/1560	4.50	4.79	4.64	4.68	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	2	1	2	0	2.43	1524/1545	2.43	4.01	4.14	4.21	2.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	0	3	3.71	1398/1496	3.71	4.49	4.49	4.50	3.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	1	4	1	3.38	1490/1498	3.38	4.70	4.75	4.77	3.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	0	2	1	1	2.38	1487/1496	2.38	4.17	4.37	4.40	2.38

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 407 01
Title:	Modern Algebra & No.Theo
Instructor:	Armstrong,Thoma

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Lecture														
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	1	1	1	2.25	1488/1494	2.25	4.28	4.37	4.41	2.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		Major 5
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 3	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 411 01
Title:	Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Potra, Florian A

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	5
Questionnaires:	4

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	1	3	4.75	339/1560	4.75	4.34	4.35	4.45	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	627/1559	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	634/1371	4.50	4.41	4.38	4.46	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1060/1519	4.00	4.29	4.27	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	433/1452	4.50	4.12	4.18	4.25	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	427/1430	4.50	4.22	4.16	4.25	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1077/1539	4.00	4.36	4.23	4.21	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.79	4.64	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	952/1545	4.00	4.01	4.14	4.21	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1144/1496	4.25	4.49	4.49	4.50	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	937/1498	4.75	4.70	4.75	4.77	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1175/1496	4.00	4.17	4.37	4.40	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1147/1494	4.00	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	3.96	4.12	4.16	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	822/1248	4.00	3.93	4.23	4.39	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	945/1250	4.00	3.91	4.39	4.55	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	971/1239	4.00	4.13	4.45	4.61	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 411 01
Title:	Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Potra, Florian A

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	5
Questionnaires:	4

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/906	5.00	3.95	4.13	4.28	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 2	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 4 Non-major 1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 430 01
Title:	Matrix Analysis
Instructor:	Kogan,Jacob

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	1	4	2	3.88	1299/1560	3.88	4.34	4.35	4.45	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1286/1559	3.88	4.34	4.31	4.34	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	998/1371	4.13	4.41	4.38	4.46	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	987/1519	4.13	4.29	4.27	4.33	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	948/1452	4.00	4.12	4.18	4.25	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1044/1430	3.83	4.22	4.16	4.25	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	976/1539	4.14	4.36	4.23	4.21	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.79	4.64	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1295/1545	3.60	4.01	4.14	4.21	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1120/1496	4.29	4.49	4.49	4.50	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1423/1498	4.14	4.70	4.75	4.77	4.14
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1273/1496	3.86	4.17	4.37	4.40	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1147/1494	4.00	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1079/1248	3.50	3.93	4.23	4.39	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	616/1250	4.50	3.91	4.39	4.55	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 430 01
Title:	Matrix Analysis
Instructor:	Kogan, Jacob

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	677/1239	4.50	4.13	4.45	4.61	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 432 01
Title:	History Of Mathematics
Instructor:	Seidman,Thomas

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	5

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	2	3	4.60	542/1560	4.60	4.34	4.35	4.45	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1423/1559	3.60	4.34	4.31	4.34	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1371	****	4.41	4.38	4.46	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1294/1519	3.75	4.29	4.27	4.33	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1452	5.00	4.12	4.18	4.25	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	323/1430	4.60	4.22	4.16	4.25	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1278/1539	3.75	4.36	4.23	4.21	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1548/1560	3.50	4.79	4.64	4.68	3.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1457/1545	3.20	4.01	4.14	4.21	3.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1420/1496	3.60	4.49	4.49	4.50	3.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.70	4.75	4.77	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1411/1496	3.40	4.17	4.37	4.40	3.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1433/1494	3.20	4.28	4.37	4.41	3.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	823/1352	4.00	3.96	4.12	4.16	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1248	5.00	3.93	4.23	4.39	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1250	5.00	3.91	4.39	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1239	5.00	4.13	4.45	4.61	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 432 01
Title:	History Of Mathematics
Instructor:	Seidman,Thomas

