

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	8	13	4.11	1019/1470	3.87	4.32	4.29	4.13	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	18	4.50	470/1470	4.32	4.46	4.23	4.17	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	22	4.71	232/1252	4.41	4.43	4.27	4.21	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	4	0	12	4.50	423/1413	4.20	4.32	4.24	4.12	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	2	5	14	4.45	329/1391	4.05	4.07	4.02	3.96	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	523/1347	4.03	4.23	4.10	4.01	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	0	3	22	4.57	357/1455	4.55	4.44	4.16	4.16	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	261/1469	4.80	4.89	4.70	4.65	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	4	10	7	4.14	745/1451	4.02	4.16	4.08	3.99	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	268/1407	4.64	4.63	4.43	4.40	4.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	600/1404	4.73	4.71	4.70	4.62	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	9	16	4.58	479/1401	4.35	4.44	4.28	4.22	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	439/1398	4.38	4.44	4.27	4.21	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	20	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	****/1176	4.19	3.64	3.96	3.84	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	1	3	2	9	3.72	924/1276	3.43	3.64	4.06	3.81	3.72	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	5	2	0	2	9	3.44	1125/1277	3.49	3.78	4.30	4.02	3.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	3	2	2	1	10	3.72	1057/1271	3.77	4.01	4.28	4.02	3.72	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	14	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 763	3.61	3.88	4.06	3.92	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 236	****	****	4.22	4.02	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 248	****	****	4.23	4.12	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.28	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.59	4.40	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.34	4.44	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.17	4.29	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.42	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.48	4.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	11
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1
				Required for Majors	8
				General	0
				Electives	0
				Other	15
				Graduate	0
				Under-grad	28
				Non-major	14
				Major	0
#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					

Course-Section: STAT 121 0201  
 Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S  
 Instructor: KHALATBARI, FAR  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1417  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	4	5	7	11	3.63	1309/1470	3.87	4.32	4.29	4.13	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	6	5	17	4.17	906/1470	4.32	4.46	4.23	4.17	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	2	6	18	4.23	764/1252	4.41	4.43	4.27	4.21	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	2	2	2	7	4.08	944/1413	4.20	4.32	4.24	4.12	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	3	3	6	3	10	3.56	1095/1391	4.05	4.07	4.02	3.96	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	2	1	3	4	7	3.76	1022/1347	4.03	4.23	4.10	4.01	3.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	6	23	4.70	228/1455	4.55	4.44	4.16	4.16	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	18	4.60	1008/1469	4.80	4.89	4.70	4.65	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	2	5	12	6	3.77	1083/1451	4.02	4.16	4.08	3.99	3.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	7	19	4.47	807/1407	4.64	4.63	4.43	4.40	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	3	24	4.70	896/1404	4.73	4.71	4.70	4.62	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	3	1	7	17	4.13	957/1401	4.35	4.44	4.28	4.22	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	6	19	4.37	753/1398	4.38	4.44	4.27	4.21	4.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	1	1	3	5	11	4.14	539/1176	4.19	3.64	3.96	3.84	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	6	4	0	8	7	3.24	1112/1276	3.43	3.64	4.06	3.81	3.24	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	5	5	8	5	3.36	1147/1277	3.49	3.78	4.30	4.02	3.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	3	2	4	7	9	3.68	1068/1271	3.77	4.01	4.28	4.02	3.68	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	20	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 763	3.61	3.88	4.06	3.92	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 236	****	****	4.22	4.02	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 248	****	****	4.23	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 214	****	****	4.16	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 21	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 2	General 2	Under-grad 30 Non-major 3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 5	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 17	
			? 0		

