```
Course-Section: CMSC 100  0101               University of Maryland                        Page  415
Title     INTRO TO COMPUTERS/PRO             Baltimore County                              FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  DESJARDINS, MAR                 Fall  2008                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    40
Questionnaires: 17                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions            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  9  7  4.35  844/1649  4.35  4.28  4.28  4.11  4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  7 10  4.59  464/1648  4.59  4.26  4.23  4.16  4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  1  2 14  4.76  283/1375  4.76  4.31  4.27  4.10  4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  4  6  7  4.18  916/1595  4.18  4.26  4.20  4.03  4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  3  8  6  4.18  695/1533  4.18  3.69  4.04  3.87  4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 3 9 4 3.94 966/1512 3.94 4.15 4.10 3.86 3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  0  5 12  4.71  272/1623  4.71  4.32  4.16  4.08  4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  1  0  0  0  2 14  4.88  714/1646  4.88  4.79  4.69  4.67  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 2 11 2 4.00 914/1621 4.00 4.01 4.06 3.96 4.00

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  4 13  4.76  461/1568  4.76  4.40  4.43  4.39  4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  1 16  4.94  355/1572  4.94  4.66  4.70  4.64  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 3 6 8 4.29 897/1564 4.29 4.24 4.28 4.20 4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  2  5 10  4.47  736/1559  4.47  4.26  4.29  4.20  4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 2 9 6 4.24 528/1352 4.24 4.10 3.98 3.86 4.24

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 1 3 3 2 3.67 1011/1384 3.67 3.74 4.08 3.86 3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 0 2 1 6 4.44 676/1382 4.44 3.90 4.29 4.03 4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 654/1368 4.50 3.82 4.30 4.01 4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  9  5  0  1  0  0  2  4.00 ****/ 948  ****  3.58  3.95  3.75  ****

              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 14 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 ****/ 555 **** 4.41 4.29 4.14 ****

              Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               12  0  1  4  0  0  0  1.80  275/ 288  1.80  3.26  3.68  3.54  1.80

              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 12 0 0 3 0 2 0 2.80 267/ 312 2.80 3.56 3.68 3.51 2.80

              Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    14  0  0  0  0  3  0  4.00 ****/ 110  ****  3.20  3.99  3.83  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 100H 0101          University of Maryland                          Page  416
Title      INTRO TO COMPUTERS/PRO        Baltimore County                               FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   DESJARDINS, MAR            Fall  2008                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     8
Questionnaires:  6                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
         Questions                 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   1   3  4.17 1057/1649  4.17  4.28  4.28 4.11  4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   3   3  4.50  556/1648  4.50  4.26  4.23 4.16  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   0   0   1   2   3  4.33  733/1375  4.33  4.31  4.27 4.10  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   1   1   3   1  3.67 1335/1595  3.67  4.26  4.20 4.03  3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   2   3   1  3.83  986/1533  3.83  3.69  4.04 3.87  3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   0   2   2   2  4.00  883/1512  4.00  4.15  4.10 3.86  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0   0   1   2   3  4.33  720/1623  4.33  4.32  4.16 4.08  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0   0   0   1   5  4.83  782/1646  4.83  4.79  4.69 4.67  4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0   0   0   1   4  4.80  133/1621  4.80  4.01  4.06 3.96  4.80


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0   0   0   3   3  4.50  852/1568  4.50  4.40  4.43 4.39  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0   0   0   0   6  5.00    1/1572  5.00  4.66  4.70 4.64  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0   0   0   2   4  4.67  473/1564  4.67  4.24  4.28 4.20  4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   0   0   1   1   4  4.50  695/1559  4.50  4.26  4.29 4.20  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  0   0   0   2   4  4.67  208/1352  4.67  4.10  3.98 3.86  4.67


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   2   0   3   1  3.50 1081/1384  3.50  3.74  4.08 3.86  3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0   0   2   3   1  3.83 1057/1382  3.83  3.90  4.29 4.03  3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  0   0   1   3   2  4.17  891/1368  4.17  3.82  4.30 4.01  4.17
4. Were special techniques successful                 0   1   0   1   2   2   0  3.20  811/ 948  3.20  3.58  3.95 3.75  3.20

              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5  0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/ 555  ****  4.41  4.29 4.14  ****


              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 5  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 312  ****  3.56  3.68 3.51  ****

                              Frequency Distribution


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

```
                                                    Frequencies       Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
         Questions                          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   2   3  14  4.50   644/1649  4.51  4.28  4.28  4.11  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      0   0   0   0   2   6  12  4.50   556/1648  4.59  4.26  4.23  4.16  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     1   0   0   0   1   4  14  4.68   380/1375  4.78  4.31  4.27  4.10  4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      0   1   0   0   2   5  12  4.53   474/1595  4.55  4.26  4.20  4.03  4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   7   3   2   6   0   2  2.69  1497/1533  3.72  3.69  4.04  3.87  2.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  6   1   0   2   2   9  4.29   651/1512  4.40  4.15  4.10  3.86  4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              0   0   0   0   3   3  14  4.55   448/1623  4.65  4.32  4.16  4.08  4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled                    0   1   0   0   0   1  18  4.95   398/1646  4.94  4.79  4.69  4.67  4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0   0   0   2  10   7  4.26   676/1621  4.30  4.01  4.06  3.96  4.26


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          1   0   0   0   0   1  18  4.95   147/1568  4.90  4.40  4.43  4.39  4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     1   0   0   0   0   2  17  4.89   615/1572  4.87  4.66  4.70  4.64  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  1   0   0   0   3   5  11  4.42   754/1564  4.55  4.24  4.28  4.20  4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       1   1   0   1   2   2  13  4.50   695/1559  4.62  4.26  4.29  4.20  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1   3   0   0   0   8   8  4.50   303/1352  4.59  4.10  3.98  3.86  4.50


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13   0   0   3   1   1   2  3.29  1181/1384  3.85  3.74  4.08  3.86  3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14   0   0   0   2   2   2  4.00   946/1382  4.00  3.90  4.29  4.03  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14  0   0   0   4   1   1  3.50  1181/1368  4.20  3.82  4.30  4.01  3.50
4. Were special techniques successful                   14   3   1   0   1   0   1  3.00  ****/ 948  4.03  3.58  3.95  3.75  ****


                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   10   2   0   1   0   2   5  4.38    93/ 221  4.38  4.12  4.16  4.05  4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12  0   0   0   1   2   5  4.50    65/ 243  4.50  4.40  4.12  4.08  4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 12  3   0   0   0   0   5  5.00     1/ 212  5.00  4.75  4.40  4.43  5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            13   1   0   0   1   0   5  4.67    72/ 209  4.67  4.77  4.35  4.38  4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  10   3   1   0   0   0   6  4.43   317/ 555  4.43  4.41  4.29  4.14  4.43