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	5

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	519/906	4.00	3.95	4.13	4.28	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 475 01
Title:	Combinatorics/Graph Thry
Instructor:	Armstrong,Thoma

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	34
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	5	7	12	4.29	932/1560	4.29	4.34	4.35	4.45	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	13	4.42	760/1559	4.42	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	13	4.43	713/1371	4.43	4.41	4.38	4.46	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	779/1519	4.33	4.29	4.27	4.33	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	601/1452	4.36	4.12	4.18	4.25	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	655/1430	4.31	4.22	4.16	4.25	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	4	6	12	4.36	725/1539	4.36	4.36	4.23	4.21	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	227/1560	4.96	4.79	4.64	4.68	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	3	0	2	8	9	1	3.45	1367/1545	3.45	4.01	4.14	4.21	3.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	5	9	6	3.95	1311/1496	3.95	4.49	4.49	4.50	3.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	1344/1498	4.35	4.70	4.75	4.77	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	6	9	3	3.65	1343/1496	3.65	4.17	4.37	4.40	3.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	8	8	4.15	1069/1494	4.15	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	13	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	994/1352	3.83	3.96	4.12	4.16	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1248	****	3.93	4.23	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1250	****	3.91	4.39	4.55	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 475 01
Title:	Combinatorics/Graph Thry
Instructor:	Armstrong,Thoma

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	34
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1239	****	4.13	4.45	4.61	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	16
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	12	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 479 01
Title:	Math Problem Solving Sem
Instructor:	Armstrong,Thoma

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	3
Questionnaires:	3

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	2	1	4.33	886/1560	4.33	4.34	4.35	4.45	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	856/1559	4.33	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1371	5.00	4.41	4.38	4.46	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.29	4.27	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1452	5.00	4.12	4.18	4.25	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1430	5.00	4.22	4.16	4.25	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1077/1539	4.00	4.36	4.23	4.21	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.79	4.64	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1264/1545	3.67	4.01	4.14	4.21	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1496	5.00	4.49	4.49	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.70	4.75	4.77	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1496	5.00	4.17	4.37	4.40	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 479 01
Title:	Math Problem Solving Sem
Instructor:	Armstrong,Thoma

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	3
Questionnaires:	3

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Lecture														
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1494	5.00	4.28	4.37	4.41	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 1	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Non-major 1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 2	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 481 01
Title:	Math Modeling
Instructor:	Rostamian,Roube

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	4	5	7	4.06	1164/1560	4.06	4.34	4.35	4.45	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	439/1559	4.65	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1371	****	4.41	4.38	4.46	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	526/1519	4.53	4.29	4.27	4.33	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	948/1452	4.00	4.12	4.18	4.25	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	304/1430	4.63	4.22	4.16	4.25	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	2	9	4.00	1077/1539	4.00	4.36	4.23	4.21	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.79	4.64	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	7	4	4.00	952/1545	4.00	4.01	4.14	4.21	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	769/1496	4.59	4.49	4.49	4.50	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	334/1498	4.94	4.70	4.75	4.77	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	677/1496	4.53	4.17	4.37	4.40	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	632/1494	4.59	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	599/1352	4.29	3.96	4.12	4.16	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1248	****	3.93	4.23	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1250	****	3.91	4.39	4.55	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 481 01
Title:	Math Modeling
Instructor:	Rostamian,Roube

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1239	****	4.13	4.45	4.61	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	6
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 482 01
Title:	Nonlinear Optimization
Instructor:	Guler,Osman

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	4
Questionnaires:	2

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.34	4.35	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	627/1559	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1371	5.00	4.41	4.38	4.46	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.29	4.27	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	948/1452	4.00	4.12	4.18	4.25	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1373/1430	3.00	4.22	4.16	4.25	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1387/1539	3.50	4.36	4.23	4.21	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.79	4.64	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	406/1545	4.50	4.01	4.14	4.21	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	871/1496	4.50	4.49	4.49	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.70	4.75	4.77	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	700/1496	4.50	4.17	4.37	4.40	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	726/1494	4.50	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	353/1352	4.50	3.96	4.12	4.16	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	822/1248	4.00	3.93	4.23	4.39	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	945/1250	4.00	3.91	4.39	4.55	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 482 01
Title:	Nonlinear Optimization
Instructor:	Guler,Osman