Course-Section: STAT 121 0301  
 Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S  
 Instructor: KEGAN, BONNIE E  
 Enrollment: 78  
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1418  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	6	11	21	21	3.87	1197/1470	3.87	4.32	4.29	4.13	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	11	17	31	4.30	753/1470	4.32	4.46	4.23	4.17	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	2	7	15	35	4.30	711/1252	4.41	4.43	4.27	4.21	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	4	2	9	14	27	4.04	968/1413	4.20	4.32	4.24	4.12	4.04	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	1	6	7	12	30	4.14	643/1391	4.05	4.07	4.02	3.96	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	13	0	4	10	14	19	4.02	762/1347	4.03	4.23	4.10	4.01	4.02	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	2	9	13	35	4.37	609/1455	4.55	4.44	4.16	4.16	4.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	2	0	4	53	4.83	779/1469	4.80	4.89	4.70	4.65	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	2	0	2	7	19	17	4.13	756/1451	4.02	4.16	4.08	3.99	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	5	13	43	4.62	613/1407	4.64	4.63	4.43	4.40	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	5	12	44	4.64	976/1404	4.73	4.71	4.70	4.62	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	4	8	11	37	4.35	757/1401	4.35	4.44	4.28	4.22	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	4	9	16	30	4.11	966/1398	4.38	4.44	4.27	4.21	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	3	4	4	13	35	4.24	471/1176	4.19	3.64	3.96	3.84	4.24	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	9	2	9	10	12	3.33	1083/1276	3.43	3.64	4.06	3.81	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	2	1	16	12	10	3.66	1071/1277	3.49	3.78	4.30	4.02	3.66	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	2	4	7	11	17	3.90	1005/1271	3.77	4.01	4.28	4.02	3.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	18	5	0	3	6	9	3.61	601/ 763	3.61	3.88	4.06	3.92	3.61	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 236	****	****	4.22	4.02	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 248	****	****	4.23	4.12	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.33	4.15	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.28	4.17	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	62	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 214	****	****	4.16	4.13	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	62	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.59	4.40	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.34	4.44	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.17	4.29	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.42	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.48	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.62	4.70	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.71	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	62	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.66	4.40	****	

Course-Section: STAT 121 0301  
 Title INTRO STATISTICS:SOC S  
 Instructor: KEGAN, BONNIE E  
 Enrollment: 78  
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1418  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 29	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99 0	B 18		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 7	C 3	General 4	Under-grad 63 Non-major 19
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 18	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 40	
			? 1		

Course-Section: STAT 350 0101  
 Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI  
 Instructor: BEBU, IONUT I  
 Enrollment: 49  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1419  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	4	19	4.54	507/1470	4.23	4.32	4.29	4.31	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	20	4.62	356/1470	4.33	4.46	4.23	4.22	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	214/1252	4.39	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.73		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	2	2	3	14	4.38	584/1413	4.17	4.32	4.24	4.27	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	157/1391	4.20	4.07	4.02	4.00	4.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	1	1	2	6	7	4.00	771/1347	3.80	4.23	4.10	4.11	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	4	18	4.60	324/1455	4.37	4.44	4.16	4.12	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1469	4.95	4.89	4.70	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	9	8	4.25	624/1451	3.93	4.16	4.08	4.07	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	21	4.76	390/1407	4.58	4.63	4.43	4.41	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	369/1404	4.65	4.71	4.70	4.69	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	368/1401	4.22	4.44	4.28	4.27	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	111/1398	4.41	4.44	4.27	4.25	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	19	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/1176	3.32	3.64	3.96	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	1	2	5	9	3.55	1010/1276	2.90	3.64	4.06	4.10	3.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	3	3	3	10	3.64	1077/1277	3.51	3.78	4.30	4.34	3.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	3	2	1	14	4.00	881/1271	3.65	4.01	4.28	4.33	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	16	3	0	0	1	1	2.40	****/ 763	****	3.88	4.06	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	1	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 236	****	****	4.22	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 248	****	****	4.23	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 233	****	****	4.33	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 232	****	****	4.28	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 214	****	****	4.16	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 73	****	****	4.59	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.70	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.66	4.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 74	****	****	4.50	4.64	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 71	****	****	4.16	4.34	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.34	4.63	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.17	4.14	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.48	4.56	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.18	4.30	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.34	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 45	****	****	4.42	4.58	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.48	4.59	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 43	****	****	4.62	4.53	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.71	4.57	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.66	4.67	****	

Course-Section: STAT 350 0101  
 Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI  
 Instructor: BEBU, IONUT I  
 Enrollment: 49  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1419  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	25	Non-major	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	1						