                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 18   1   0   1   0   0   0  2.00  ****/  88  ****  3.97  4.54  4.31  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 19  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  85  ****  3.79  4.47  4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 19   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  81  ****  3.58  4.43  4.39  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     19   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  92  ****  4.00  4.35  4.01  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 14   0   1   1   0   3   1  3.33   208/ 288  3.56  3.26  3.68  3.54  3.33


                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  19   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00  ****/  52  ****  2.00  4.06  3.72  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  19   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  48  ****  2.00  4.09  3.65  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        19   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47  4.36  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    19   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  39  ****  1.50  4.38  4.37  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  11   0   0   3   0   6   0  3.33   239/ 312  3.52  3.56  3.68  3.51  3.33


                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18   0   1   0   1   0   0  2.00  ****/  53  ****  2.50  4.30  4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     18   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  30  ****  1.50  4.16  4.06  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       18   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00  ****/  41  ****  2.00  4.43  4.27  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        18   0   0   1   0   0   1  3.50  ****/  24  ****  2.00  4.42  4.24  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      13   1   0   1   0   5   0  3.67    92/ 110  3.67  3.20  3.99  3.83  3.67
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 104  0101           University of Maryland                        Page  417
Title          PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR      Baltimore County                           FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    PARK, JOHN                   Fall   2008                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      39
Questionnaires:  20                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades           Reasons              Type                    Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     5        0.00-0.99   0        A   11        Required for Majors  1      Graduate     0      Major        4
 28-55     3        1.00-1.99   0        B    6                                                        
 56-83     0        2.00-2.99   1        C    1        General              6      Under-grad  20      Non-major   16
 84-150    1        3.00-3.49   2        D    0                                                        
 Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   0        F    0        Electives            1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                9
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 104  0201               University of Maryland                                          Page  418
Title     PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR             Baltimore County                                                FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   BLOCK, DAWN M                  Fall  2008                                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      48
Questionnaires:  22                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                     Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                            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  2  5 14  4.45  710/1649  4.51  4.28  4.28 4.11  4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  6 16  4.73  291/1648  4.59  4.26  4.23 4.16  4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  3 18  4.77  271/1375  4.78  4.31  4.27 4.10  4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   1  0  0  3  2 15  4.60  383/1595  4.55  4.26  4.20 4.03  4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 14  0  1  0  2  5  4.38  505/1533  3.72  3.69  4.04 3.87  4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6  0  0  2  4 10  4.50  380/1512  4.40  4.15  4.10 3.86  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  1  2  3 16  4.55  459/1623  4.65  4.32  4.16 4.08  4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  2 20  4.91  664/1646  4.94  4.79  4.69 4.67  4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  0  2 10 10  4.36  559/1621  4.30  4.01  4.06 3.96  4.36


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  4 18  4.82  372/1568  4.90  4.40  4.43 4.39  4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  1 21  4.95  296/1572  4.87  4.66  4.70 4.64  4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  2  3 17  4.68  447/1564  4.55  4.24  4.28 4.20  4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  0  5 17  4.77  361/1559  4.62  4.26  4.29 4.20  4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  3  0  0  1  5 13  4.63  227/1352  4.59  4.10  3.98 3.86  4.63


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0  1  1  1  4  5  3.92  876/1384  3.85  3.74  4.08 3.86  3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0  1  0  1  3  6  4.18  875/1382  4.00  3.90  4.29 4.03  4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 0  0  1  3  6  4.50  654/1368  4.20  3.82  4.30 4.01  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  11   4  1  0  1  2  3  3.86  555/ 948  4.03  3.58  3.95 3.75  3.86


                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  17   0  0  0  0  3  2  4.40  ****/ 221  4.38  4.12  4.16 4.05  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 0 0  0  2  3  4.60  ****/ 243  4.50  4.40  4.12 4.08  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 17 2 0  0  0  1  2  4.67  ****/ 212  5.00  4.75  4.40 4.43  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           17   2  0  0  1  0  2  4.33  ****/ 209  4.67  4.77  4.35 4.38  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16   2  0  0  2  0  2  4.00  ****/ 555  4.43  4.41  4.29 4.14  ****


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19  2  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  88  ****  3.97  4.54 4.31  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 19 2 0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  85  ****  3.79  4.47 4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 19  2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  81  ****  3.58  4.43 4.39  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    19   2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  92  ****  4.00  4.35 4.01  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                19   2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 288  3.56  3.26  3.68 3.54  ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19  0  0  1  0  0  2  4.00  ****/  52  ****  2.00  4.06 3.72  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 19  0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33  ****/  48  ****  2.00  4.09 3.65  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       19   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47 4.36  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   19   1  0  0  0  2  0  4.00  ****/  39  ****  1.50  4.38 4.37  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 19   1  0  0  1  1  0  3.50  ****/ 312  3.52  3.56  3.68 3.51  ****


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18  0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  ****/  53  ****  2.50  4.30 4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    18   0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50  ****/  30  ****  1.50  4.16 4.06  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      18   0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  ****/  41  ****  2.00  4.43 4.27  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       18   2  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/  24  ****  2.00  4.42 4.24  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     18   2  0  0  1  0  1  4.00  ****/ 110  3.67  3.20  3.99 3.83  ****
```

                                            Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   4   0.00-0.99   2   A   8   Required for Majors   0   Graduate   0   Major   6
 28-55   2   1.00-1.99   0   B   8
 56-83   2   2.00-2.99   2   C   2   General   3   Under-grad   22   Non-major   16
 84-150   2   3.00-3.49   2   D   1
 Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   2   F   0   Electives   3   #### - Means there are not enough
                                                P   0   responses to be significant
                                                I   0   Other   13
                                                ?   0

```
Course-Section: CMSC 104  0301              University of Maryland                              Page  419
Title      PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR           Baltimore County                                   FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   TANG, SHILANG                 Fall  2008                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      38
Questionnaires:  17                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

General

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	644/1649	4.51	4.28	4.28	4.11	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	743/1648	4.59	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	226/1375	4.78	4.31	4.27	4.10	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	782/1595	4.55	4.26	4.20	4.03	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	2	4	1	3	3.27	1358/1533	3.72	3.69	4.04	3.87	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	595/1512	4.40	4.15	4.10	3.86	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	296/1623	4.65	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	531/1646	4.94	4.79	4.69	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	1060/1621	4.30	4.01	4.06	3.96	3.90