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	4
Questionnaires:	2

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	971/1239	4.00	4.13	4.45	4.61	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 485 01
Title:	Intro Calc Of Variations
Instructor:	Hoffman,Kathlee

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	6	6	4.50	664/1560	4.50	4.34	4.35	4.45	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	521/1559	4.58	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	170/1371	4.91	4.41	4.38	4.46	4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	678/1519	4.42	4.29	4.27	4.33	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	857/1452	4.11	4.12	4.18	4.25	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	778/1430	4.17	4.22	4.16	4.25	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	540/1539	4.50	4.36	4.23	4.21	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.79	4.64	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	202/1545	4.73	4.01	4.14	4.21	4.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	693/1496	4.64	4.49	4.49	4.50	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.70	4.75	4.77	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	877/1496	4.36	4.17	4.37	4.40	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	451/1494	4.73	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.73

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 485 01
Title:	Intro Calc Of Variations
Instructor:	Hoffman,Kathlee

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Lecture														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1244/1352	3.25	3.96	4.12	4.16	3.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 4 Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 8 Non-major 3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 7	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 612 01
Title:	Ordinary Differential Eq
Instructor:	Rathinam,Muruha

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	1	4	3	4.00	1193/1560	4.00	4.34	4.35	4.37	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	1077/1559	4.11	4.34	4.31	4.29	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	2	4	3.89	1162/1371	3.89	4.41	4.38	4.37	3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	635/1519	4.44	4.29	4.27	4.29	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	948/1452	4.00	4.12	4.18	4.23	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	375/1430	4.56	4.22	4.16	4.28	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	223/1539	4.78	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.79	4.64	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1237/1545	3.71	4.01	4.14	4.11	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	953/1496	4.44	4.49	4.49	4.47	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	1199/1498	4.56	4.70	4.75	4.76	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	911/1496	4.33	4.17	4.37	4.29	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	667/1494	4.56	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1352	****	3.96	4.12	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1248	****	3.93	4.23	4.28	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1250	****	3.91	4.39	4.49	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 612 01
Title:	Ordinary Differential Eq
Instructor:	Rathinam,Muruha

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1239	****	4.13	4.45	4.57	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 621 01
Title:	Numer. Methods For PDE
Instructor:	Gobbert,Matthia

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	7
Questionnaires:	5

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	1	4	4.80	276/1560	4.80	4.34	4.35	4.37	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	775/1559	4.40	4.34	4.31	4.29	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	693/1519	4.40	4.29	4.27	4.29	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	555/1452	4.40	4.12	4.18	4.23	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	746/1430	4.20	4.22	4.16	4.28	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	435/1539	4.60	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.79	4.64	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	952/1545	4.00	4.01	4.14	4.11	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1281/1496	4.00	4.49	4.49	4.47	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1239/1498	4.50	4.70	4.75	4.76	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1035/1496	4.20	4.17	4.37	4.29	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	1033/1494	4.20	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1352	5.00	3.96	4.12	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	618/1248	4.33	3.93	4.23	4.28	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	479/1250	4.67	3.91	4.39	4.49	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	812/1239	4.33	4.13	4.45	4.57	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 621 01
Title:	Numer. Methods For PDE
Instructor:	Gobbert,Matthia

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	7
Questionnaires:	5

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/906	****	3.95	4.13	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 625 01
Title:	Comp Math & C Prog
Instructor:	Rostamian,Roube