Course-Section: STAT 350 0201  
 Title STAT W/APP IN BIOL SCI  
 Instructor: WILSON, MARY C  
 Enrollment: 77  
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1420  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	4	7	19	17	3.92	1168/1470	4.23	4.32	4.29	4.31	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	3	8	17	19	4.04	1000/1470	4.33	4.46	4.23	4.22	4.04	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	4	8	15	21	4.04	886/1252	4.39	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.04	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	2	12	14	17	3.96	1054/1413	4.17	4.32	4.24	4.27	3.96	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	15	3	2	9	9	11	3.68	1026/1391	4.20	4.07	4.02	4.00	3.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	1	7	11	9	12	3.60	1131/1347	3.80	4.23	4.10	4.11	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	7	14	24	4.14	864/1455	4.37	4.44	4.16	4.12	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	1	47	4.90	671/1469	4.95	4.89	4.70	4.67	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	2	4	12	16	9	3.60	1175/1451	3.93	4.16	4.08	4.07	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	8	13	28	4.41	889/1407	4.58	4.63	4.43	4.41	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	7	14	28	4.38	1208/1404	4.65	4.71	4.70	4.69	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	6	9	17	15	3.76	1183/1401	4.22	4.44	4.28	4.27	3.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	5	7	12	21	3.90	1102/1398	4.41	4.44	4.27	4.25	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	9	2	7	11	11	6	3.32	971/1176	3.32	3.64	3.96	3.97	3.32	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	22	5	7	9	3	2.26	1259/1276	2.90	3.64	4.06	4.10	2.26	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	8	6	8	7	16	3.38	1144/1277	3.51	3.78	4.30	4.34	3.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	4	10	10	7	12	3.30	1155/1271	3.65	4.01	4.28	4.33	3.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	37	3	0	1	1	1	2.50	****/ 763	****	3.88	4.06	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 236	****	****	4.22	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 248	****	****	4.23	4.32	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.28	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 214	****	****	4.16	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 25	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	13	2.00-2.99 9	C 5	General	2
84-150	13	3.00-3.49 11	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 14	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	40

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

Course-Section: STAT 351 0101  
 Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO  
 Instructor: PALMATEER, JASO  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1421  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	13	10	4.28	833/1470	4.55	4.32	4.29	4.31	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	14	4.48	502/1470	4.68	4.46	4.23	4.22	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	16	4.56	410/1252	4.73	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	1	7	13	4.45	489/1413	4.46	4.32	4.24	4.27	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	2	1	1	3	5	3.67	1033/1391	3.97	4.07	4.02	4.00	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	216/1347	4.38	4.23	4.10	4.11	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	10	14	4.52	414/1455	4.63	4.44	4.16	4.12	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	977/1469	4.78	4.89	4.70	4.67	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	11	7	4.25	624/1451	4.43	4.16	4.08	4.07	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	8	16	4.60	641/1407	4.80	4.63	4.43	4.41	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	4	17	4.52	1088/1404	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.69	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	10	13	4.50	553/1401	4.69	4.44	4.28	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	14	4.32	793/1398	4.65	4.44	4.27	4.25	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	5	5	11	4.18	507/1176	4.07	3.64	3.96	3.97	4.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	459/1276	4.11	3.64	4.06	4.10	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	876/1277	4.06	3.78	4.30	4.34	4.11	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	760/1271	4.24	4.01	4.28	4.33	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 763	3.84	3.88	4.06	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 25
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	19
			? 1		