Lecture

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	287/1568	4.90	4.40	4.43	4.39	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	1046/1572	4.87	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	939/1564	4.55	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	861/1559	4.62	4.26	4.29	4.20	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	303/1352	4.59	4.10	3.98	3.86	4.50

Discussion

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	1029/1384	3.85	3.74	4.08	3.86	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1098/1382	4.00	3.90	4.29	4.03	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	827/1368	4.20	3.82	4.30	4.01	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 948	4.03	3.58	3.95	3.75	****

Laboratory

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 221	4.38	4.12	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 243	4.50	4.40	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	5.00	4.75	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	4.67	4.77	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	4.43	4.41	4.29	4.14	****

Seminar

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	184/ 288	3.56	3.26	3.68	3.54	3.60

Field Work

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	215/ 312	3.52	3.56	3.68	3.51	3.60

Self Paced

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	2.50	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	1.50	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	2.00	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	2.00	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	3.67	3.20	3.99	3.83	****

Frequency Distribution

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

```
I     0              Other              6
?     0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 104  0401              University of Maryland                                    Page  420
Title       PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR           Baltimore County                                    FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   BLOCK, DAWN M                  Fall   2008                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      45
Questionnaires: 30                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 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   4   4  22  4.60   510/1649  4.51  4.28  4.28  4.11  4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   0   7  23  4.77   253/1648  4.59  4.26  4.23  4.16  4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   4  26  4.87   192/1375  4.78  4.31  4.27  4.10  4.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   2   0   0   1   4  22  4.78   218/1595  4.55  4.26  4.20  4.03  4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  14   0   0   2   3  10  4.53   342/1533  3.72  3.69  4.04  3.87  4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  7   0   0   2   7  12  4.48   422/1512  4.40  4.15  4.10  3.86  4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   1   0   3  26  4.80   169/1623  4.65  4.32  4.16  4.08  4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   2   0   0   0   1  27  4.96   266/1646  4.94  4.79  4.69  4.67  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  3   0   0   1   6  18  4.68   225/1621  4.30  4.01  4.06  3.96  4.68


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3   0   0   0   0   1  26  4.96    98/1568  4.90  4.40  4.43  4.39  4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3   0   0   0   0   2  25  4.93   473/1572  4.87  4.66  4.70  4.64  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0   0   0   0   4  23  4.85   216/1564  4.55  4.24  4.28  4.20  4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3   0   0   0   0   5  22  4.81   306/1559  4.62  4.26  4.29  4.20  4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  2   0   0   0   7  18  4.72   177/1352  4.59  4.10  3.98  3.86  4.72


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16  0   0   0   2   2  10  4.57   394/1384  3.85  3.74  4.08  3.86  4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16  0   0   2   2   3   7  4.07   929/1382  4.00  3.90  4.29  4.03  4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16  0   0   0   2   3   9  4.50   654/1368  4.20  3.82  4.30  4.01  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                   16  4   1   0   0   4   5  4.20   365/ 948  4.03  3.58  3.95  3.75  4.20


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   27  0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67  ****/ 221  4.38  4.12  4.16  4.05  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 27  0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67  ****/ 243  4.50  4.40  4.12  4.08  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 27  1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00  ****/ 212  5.00  4.75  4.40  4.43  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            27  0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00  ****/ 209  4.67  4.77  4.35  4.38  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  25  1   0   0   1   0   3  4.50  ****/ 555  4.43  4.41  4.29  4.14  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 28  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/  88  ****  3.97  4.54  4.31  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 28  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/  85  ****  3.79  4.47  4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 28  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00  ****/  81  ****  3.58  4.43  4.39  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     28  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00  ****/  92  ****  4.00  4.35  4.01  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 22  0   0   2   0   4   2  3.75   173/ 288  3.56  3.26  3.68  3.54  3.75


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  28  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/  52  ****  2.00  4.06  3.72  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  28  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/  48  ****  2.00  4.09  3.65  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        28  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00  ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47  4.36  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    28  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00  ****/  39  ****  1.50  4.38  4.37  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  19  0   1   1   0   8   1  3.64   211/ 312  3.52  3.56  3.68  3.51  3.64


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 28  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00  ****/  53  ****  2.50  4.30  4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     28  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/  30  ****  1.50  4.16  4.06  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       28  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/  41  ****  2.00  4.43  4.27  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        28  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/  24  ****  2.00  4.42  4.24  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      27  0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67  ****/ 110  3.67  3.20  3.99  3.83  ****
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 104  0401           University of Maryland                        Page  420
Title         PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR       Baltimore County                           FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   BLOCK, DAWN M                Fall   2008                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      45
Questionnaires:  30                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades            Reasons                Type                  Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     7        0.00-0.99    1        A    21        Required for Majors   1      Graduate     0        Major         9
 28-55     7        1.00-1.99    0        B     4                                                           
 56-83     1        2.00-2.99    3        C     1        General               0      Under-grad  30        Non-major    21
 84-150    1        3.00-3.49    2        D     0                                                           
 Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   10        F     0        Electives             6      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P     0                                     responses to be significant
                                          I     0        Other                19
                                          ?     0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 201  0103                  University of Maryland                                    Page  421
Title       COMPUTER SCIENCE I                    Baltimore County                                        FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  BERGERON, RYAN                         Fall   2008                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    17
Questionnaires:  15                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                    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  3  1  6  4  3.79 1361/1649  4.30  4.28  4.28 4.29  3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0   1  0  3  5  5  3.93 1208/1648  4.37  4.26  4.23 4.25  3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0   0  0  1  9  4  4.21  840/1375  4.56  4.31  4.27 4.37  4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   4   0  0  1  5  4  4.30  759/1595  4.37  4.26  4.20 4.22  4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   9   2  0  1  1  1  2.80 1490/1533  3.20  3.69  4.04 4.04  2.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 9   0  0  1  3  1  4.00  883/1512  4.45  4.15  4.10 4.14  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0   0  0  0  5  9  4.64  345/1623  4.60  4.32  4.16 4.21  4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0  2  0  1 11  4.50 1193/1646  4.93  4.79  4.69 4.63  4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0   0  1  3  6  2  3.75 1192/1621  4.17  4.01  4.06 4.01  3.75

               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0   0  1  1  6  6  4.21 1153/1568  4.50  4.40  4.43 4.39  4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0   1  1  0  5  7  4.14 1435/1572  4.54  4.66  4.70 4.73  4.14
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   0  1  4  8  1  3.64 1344/1564  4.45  4.24  4.28 4.27  3.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0   1  1  1  8  3  3.79 1258/1559  4.36  4.26  4.29 4.33  3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  3   1  0  1  2  6  4.20  556/1352  4.16  4.10  3.98 4.07  4.20