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	22
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	1	3	11	4.67	458/1560	4.67	4.34	4.35	4.37	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	856/1559	4.33	4.34	4.31	4.29	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1371	****	4.41	4.38	4.37	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	356/1519	4.67	4.29	4.27	4.29	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	196/1452	4.77	4.12	4.18	4.23	4.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	108/1430	4.88	4.22	4.16	4.28	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	965/1539	4.15	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	363/1560	4.93	4.79	4.64	4.72	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	172/1545	4.77	4.01	4.14	4.11	4.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	744/1496	4.60	4.49	4.49	4.47	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.70	4.75	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	588/1496	4.60	4.17	4.37	4.29	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	2	10	4.27	985/1494	4.27	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	494/1352	4.38	3.96	4.12	3.99	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1248	****	3.93	4.23	4.28	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1250	****	3.91	4.39	4.49	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 625 01
Title:	Comp Math & C Prog
Instructor:	Rostamian,Roube

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	22
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1239	****	4.13	4.45	4.57	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 630 01
Title:	Numerical Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Draganescu,Andr

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	3	5	4.63	514/1560	4.63	4.34	4.35	4.37	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	627/1559	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.29	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	1066/1371	4.00	4.41	4.38	4.37	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	469/1519	4.57	4.29	4.27	4.29	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	825/1452	4.14	4.12	4.18	4.23	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	746/1430	4.20	4.22	4.16	4.28	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	713/1539	4.38	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	940/1560	4.63	4.79	4.64	4.72	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1181/1545	3.80	4.01	4.14	4.11	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	489/1496	4.75	4.49	4.49	4.47	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	937/1498	4.75	4.70	4.75	4.76	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	866/1496	4.38	4.17	4.37	4.29	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	880/1494	4.38	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	353/1352	4.50	3.96	4.12	3.99	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	618/1248	4.33	3.93	4.23	4.28	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	945/1250	4.00	3.91	4.39	4.49	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	812/1239	4.33	4.13	4.45	4.57	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 630 01
Title:	Numerical Linear Algebra
Instructor:	Draganescu,Andr

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/906	****	3.95	4.13	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Non-major 1
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 3	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 651 01
Title:	Optimization Algorithms
Instructor:	Guler,Osman

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	5
Questionnaires:	5

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	3	2	4.40	808/1560	4.40	4.34	4.35	4.37	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	775/1559	4.40	4.34	4.31	4.29	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1249/1371	3.67	4.41	4.38	4.37	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	693/1519	4.40	4.29	4.27	4.29	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	330/1452	4.60	4.12	4.18	4.23	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	559/1430	4.40	4.22	4.16	4.28	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	435/1539	4.60	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.79	4.64	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	952/1545	4.00	4.01	4.14	4.11	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1144/1496	4.25	4.49	4.49	4.47	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1239/1498	4.50	4.70	4.75	4.76	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1378/1496	3.50	4.17	4.37	4.29	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1147/1494	4.00	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1157/1352	3.50	3.96	4.12	3.99	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1248	****	3.93	4.23	4.28	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1250	****	3.91	4.39	4.49	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 651 01
Title:	Optimization Algorithms
Instructor:	Guler,Osman

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	5
Questionnaires:	5

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1239	****	4.13	4.45	4.57	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	3	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
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.	3	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						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 710 01
Title:	Spec Topics In Appl Math
Instructor:	Gowda,Muddappa

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	7
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.34	4.35	4.37	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.34	4.31	4.29	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1371	5.00	4.41	4.38	4.37	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.29	4.27	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	620/1452	4.33	4.12	4.18	4.23	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1430	5.00	4.22	4.16	4.28	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	243/1539	4.75	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	622/1560	4.83	4.79	4.64	4.72	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1545	5.00	4.01	4.14	4.11	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1496	5.00	4.49	4.49	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.70	4.75	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1496	5.00	4.17	4.37	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1494	5.00	4.28	4.37	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	215/1352	4.67	3.96	4.12	3.99	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1248	****	3.93	4.23	4.28	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1250	****	3.91	4.39	4.49	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	MATH 710 01
Title:	Spec Topics In Appl Math
Instructor:	Gowda,Muddappa

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	7
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1239	****	4.13	4.45	4.57	****

Frequency Distribution

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