Course-Section: STAT 351 0201  
 Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO  
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI  
 Enrollment: 79  
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1422  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	11	24	4.59	444/1470	4.55	4.32	4.29	4.31	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	27	4.68	288/1470	4.68	4.46	4.23	4.22	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	26	4.65	318/1252	4.73	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	3	12	18	4.29	727/1413	4.46	4.32	4.24	4.27	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	0	4	8	20	4.29	490/1391	3.97	4.07	4.02	4.00	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	1	2	3	7	14	4.15	681/1347	4.38	4.23	4.10	4.11	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	6	26	4.56	380/1455	4.63	4.44	4.16	4.12	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	34	4.94	392/1469	4.78	4.89	4.70	4.67	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	10	18	4.41	450/1451	4.43	4.16	4.08	4.07	4.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	4	29	4.72	465/1407	4.80	4.63	4.43	4.41	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	4	29	4.69	896/1404	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.69	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	6	25	4.56	500/1401	4.69	4.44	4.28	4.27	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	5	27	4.64	465/1398	4.65	4.44	4.27	4.25	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	2	2	4	5	9	3.77	783/1176	4.07	3.64	3.96	3.97	3.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	3	6	6	9	3.76	899/1276	4.11	3.64	4.06	4.10	3.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	3	2	5	3	12	3.76	1035/1277	4.06	3.78	4.30	4.34	3.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	2	5	9	9	4.00	881/1271	4.24	4.01	4.28	4.33	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	11	0	3	3	2	6	3.79	534/ 763	3.84	3.88	4.06	4.07	3.79	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 236	****	****	4.22	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 248	****	****	4.23	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.33	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.28	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 214	****	****	4.16	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.59	4.39	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.34	4.63	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.17	4.14	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.48	4.56	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.18	4.30	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.34	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.42	4.58	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.48	4.59	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.62	4.53	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.71	4.57	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.66	4.67	****	

Course-Section: STAT 351 0201  
 Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO  
 Instructor: DASGUPTA, NANDI  
 Enrollment: 79  
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1422  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	37	Non-major	18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	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	26				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 351 0301  
 Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO  
 Instructor: STARK, DAVID R  
 Enrollment: 46  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1423  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	187/1470	4.55	4.32	4.29	4.31	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	84/1470	4.68	4.46	4.23	4.22	4.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1252	4.73	4.43	4.27	4.27	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	107/1413	4.46	4.32	4.24	4.27	4.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	450/1391	3.97	4.07	4.02	4.00	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	124/1347	4.38	4.23	4.10	4.11	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	77/1455	4.63	4.44	4.16	4.12	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	833/1469	4.78	4.89	4.70	4.67	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	240/1451	4.43	4.16	4.08	4.07	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1407	4.80	4.63	4.43	4.41	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	896/1404	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.69	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1401	4.69	4.44	4.28	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	139/1398	4.65	4.44	4.27	4.25	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1176	4.07	3.64	3.96	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	1	0	4	3.86	845/1276	4.11	3.64	4.06	4.10	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	855/1277	4.06	3.78	4.30	4.34	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	738/1271	4.24	4.01	4.28	4.33	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 763	3.84	3.88	4.06	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	9	25	4.54	497/1470	4.55	4.32	4.29	4.31	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	28	4.68	288/1470	4.68	4.46	4.23	4.22	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	27	4.70	242/1252	4.73	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	8	7	17	4.21	818/1413	4.46	4.32	4.24	4.27	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	6	2	5	7	13	3.58	1090/1391	3.97	4.07	4.02	4.00	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	1	10	4	15	4.00	771/1347	4.38	4.23	4.10	4.11	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	4	3	27	4.53	414/1455	4.63	4.44	4.16	4.12	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	26	4.72	911/1469	4.78	4.89	4.70	4.67	4.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	4	9	17	4.43	414/1451	4.43	4.16	4.08	4.07	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	2	30	4.88	233/1407	4.80	4.63	4.43	4.41	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	4	27	4.76	788/1404	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.69	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	7	23	4.71	334/1401	4.69	4.44	4.28	4.27	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	4	26	4.75	300/1398	4.65	4.44	4.27	4.25	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	13	1	0	3	2	10	4.25	457/1176	4.07	3.64	3.96	3.97	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	7	18	4.46	378/1276	4.11	3.64	4.06	4.10	4.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	1	2	7	16	4.21	807/1277	4.06	3.78	4.30	4.34	4.21	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	3	10	15	4.43	641/1271	4.24	4.01	4.28	4.33	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	10	3	1	1	3	10	3.89	509/ 763	3.84	3.88	4.06	4.07	3.89	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 236	****	****	4.22	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 248	****	****	4.23	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 233	****	****	4.33	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 232	****	****	4.28	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 214	****	****	4.16	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.59	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.70	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.66	4.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 74	****	****	4.50	4.64	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 71	****	****	4.16	4.34	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.34	4.63	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.48	4.56	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.18	4.30	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.34	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.42	4.58	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.48	4.59	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.62	4.53	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.71	4.57	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.66	4.67	****	