               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3   0   0  1  3  4  4  3.92  876/1384  3.91  3.74  4.08 3.99  3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3   0   3  1  5  2  1  2.75 1350/1382  3.45  3.90  4.29 4.19  2.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0   1  2  7  1  0  2.73 1334/1368  2.71  3.82  4.30 4.21  2.73
4. Were special techniques successful                   4  10   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 948  2.78  3.58  3.95 3.89  ****

               Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  13   0   1  0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/ 221  4.25  4.12  4.16 4.45  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/ 243  4.36  4.40  4.12 4.47  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 212  4.73  4.75  4.40 4.62  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           13   0   0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/ 209  4.72  4.77  4.35 4.64  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 10   1   1  1  1  0  1  2.75  506/ 555  4.29  4.41  4.29 4.33  2.75

               Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                12   0   0  0  0  3  0  4.00 ****/ 288  3.00  3.26  3.68 3.65  ****

               Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 14   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 312  3.25  3.56  3.68 3.59  ****

               Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     13   0   0  1  0  1  0  3.00 ****/ 110  2.00  3.20  3.99 3.72  ****
```

```
                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades           Reasons                  Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1        0.00-0.99   0       A    2        Required for Majors   0       Graduate      0       Major      6
  28-55     2        1.00-1.99   0       B    2                                                             
  56-83     1        2.00-2.99   3       C    4        General               0       Under-grad   15       Non-major  9
  84-150    0        3.00-3.49   0       D    0                                                             
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   2       F    1        Electives             0       #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                        responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                10
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 201  0104                    University of Maryland                              Page  422
Title      COMPUTER SCIENCE I                        Baltimore County                              FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   BERGERON, RYAN                          Fall   2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires:  1                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                 Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                  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  1  5.00    1/1649   4.30  4.28  4.28  4.29  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1648   4.37  4.26  4.23  4.25  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1375   4.56  4.31  4.27  4.37  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1595   4.37  4.26  4.20  4.22  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/1512   4.45  4.15  4.10  4.14  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1623   4.60  4.32  4.16  4.21  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1646   4.93  4.79  4.69  4.63  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/1621   4.17  4.01  4.06  4.01  5.00


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  1515/1568   4.50  4.40  4.43  4.39  3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  1463/1572   4.54  4.66  4.70  4.73  4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/1564   4.45  4.24  4.28  4.27  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1559   4.36  4.26  4.29  4.33  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/1352   4.16  4.10  3.98  4.07  5.00


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/1384   3.91  3.74  4.08  3.99  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/1382   3.45  3.90  4.29  4.19  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  0  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00  1365/1368   2.71  3.82  4.30  4.21  1.00
```

```
                                          Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 201  0105            University of Maryland                                         Page  423
Title     COMPUTER SCIENCE I              Baltimore County                                              FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  BERGERON, RYAN               Fall   2008                                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires: 17                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 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   2   7   7  4.31   898/1649  4.30  4.28  4.28  4.29  4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   0   8   8  4.35   770/1648  4.37  4.26  4.23  4.25  4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0   0   1   3   3   9  4.25   806/1375  4.56  4.31  4.27  4.37  4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   2   0   1   0   7   6  4.29   782/1595  4.37  4.26  4.20  4.22  4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 12   1   0   1   2   0  3.00  ****/1533  3.20  3.69  4.04  4.04  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 10  0   0   0   2   4  4.67   263/1512  4.45  4.15  4.10  4.14  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   0   2   4  10  4.50   502/1623  4.60  4.32  4.16  4.21  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0   0  16  5.00     1/1646  4.93  4.79  4.69  4.63  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1  0   0   6   7   1  3.64  1274/1621  4.17  4.01  4.06  4.01  3.64


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   0   0   5  11  4.69   604/1568  4.50  4.40  4.43  4.39  4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   1   0   5  10  4.50  1241/1572  4.54  4.66  4.70  4.73  4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   0   0   8   8  4.50   651/1564  4.45  4.24  4.28  4.27  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0   0   1   6   9  4.50   695/1559  4.36  4.26  4.29  4.33  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1  0   1   3   6   5  4.00   690/1352  4.16  4.10  3.98  4.07  4.00


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0   1   0   0   4   3  4.00   795/1384  3.91  3.74  4.08  3.99  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0   0   1   0   2   5  4.38   740/1382  3.45  3.90  4.29  4.19  4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0  1   1   2   3   1  3.25  1252/1368  2.71  3.82  4.30  4.21  3.25
4. Were special techniques successful                  9   7   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 948  2.78  3.58  3.95  3.89  ****


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  14  0   0   0   1   1   1  4.00  ****/ 221  4.25  4.12  4.16  4.45  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0  0   0   0   3   0  4.00  ****/ 243  4.36  4.40  4.12  4.47  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 14 0  0   0   0   1   2  4.67  ****/ 212  4.73  4.75  4.40  4.62  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           14  0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67  ****/ 209  4.72  4.77  4.35  4.64  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  13  2   0   0   0   0   2  5.00  ****/ 555  4.29  4.41  4.29  4.33  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  88  3.75  3.97  4.54  3.75  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  85  3.33  3.79  4.47  3.33  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  81  3.67  3.58  4.43  3.67  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                14   1   0   0   0   2   0  4.00  ****/ 288  3.00  3.26  3.68  3.65  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  52  2.00  2.00  4.06  3.93  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  16  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  48  2.00  2.00  4.09  4.05  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       16   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47  4.49  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   16   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  39  1.50  1.50  4.38  3.66  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  12  1   0   1   0   3   0  3.50  ****/ 312  3.25  3.56  3.68  3.59  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  53  2.50  2.50  4.30  4.07  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    16   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  30  1.50  1.50  4.16  1.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      16   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  41  2.00  2.00  4.43  3.50  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     13   1   0   0   0   3   0  4.00  ****/ 110  2.00  3.20  3.99  3.72  ****
```

                                      Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 201  0106              University of Maryland                           Page  424
Title      COMPUTER SCIENCE I               Baltimore County                                 FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    BERGERON, RYAN               Fall   2008                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       19
Questionnaires:   19                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                       Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions            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   1   1   0   6   9  4.24   986/1649  4.30  4.28  4.28  4.29  4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     2   0   0   0   0   8   9  4.53   533/1648  4.37  4.26  4.23  4.25  4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    3   0   0   0   1   5  10  4.56   496/1375  4.56  4.31  4.27  4.37  4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     2   1   0   0   0  11   5  4.31   746/1595  4.37  4.26  4.20  4.22  4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   9   1   0   2   1   4  3.88   945/1533  3.20  3.69  4.04  4.04  3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 9   0   1   1   2   4  4.13   817/1512  4.45  4.15  4.10  4.14  4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0   0   1   2   6   8  4.24   838/1623  4.60  4.32  4.16  4.21  4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2   0   0   0   0   3  14  4.82   799/1646  4.93  4.79  4.69  4.63  4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0   0   0   3   7   2  3.92  1045/1621  4.17  4.01  4.06  4.01  3.92