Course-Section: STAT 351 0401  
 Title APPLIED STAT/BUS & ECO  
 Instructor: HEINZ, FEDERICO  
 Enrollment: 61  
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1424  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	7	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	37	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	1	Other	28				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 355 0101  
 Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT  
 Instructor: SVERDLOV, OLEKS  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1425  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	10	9	4.40	680/1470	4.11	4.32	4.29	4.31	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	11	7	4.25	808/1470	4.36	4.46	4.23	4.22	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	473/1252	4.51	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	766/1413	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.27	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	1	5	6	5	3.88	875/1391	4.01	4.07	4.02	4.00	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	885/1347	4.02	4.23	4.10	4.11	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	4	12	4.40	576/1455	4.56	4.44	4.16	4.12	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	392/1469	4.95	4.89	4.70	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	12	3	4.00	845/1451	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	4	13	4.47	793/1407	4.55	4.63	4.43	4.41	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	896/1404	4.76	4.71	4.70	4.69	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	745/1401	4.28	4.44	4.28	4.27	4.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	528/1398	4.31	4.44	4.27	4.25	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	14	0	3	0	0	1	2.75	****/1176	3.69	3.64	3.96	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	6	6	4	3.56	1006/1276	3.43	3.64	4.06	4.10	3.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	3	9	2	3	3.05	1198/1277	3.44	3.78	4.30	4.34	3.05	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	2	7	4	3	3.22	1165/1271	3.59	4.01	4.28	4.33	3.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	13	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	****/ 763	****	3.88	4.06	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 236	****	****	4.22	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/ 248	****	****	4.23	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.33	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.28	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 214	****	****	4.16	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.59	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.70	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.66	4.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 74	****	****	4.50	4.64	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 71	****	****	4.16	4.34	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.34	4.63	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.17	4.14	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.48	4.56	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.18	4.30	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.34	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.42	4.58	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.48	4.59	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.62	4.53	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.71	4.57	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.66	4.67	****	

Course-Section: STAT 355 0101  
 Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT  
 Instructor: SVERDLOV, OLEKS  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1425  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 355 0201  
 Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT  
 Instructor: NIE, LEI  
 Enrollment: 51  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1426  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	8	10	4.08	1031/1470	4.11	4.32	4.29	4.31	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	14	4.40	632/1470	4.36	4.46	4.23	4.22	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	18	4.72	232/1252	4.51	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.72		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	657/1413	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.27	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	1	6	10	4.33	450/1391	4.01	4.07	4.02	4.00	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	439/1347	4.02	4.23	4.10	4.11	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	209/1455	4.56	4.44	4.16	4.12	4.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1469	4.95	4.89	4.70	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	3	9	6	4.00	845/1451	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	9	15	4.56	685/1407	4.55	4.63	4.43	4.41	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	693/1404	4.76	4.71	4.70	4.69	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	10	11	4.20	915/1401	4.28	4.44	4.28	4.27	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	4	14	4.13	957/1398	4.31	4.44	4.27	4.25	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	17	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/1176	3.69	3.64	3.96	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	0	9	2	6	3.29	1098/1276	3.43	3.64	4.06	4.10	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	4	3	2	2	10	3.52	1106/1277	3.44	3.78	4.30	4.34	3.52	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	3	1	5	3	8	3.60	1089/1271	3.59	4.01	4.28	4.33	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	17	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 763	****	3.88	4.06	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 248	****	****	4.23	4.32	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 71	****	****	4.16	4.34	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.34	4.63	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 42	****	****	4.17	4.14	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.48	4.56	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.18	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.42	4.58	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.48	4.59	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.62	4.53	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.71	4.57	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.66	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 13	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 1 Major
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1 Under-grad 24 Non-major
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	19

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



Course-Section: STAT 355 0301  
 Title INTRO APP PROB & STAT  
 Instructor: DRUMMEY, KEVIN  
 Enrollment: 95  
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1427  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	3	7	19	18	3.86	1197/1470	4.11	4.32	4.29	4.31	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	15	28	4.42	599/1470	4.36	4.46	4.23	4.22	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	19	25	4.32	680/1252	4.51	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.32	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	3	0	3	4	22	15	4.11	917/1413	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.27	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	8	1	2	10	16	10	3.82	916/1391	4.01	4.07	4.02	4.00	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	7	2	1	11	18	9	3.76	1030/1347	4.02	4.23	4.10	4.11	3.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	13	32	4.55	380/1455	4.56	4.44	4.16	4.12	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	5	43	4.90	671/1469	4.95	4.89	4.70	4.67	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	0	1	5	18	16	4.22	657/1451	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.07	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	13	35	4.62	613/1407	4.55	4.63	4.43	4.41	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	7	42	4.78	731/1404	4.76	4.71	4.70	4.69	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	5	17	25	4.26	852/1401	4.28	4.44	4.28	4.27	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	7	12	28	4.24	863/1398	4.31	4.44	4.27	4.25	4.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	13	3	3	9	7	13	3.69	833/1176	3.69	3.64	3.96	3.97	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	8	2	3	10	12	3.46	1044/1276	3.43	3.64	4.06	4.10	3.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	4	8	8	13	3.74	1041/1277	3.44	3.78	4.30	4.34	3.74	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	3	2	4	10	15	3.94	955/1271	3.59	4.01	4.28	4.33	3.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	24	0	0	5	5	1	3.64	****/ 763	****	3.88	4.06	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 18	Required for Majors	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	B 18		Graduate
56-83	15	2.00-2.99	C 13	General	2
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	3
			P 0		### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	45
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	8	5	2	3.41	1381/1470	3.41	4.32	4.29	4.36	3.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	8	2	3.71	1231/1470	3.71	4.46	4.23	4.25	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	5	4.18	811/1252	4.18	4.43	4.27	4.30	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	6	6	1	3.62	1266/1413	3.62	4.32	4.24	4.27	3.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	6	6	2	3.60	1075/1391	3.60	4.07	4.02	4.04	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	5	5	3	3.60	1131/1347	3.60	4.23	4.10	4.15	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	698/1455	4.29	4.44	4.16	4.15	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	872/1469	4.76	4.89	4.70	4.74	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	9	2	3.80	1054/1451	3.80	4.16	4.08	4.17	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	807/1407	4.47	4.63	4.43	4.47	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	826/1404	4.73	4.71	4.70	4.75	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	5	4	5	3.80	1162/1401	3.80	4.44	4.28	4.32	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	5	5	4.00	1021/1398	4.00	4.44	4.27	4.33	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	1	2	2	0	3	3.25	989/1176	3.25	3.64	3.96	4.05	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	1	2	2	0	2.38	1253/1276	2.38	3.64	4.06	4.19	2.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	2	1	1	2	3.14	1190/1277	3.14	3.78	4.30	4.46	3.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1109/1271	3.50	4.01	4.28	4.41	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 763	****	3.88	4.06	4.22	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 236	****	****	4.22	4.37	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 248	****	****	4.23	4.06	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 233	****	****	4.33	4.00	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 232	****	****	4.28	4.17	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 214	****	****	4.16	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.59	4.71	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.70	4.77	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.66	4.59	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 74	****	****	4.50	4.43	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 71	****	****	4.16	3.98	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.34	3.95	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.17	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.48	3.93	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.18	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.63	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.42	4.25	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.48	3.70	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.62	4.22	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.71	4.17	****	

Course-Section: STAT 414 0101  
 Title ENVIRONMENTAL STATISTI  
 Instructor: NEERCHAL, NAGAR  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1428  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	16	Non-major	0
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: STAT 419 0101  
 Title INTRO TO BIOSTATISTICS  
 Instructor: ROSENBERGER, WI  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1429  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	623/1470	4.44	4.32	4.29	4.36	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	300/1470	4.67	4.46	4.23	4.25	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	853/1252	4.11	4.43	4.27	4.30	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	986/1413	4.00	4.32	4.24	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	3	4	4.00	736/1391	4.00	4.07	4.02	4.04	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	6	1	3.75	1030/1347	3.75	4.23	4.10	4.15	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1172/1455	3.75	4.44	4.16	4.15	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	707/1469	4.88	4.89	4.70	4.74	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	485/1451	4.38	4.16	4.08	4.17	4.38	
-----															
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	558/1407	4.67	4.63	4.43	4.47	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	1061/1404	4.56	4.71	4.70	4.75	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	640/1401	4.44	4.44	4.28	4.32	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	662/1398	4.44	4.44	4.27	4.33	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1176	****	3.64	3.96	4.05	****	
-----															
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1276	****	3.64	4.06	4.19	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1277	****	3.78	4.30	4.46	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1271	****	4.01	4.28	4.41	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 2	Other	6