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3   0   0   0   0   3  13  4.81   372/1568  4.50  4.40  4.43  4.39  4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3   0   0   0   0   1  15  4.94   414/1572  4.54  4.66  4.70  4.73  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0   0   0   1   6   9  4.50   651/1564  4.45  4.24  4.28  4.27  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3   0   1   0   0   6   9  4.38   861/1559  4.36  4.26  4.29  4.33  4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  4   0   0   1   5   6  4.42   389/1352  4.16  4.10  3.98  4.07  4.42


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0   2   1   2   5   5  3.67  1011/1384  3.91  3.74  4.08  3.99  3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0   1   2   4   4   4  3.53  1203/1382  3.45  3.90  4.29  4.19  3.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0   3   0   1   6   5  3.67  1129/1368  2.71  3.82  4.30  4.21  3.67
4. Were special techniques successful                   4  10   0   1   1   1   2  3.80   578/ 948  2.78  3.58  3.95  3.89  3.80


                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  12   1   0   0   0   2   4  4.67    45/ 221  4.25  4.12  4.16  4.45  4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0  0   0   2   0   4  4.33   110/ 243  4.36  4.40  4.12  4.47  4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 1  0   0   0   1   4  4.80    50/ 212  4.73  4.75  4.40  4.62  4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           13   1   0   0   0   1   4  4.80    45/ 209  4.72  4.77  4.35  4.64  4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  9   2   0   0   0   1   7  4.88   231/ 555  4.29  4.41  4.29  4.33  4.88


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17  1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  88  3.75  3.97  4.54  3.75  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 1  0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  85  3.33  3.79  4.47  3.33  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17  1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  81  3.67  3.58  4.43  3.67  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                15   1   0   2   0   1   0  2.67  ****/ 288  3.00  3.26  3.68  3.65  ****


                Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13   0   0   0   0   6   0  4.00    68/ 312  3.25  3.56  3.68  3.59  4.00


                Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     17   0   0   1   0   1   0  3.00  ****/ 110  2.00  3.20  3.99  3.72  ****


                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      2      0.00-0.99    1      A   5     Required for Majors   0     Graduate      0      Major       8
28-55      1      1.00-1.99    0      B   8                                Under-grad   19      Non-major  11
56-83      1      2.00-2.99    0      C   1     General               1
84-150     1      3.00-3.49    0      D   1                                ####  - Means there are not enough
Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    5      F   0     Electives             1     responses to be significant
                                      P   0
                                      I   0     Other                13
```

? 0

```
Course-Section: CMSC 201  0201                    University of Maryland                                              Page  425
Title          COMPUTER SCIENCE I                  Baltimore County                                                  FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    EVANS, SUSAN A                      Fall   2008                                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires: 9                             Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                  Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                  Questions                 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   5   4.11 1106/1649  4.30  4.28  4.28  4.29  4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   1   1   1   6   4.33  797/1648   4.37  4.26  4.23  4.25  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   1   7   4.67  401/1375   4.56  4.31  4.27  4.37  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2   0   0   1   3   3   4.29  782/1595   4.37  4.26  4.20  4.22  4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   6   0   0   0   1   2   4.67  241/1533   3.20  3.69  4.04  4.04  4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  6  0   0   0   1   2   4.67  263/1512   4.45  4.15  4.10  4.14  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   0   0   1   8   4.89  130/1623   4.60  4.32  4.16  4.21  4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   0   9   5.00    1/1646   4.93  4.79  4.69  4.63  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  0   0   1   4   3   4.25  687/1621   4.17  4.01  4.06  4.01  4.25


                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   0   3   6   4.67  636/1568   4.50  4.40  4.43  4.39  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   0   3   6   4.67 1071/1572   4.54  4.66  4.70  4.73  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   1   1   2   5   4.22  971/1564   4.45  4.24  4.28  4.27  4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0   1   1   2   5   4.22  987/1559   4.36  4.26  4.29  4.33  4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  1   0   1   2   5   4.11  624/1352   4.16  4.10  3.98  4.07  4.11


                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3   0   0   0   2   2   2   4.00  795/1384   3.91  3.74  4.08  3.99  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3   0   1   0   3   1   1   3.17 1298/1382   3.45  3.90  4.29  4.19  3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0  1   0   4   1   0   2.83 1322/1368   2.71  3.82  4.30  4.21  2.83
4. Were special techniques successful                   3   3   0   0   2   1   0   3.33  776/ 948   2.78  3.58  3.95  3.89  3.33


                  Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   6   0   0   0   1   1   1   4.00  129/ 221   4.25  4.12  4.16  4.45  4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6  0  0   0   2   0   1   3.67  195/ 243   4.36  4.40  4.12  4.47  3.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6  0  0   0   1   0   2   4.33  126/ 212   4.73  4.75  4.40  4.62  4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            6   0   0   0   1   0   2   4.33  129/ 209   4.72  4.77  4.35  4.64  4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  5   1   0   0   1   0   2   4.33  338/ 555   4.29  4.41  4.29  4.33  4.33


                  Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 6   0   0   0   0   3   0   4.00   83/ 288   3.00  3.26  3.68  3.65  4.00


                  Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  5   0   0   0   0   4   0   4.00   68/ 312   3.25  3.56  3.68  3.59  4.00

                                           Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 201  0202                University of Maryland                            Page  426
Title      COMPUTER SCIENCE I                  Baltimore County                                 FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  EVANS, SUSAN A                    Fall   2008                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires:  4                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                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  644/1649  4.30 4.28 4.28 4.29 4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  2  2 4.50  556/1648  4.37 4.26 4.23 4.25 4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  1  3 4.75  296/1375  4.56 4.31 4.27 4.37 4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  2  2 4.50  497/1595  4.37 4.26 4.20 4.22 4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/1512  4.45 4.15 4.10 4.14 5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  0  1  3 4.75  220/1623  4.60 4.32 4.16 4.21 4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1646  4.93 4.79 4.69 4.63 5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  0  0  3  1 4.25  687/1621  4.17 4.01 4.06 4.01 4.25


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  0  1  3 4.75  480/1568  4.50 4.40 4.43 4.39 4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  2  2 4.50 1241/1572  4.54 4.66 4.70 4.73 4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  1  3 4.75  342/1564  4.45 4.24 4.28 4.27 4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  0  1  3 4.75  390/1559  4.36 4.26 4.29 4.33 4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0  0  2  0  2 4.00  690/1352  4.16 4.10 3.98 4.07 4.00