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

Course-Section: STAT 453 0101  
 Title INTRO MATHEMATICAL STA  
 Instructor: ROY, ANINDYA  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1430  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	6	9	4.20	936/1470	4.20	4.32	4.29	4.36	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	8	7	4.10	971/1470	4.10	4.46	4.23	4.25	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	8	4.15	825/1252	4.15	4.43	4.27	4.30	4.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	379/1413	4.55	4.32	4.24	4.27	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	550/1391	4.23	4.07	4.02	4.04	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	356/1347	4.47	4.23	4.10	4.15	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	8	7	3.95	1016/1455	3.95	4.44	4.16	4.15	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1469	5.00	4.89	4.70	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	701/1451	4.19	4.16	4.08	4.17	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	861/1407	4.42	4.63	4.43	4.47	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	976/1404	4.63	4.71	4.70	4.75	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	8	6	4.05	1000/1401	4.05	4.44	4.28	4.32	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	9	6	4.00	1021/1398	4.00	4.44	4.27	4.33	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	905/1176	3.50	3.64	3.96	4.05	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/1276	****	3.64	4.06	4.19	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1277	****	3.78	4.30	4.46	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1271	****	4.01	4.28	4.41	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 2
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	

Course-Section: STAT 455 0101  
 Title DESIGN QUALITY CONTROL  
 Instructor: MATHEW, THOMAS  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1431  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	2	6	4.20	936/1470	4.20	4.32	4.29	4.36	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	470/1470	4.50	4.46	4.23	4.25	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	1	5	3.90	987/1252	3.90	4.43	4.27	4.30	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	528/1413	4.43	4.32	4.24	4.27	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	530/1391	4.25	4.07	4.02	4.04	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	486/1347	4.33	4.23	4.10	4.15	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1091/1455	3.89	4.44	4.16	4.15	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	653/1469	4.90	4.89	4.70	4.74	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	533/1451	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.17	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	315/1407	4.80	4.63	4.43	4.47	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	896/1404	4.70	4.71	4.70	4.75	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	345/1401	4.70	4.44	4.28	4.32	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	504/1398	4.60	4.44	4.27	4.33	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1176	****	3.64	3.96	4.05	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1276	****	3.64	4.06	4.19	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1277	****	3.78	4.30	4.46	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1271	****	4.01	4.28	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 763	****	3.88	4.06	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 2		

Course-Section: STAT 602 0101  
 Title APPLIED STATISTICS II  
 Instructor: NIE, LEI  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1432  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	539/1470	4.50	4.32	4.29	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	808/1470	4.25	4.46	4.23	4.34	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	904/1252	4.00	4.43	4.27	4.35	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	423/1413	4.50	4.32	4.24	4.37	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	530/1391	4.25	4.07	4.02	4.25	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	124/1347	4.75	4.23	4.10	4.31	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	437/1455	4.50	4.44	4.16	4.22	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1469	5.00	4.89	4.70	4.82	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	211/1451	4.67	4.16	4.08	4.23	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1017/1407	4.25	4.63	4.43	4.53	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	788/1404	4.75	4.71	4.70	4.79	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	553/1401	4.50	4.44	4.28	4.40	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	849/1398	4.25	4.44	4.27	4.39	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	905/1176	3.50	3.64	3.96	4.02	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1276	5.00	3.64	4.06	4.31	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.78	4.30	4.60	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.01	4.28	4.57	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 763	5.00	3.88	4.06	4.11	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 612 0101  
 Title MATHEMATICAL STAT II  
 Instructor: SINHA, BIMAL  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1433  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1470	5.00	4.32	4.29	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	300/1470	4.67	4.46	4.23	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	292/1252	4.67	4.43	4.27	4.35	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	256/1413	4.67	4.32	4.24	4.37	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1127/1391	3.50	4.07	4.02	4.25	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	190/1347	4.67	4.23	4.10	4.31	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	260/1455	4.67	4.44	4.16	4.22	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1469	5.00	4.89	4.70	4.82	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	533/1451	4.33	4.16	4.08	4.23	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.63	4.43	4.53	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1404	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1401	4.67	4.44	4.28	4.40	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	426/1398	4.67	4.44	4.27	4.39	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1173/1176	1.00	3.64	3.96	4.02	1.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1156/1276	3.00	3.64	4.06	4.31	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1157/1277	3.33	3.78	4.30	4.60	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	704/1271	4.33	4.01	4.28	4.57	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	700/ 763	3.00	3.88	4.06	4.11	3.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	27/ 45	4.00	4.00	4.34	4.07	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 621 0101  
 Title PROB THRY/STOCH PROC I  
 Instructor: RATHINAM, MURUH  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1434  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	187/1470	4.80	4.32	4.29	4.46	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	266/1470	4.70	4.46	4.23	4.34	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	254/1252	4.70	4.43	4.27	4.35	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	766/1413	4.25	4.32	4.24	4.37	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	450/1391	4.33	4.07	4.02	4.25	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	190/1347	4.67	4.23	4.10	4.31	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	437/1455	4.50	4.44	4.16	4.22	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1469	5.00	4.89	4.70	4.82	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	5	2	3.78	1075/1451	3.78	4.16	4.08	4.23	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	753/1407	4.50	4.63	4.43	4.53	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1199/1404	4.40	4.71	4.70	4.79	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	448/1401	4.60	4.44	4.28	4.40	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	504/1398	4.60	4.44	4.27	4.39	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1176	****	3.64	3.96	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1276	****	3.64	4.06	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	3.78	4.30	4.60	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1271	****	4.01	4.28	4.57	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 763	****	3.88	4.06	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 710A 0101  
 Title BAYESIAN INFERENCE  
 Instructor: ROY, ANINDYA  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1435  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	322/1470	4.70	4.32	4.29	4.46	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	419/1470	4.56	4.46	4.23	4.34	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	473/1252	4.50	4.43	4.27	4.35	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	805/1413	4.22	4.32	4.24	4.37	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	481/1391	4.30	4.07	4.02	4.25	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	421/1347	4.40	4.23	4.10	4.31	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	687/1455	4.30	4.44	4.16	4.22	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1469	5.00	4.89	4.70	4.82	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	211/1451	4.67	4.16	4.08	4.23	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	753/1407	4.50	4.63	4.43	4.53	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	693/1404	4.80	4.71	4.70	4.79	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	816/1401	4.30	4.44	4.28	4.40	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	387/1398	4.70	4.44	4.27	4.39	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	843/1176	3.67	3.64	3.96	4.02	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1276	****	3.64	4.06	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1277	****	3.78	4.30	4.60	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1271	****	4.01	4.28	4.57	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 763	****	3.88	4.06	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: STAT 750 0101  
 Title INTERDISCIPL CONSULTIN  
 Instructor: NEERCHAL, NAGAR  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1436  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	248/1470	4.75	4.32	4.29	4.46	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1470	5.00	4.46	4.23	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	669/1252	4.33	4.43	4.27	4.35	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1413	5.00	4.32	4.24	4.37	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	279/1391	4.50	4.07	4.02	4.25	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1347	5.00	4.23	4.10	4.31	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	174/1455	4.75	4.44	4.16	4.22	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1469	5.00	4.89	4.70	4.82	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1304/1451	3.33	4.16	4.08	4.23	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	409/1407	4.75	4.63	4.43	4.53	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1404	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1401	5.00	4.44	4.28	4.40	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	587/1398	4.50	4.44	4.27	4.39	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	119/1176	4.75	3.64	3.96	4.02	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1276	5.00	3.64	4.06	4.31	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.78	4.30	4.60	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.01	4.28	4.57	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	421/ 763	4.00	3.88	4.06	4.11	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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