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  0  1  1 4.50  437/1384  3.91 3.74 4.08 3.99 4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  1  0  1 4.00  946/1382  3.45 3.90 4.29 4.19 4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1  0  1  0  0 2.00 1356/1368  2.71 3.82 4.30 4.21 2.00


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   1  0  0  0  0  2  1 4.33   99/ 221  4.25 4.12 4.16 4.45 4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 0 0  0  1  2 4.67   49/ 243  4.36 4.40 4.12 4.47 4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 1 0 0  0  0  2 5.00    1/ 212  4.73 4.75 4.40 4.62 5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            1  0  0  0  0  0  3 5.00    1/ 209  4.72 4.77 4.35 4.64 5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  1  1  0  0  0  1  1 4.50  293/ 555  4.29 4.41 4.29 4.33 4.50


            Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 3  0  0  1  0  0  0 2.00  266/ 288  3.00 3.26 3.68 3.65 2.00


            Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      3  0  0  1  0  0  0 2.00  107/ 110  2.00 3.20 3.99 3.72 2.00

                                      Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 201  0203                    University of Maryland                                    Page  427
Title      COMPUTER SCIENCE I                       Baltimore County                                       FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   EVANS, SUSAN A                        Fall   2008                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    19
Questionnaires:  9                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                    Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                    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  723/1649  4.30  4.28  4.28  4.29  4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0  0  1  3  5  4.44  643/1648  4.37  4.26  4.23  4.25  4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0  0  1  2  6  4.56  505/1375  4.56  4.31  4.27  4.37  4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0  1  1  2  5  4.22  853/1595  4.37  4.26  4.20  4.22  4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  5   0  0  3  0  1  3.50 1249/1533  3.20  3.69  4.04  4.04  3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6  0  0  0  2  1  4.33  595/1512  4.45  4.15  4.10  4.14  4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0  0  2  2  5  4.33  720/1623  4.60  4.32  4.16  4.21  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1646  4.93  4.79  4.69  4.63  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  1  7  0  3.88 1087/1621  4.17  4.01  4.06  4.01  3.88

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0  0  0  2  7  4.78  442/1568  4.50  4.40  4.43  4.39  4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0  0  0  2  7  4.78  894/1572  4.54  4.66  4.70  4.73  4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0  0  1  2  6  4.56  600/1564  4.45  4.24  4.28  4.27  4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0  1  1  3  4  4.11 1067/1559  4.36  4.26  4.29  4.33  4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  0  1  1  2  5  4.22  534/1352  4.16  4.10  3.98  4.07  4.22

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0   0  0  2  2  3  4.14  737/1384  3.91  3.74  4.08  3.99  4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0   2  0  0  2  3  3.57 1187/1382  3.45  3.90  4.29  4.19  3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0  2  0  0  3  0  2.80 1326/1368  2.71  3.82  4.30  4.21  2.80
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   5   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 948  2.78  3.58  3.95  3.89  ****

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  5   0   0  0  2  1  1  3.75  174/ 221  4.25  4.12  4.16  4.45  3.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75   35/ 243  4.36  4.40  4.12  4.47  4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 5 0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75   65/ 212  4.73  4.75  4.40  4.62  4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           5   0   0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/ 209  4.72  4.77  4.35  4.64  5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 4   2   0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/ 555  4.29  4.41  4.29  4.33  5.00

                Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                6   1   1  0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/ 288  3.00  3.26  3.68  3.65  ****

                Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6   0   0  3  0  0  0  2.00  291/ 312  3.25  3.56  3.68  3.59  2.00

                Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     8   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 110  2.00  3.20  3.99  3.72  ****

                            Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 201  0204                University of Maryland                        Page  428
Title       COMPUTER SCIENCE I                 Baltimore County                            FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   EVANS, SUSAN A                   Fall  2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    19
Questionnaires:  4                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                    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  4  5.00    1/1649   4.30  4.28  4.28  4.29  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  263/1648   4.37  4.26  4.23  4.25  4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1375   4.56  4.31  4.27  4.37  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1595   4.37  4.26  4.20  4.22  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  3  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 1526/1533   3.20  3.69  4.04  4.04  2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  380/1512   4.45  4.15  4.10  4.14  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1623   4.60  4.32  4.16  4.21  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1646   4.93  4.79  4.69  4.63  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  0  0  1  3  4.75  165/1621   4.17  4.01  4.06  4.01  4.75

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1568   4.50  4.40  4.43  4.39  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1572   4.54  4.66  4.70  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1564   4.45  4.24  4.28  4.27  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1559   4.36  4.26  4.29  4.33  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  0  1  0  0  3  4.25  515/1352   4.16  4.10  3.98  4.07  4.25

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 1081/1384   3.91  3.74  4.08  3.99  3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  1  1  0  0  2.50 1363/1382   3.45  3.90  4.29  4.19  2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0  1  0  1  0  3.00 1286/1368   2.71  3.82  4.30  4.21  3.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   2  1  1  0  0  0  0  1.00  945/ 948   2.78  3.58  3.95  3.89  1.00

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   2  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/ 221   4.25  4.12  4.16  4.45  5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 2 0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/ 243   4.36  4.40  4.12  4.47  5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 2 1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 212   4.73  4.75  4.40  4.62  5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            2  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 209   4.72  4.77  4.35  4.64  5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  2  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 555   4.29  4.41  4.29  4.33  5.00

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  88   3.75  3.97  4.54  3.75  5.00
```

```
                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 201  0205              University of Maryland                                    Page  429
Title      COMPUTER SCIENCE I               Baltimore County                                         FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    EVANS, SUSAN A               Fall   2008                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires:  8                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                       Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
        Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
        General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0  1  2  0  3  1  3.14 1585/1649  4.30  4.28  4.28  4.29  3.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  3  1  3  3.75 1347/1648  4.37  4.26  4.23  4.25  3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  2  1  4  4.00  950/1375  4.56  4.31  4.27  4.37  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   3  0  1  0  1  2  4.00 1067/1595  4.37  4.26  4.20  4.22  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  3  0  1  3  0  1  3.20 1385/1533  3.20  3.69  4.04  4.04  3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7 1 0 0 0 0  1.00 ****/1512  4.45  4.15  4.10  4.14  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  1  0  0  6  4.13  957/1623  4.60  4.32  4.16  4.21  4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1646  4.93  4.79  4.69  4.63  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 2 4 1 3.86 1105/1621  4.17  4.01  4.06  4.01  3.86


        Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  1  2  0  5  4.13 1220/1568  4.50  4.40  4.43  4.39  4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  2  1  1  4  3.88 1498/1572  4.54  4.66  4.70  4.73  3.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  2  1  1  4  3.88 1235/1564  4.45  4.24  4.28  4.27  3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  2  0  3  3  3.88 1211/1559  4.36  4.26  4.29  4.33  3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 1 2 1 0 3  3.29 1149/1352  4.16  4.10  3.98  4.07  3.29


        Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  2  0  1  2  3.60 1039/1384  3.91  3.74  4.08  3.99  3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  1  1  0  1  1  3.00 1316/1382  3.45  3.90  4.29  4.19  3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 1 0 1 1  3.00 1286/1368  2.71  3.82  4.30  4.21  3.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   3  0  1  0  1  0  3.00  844/ 948  2.78  3.58  3.95  3.89  3.00


        Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  3   1  1  1  0  0  2  3.25  208/ 221  4.25  4.12  4.16  4.45  3.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 0 1 1 0 0 3  3.60  199/ 243  4.36  4.40  4.12  4.47  3.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3 0 0 1 0 1 3  4.20  139/ 212  4.73  4.75  4.40  4.62  4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           3   0  0  1  0  0  4  4.40  116/ 209  4.72  4.77  4.35  4.64  4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 2   1  0  1  2  0  2  3.60  464/ 555  4.29  4.41  4.29  4.33  3.60


        Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5  1  0  1  1  0  0  2.50   88/  88  3.75  3.97  4.54  3.75  2.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 5 0 0 1 1 0 1  3.33   84/  85  3.33  3.79  4.47  3.33  3.33
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 5  0  0  1  0  1  1  3.67   75/  81  3.67  3.58  4.43  3.67  3.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    6   1  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  92  ****  4.00  4.35  5.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                5   0  0  1  1  1  0  3.00  229/ 288  3.00  3.26  3.68  3.65  3.00


        Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 6   0  1  0  1  0  0  2.00   49/  52  2.00  2.00  4.06  3.93  2.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  6   0  1  0  1  0  0  2.00   48/  48  2.00  2.00  4.09  4.05  2.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       6   1  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47  4.49  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   6   0  1  1  0  0  0  1.50   39/  39  1.50  1.50  4.38  3.66  1.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  3   1  0  2  0  2  0  3.00  256/ 312  3.25  3.56  3.68  3.59  3.00


        Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 6   0  0  1  1  0  0  2.50   53/  53  2.50  2.50  4.30  4.07  2.50
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    6   0  1  1  0  0  0  1.50   30/  30  1.50  1.50  4.16  1.50  1.50
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      6   0  0  2  0  0  0  2.00   41/  41  2.00  2.00  4.43  3.50  2.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       6   0  0  2  0  0  0  2.00   24/  24  2.00  2.00  4.42  2.00  2.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     6   0  0  2  0  0  0  2.00  107/ 110  2.00  3.20  3.99  3.72  2.00
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 201  0205                  University of Maryland                        Page  429
Title           COMPUTER SCIENCE I               Baltimore County                             FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:     EVANS, SUSAN A                   Fall   2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     20
Questionnaires: 8                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                      Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 201  0206                    University of Maryland                                     Page  430
Title       COMPUTER SCIENCE I                      Baltimore County                                        FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   EVANS, SUSAN A                        Fall   2008                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     20
Questionnaires:   7                           Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                            Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                              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   2   4  4.43   749/1649  4.30  4.28  4.28  4.29  4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   1   1   1   4  4.14  1021/1648  4.37  4.26  4.23  4.25  4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   0   1   0   0   6  4.57   488/1375  4.56  4.31  4.27  4.37  4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   2   0   1   1   1   2  3.80  1260/1595  4.37  4.26  4.20  4.22  3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  4   2   0   0   0   1  2.33  1520/1533  3.20  3.69  4.04  4.04  2.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3  0   1   1   0   2  3.75  1119/1512  4.45  4.15  4.10  4.14  3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0   0   1   1   5  4.57   427/1623  4.60  4.32  4.16  4.21  4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0   0   0   0   7  5.00     1/1646  4.93  4.79  4.69  4.63  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0  0   1   1   3  4.40   511/1621  4.17  4.01  4.06  4.01  4.40


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0   0   0   0   7  5.00     1/1568  4.50  4.40  4.43  4.39  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0   0   0   0   7  5.00     1/1572  4.54  4.66  4.70  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0   0   1   2   4  4.43   754/1564  4.45  4.24  4.28  4.27  4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   1   0   1   1   4  4.00  1121/1559  4.36  4.26  4.29  4.33  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 1  0   1   0   5  4.14   599/1352  4.16  4.10  3.98  4.07  4.14


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0  2   0   1   1   1  2.80  1314/1384  3.91  3.74  4.08  3.99  2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0  2   0   2   0   1  2.60  1356/1382  3.45  3.90  4.29  4.19  2.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1  1   2   0   1  2.80  1326/1368  2.71  3.82  4.30  4.21  2.80
4. Were special techniques successful                 2   4   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 948  2.78  3.58  3.95  3.89  ****


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 3   0   0   0   0   1   3  4.75    31/ 221  4.25  4.12  4.16  4.45  4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 0 0  0   1   0   3  4.50    65/ 243  4.36  4.40  4.12  4.47  4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3 0  0   0   0   0   4  5.00     1/ 212  4.73  4.75  4.40  4.62  5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          3   0   0   0   1   0   3  4.50   109/ 209  4.72  4.77  4.35  4.64  4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3  3   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 555  4.29  4.41  4.29  4.33  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  88  3.75  3.97  4.54  3.75  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 0 0  0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  85  3.33  3.79  4.47  3.33  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 6 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  81  3.67  3.58  4.43  3.67  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               5   1   0   1   0   0   0  2.00  ****/ 288  3.00  3.26  3.68  3.65  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 6 0  0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  52  2.00  2.00  4.06  3.93  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 6 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  48  2.00  2.00  4.09  4.05  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      6   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47  4.49  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 5 1  0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 312  3.25  3.56  3.68  3.59  ****


            Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    6   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 110  2.00  3.20  3.99  3.72  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 202  0101              University of Maryland                            Page  431
Title       COMPUTER SCIENCE II             Baltimore County                                 FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  FREY, DENNIS                   Fall   2008                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     17
Questionnaires:  16                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                 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  2  6  7  4.19 1037/1649  4.48  4.28  4.28 4.29  4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0  0  4  3  9  4.31  825/1648  4.63  4.26  4.23 4.25  4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   2  0  2  4  8  4.00  950/1375  4.53  4.31  4.27 4.37  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2   0  2  2  2  8  4.14  956/1595  4.62  4.26  4.20 4.22  4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  12   0  0  1  1  2  4.25  624/1533  3.43  3.69  4.04 4.04  4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 9   0  0  1  2  4  4.43  493/1512  4.74  4.15  4.10 4.14  4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0   0  0  2  3 10  4.53  469/1623  4.70  4.32  4.16 4.21  4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0  0  0  2 14  4.88  714/1646  4.99  4.79  4.69 4.63  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0   0  0  3  7  4  4.07  875/1621  3.97  4.01  4.06 4.01  4.07

               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0  0  1  2 13  4.75  480/1568  4.60  4.40  4.43 4.39  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0  0  1  1 14  4.81  815/1572  4.86  4.66  4.70 4.73  4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0  0  3  6  7  4.25  939/1564  4.46  4.24  4.28 4.27  4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0  0  2  5  9  4.44  790/1559  4.65  4.26  4.29 4.33  4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  1   1  0  2  3  9  4.27  508/1352  4.45  4.10  3.98 4.07  4.27

               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0   1  3  3  7  2  3.38 1137/1384  3.76  3.74  4.08 3.99  3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0   0   3  2  3  4  4  3.25 1275/1382  3.95  3.90  4.29 4.19  3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0   4  1  3  6  2  3.06 1284/1368  3.56  3.82  4.30 4.21  3.06
4. Were special techniques successful                   0  13   0  0  1  2  0  3.67 ****/ 948  ****  3.58  3.95 3.89  ****

               Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  4   0   0  0  0  0 12  5.00    1/ 555  4.83  4.41  4.29 4.33  5.00

               Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                14   0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 288  4.21  3.26  3.68 3.65  ****

               Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 15   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 312  4.33  3.56  3.68 3.59  ****

               Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     13   0   0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/ 110  4.00  3.20  3.99 3.72  ****
```

```
                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades       Reasons              Type               Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      2      0.00-0.99   0      A    3       Required for Majors  0    Graduate     0      Major      12
  28-55      3      1.00-1.99   0      B   10                                 Under-grad  16      Non-major   4
  56-83      1      2.00-2.99   5      C    3       General              0    Under-grad  16      Non-major   4
  84-150     2      3.00-3.49   4      D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   3      F    0       Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0       Other               15
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 202  0201            University of Maryland                                         Page  432
Title      COMPUTER SCIENCE II               Baltimore County                                           FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   FREY, DENNIS                       Fall   2008                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires:  18               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions             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  6  11  4.56   577/1649  4.48  4.28  4.28  4.29  4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      0   0  0  0  2  4  12  4.56   498/1648  4.63  4.26  4.23  4.25  4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  3  6   9  4.33   733/1375  4.53  4.31  4.27  4.37  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      0   0  0  0  2  5  11  4.50   497/1595  4.62  4.26  4.20  4.22  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  10  1  1  2  2   2  3.38  1326/1533  3.43  3.69  4.04  4.04  3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 13  0  0  0  1   4  4.80   156/1512  4.74  4.15  4.10  4.14  4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              0   0  0  1  1  6  10  4.39   659/1623  4.70  4.32  4.16  4.21  4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled                    2   0  0  0  0  0  16  5.00     1/1646  4.99  4.79  4.69  4.63  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  0  0  2  9   6  4.24   709/1621  3.97  4.01  4.06  4.01  4.24

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          0   0  0  0  1  5  12  4.61   715/1568  4.60  4.40  4.43  4.39  4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     1   0  0  0  0  3  14  4.82   790/1572  4.86  4.66  4.70  4.73  4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  2   0  0  0  2  3  11  4.56   590/1564  4.46  4.24  4.28  4.27  4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       1   0  0  0  1  4  12  4.65   536/1559  4.65  4.26  4.29  4.33  4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2   1  0  0  4  2   9  4.33   457/1352  4.45  4.10  3.98  4.07  4.33

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1   0  0  0  3  2  12  4.53   424/1384  3.76  3.74  4.08  3.99  4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  1   0  0  0  4  5   8  4.24   844/1382  3.95  3.90  4.29  4.19  4.24
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1   0  0  1  7  3   6  3.82  1063/1368  3.56  3.82  4.30  4.21  3.82
4. Were special techniques successful                    1  15  0  0  1  0   1  4.00  ****/ 948  ****  3.58  3.95  3.89  ****

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   16   0  1  0  1  0   0  2.00  ****/ 221  3.56  4.12  4.16  4.45  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0  0  0  2  0   0  3.00  ****/ 243  4.50  4.40  4.12  4.47  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16  1  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/ 212  4.71  4.75  4.40  4.62  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            16   0  0  0  0  0   2  5.00  ****/ 209  5.00  4.77  4.35  4.64  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  16   1  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/ 555  4.83  4.41  4.29  4.33  ****


                                  Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0       0.00-0.99   0        A    3      Required for Majors  0     Graduate      0       Major       7
 28-55      3       1.00-1.99   0        B   12
 56-83      3       2.00-2.99   4        C    2      General              1     Under-grad   18       Non-major  11
 84-150     2       3.00-3.49   0        D    0
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   5        F    0      Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    1                                responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other               16
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 202  0202                    University of Maryland                                    Page  433
Title           COMPUTER SCIENCE II               Baltimore County                                         FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:     FREY, DENNIS    (Instr. A)              Fall   2008                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      18
Questionnaires:   1                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                     Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                    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   1  5.00    1/1649  4.48  4.28  4.28  4.29  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1648  4.63  4.26  4.23  4.25  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1375  4.53  4.31  4.27  4.37  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1595  4.62  4.26  4.20  4.22  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 1441/1533  3.43  3.69  4.04  4.04  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1512  4.74  4.15  4.10  4.14  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1623  4.70  4.32  4.16  4.21  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1646  4.99  4.79  4.69  4.63  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1621  3.97  4.01  4.06  4.01  3.67

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1568  4.60  4.40  4.43  4.39  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1572  4.86  4.66  4.70  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1564  4.46  4.24  4.28  4.27  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1559  4.65  4.26  4.29  4.33  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0  0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1352  4.45  4.10  3.98  4.07  5.00

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 1254/1384  3.76  3.74  4.08  3.99  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  946/1382  3.95  3.90  4.29  4.19  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0  0   1   0   0  3.00 1286/1368  3.56  3.82  4.30  4.21  3.00
```

```
                                             Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 202  0202              University of Maryland                                  Page  434
Title       COMPUTER SCIENCE II                 Baltimore County                                  FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:                  (Instr. B)             Fall   2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      18
Questionnaires:   1                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                       Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                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  1  5.00   1/1649   4.48  4.28  4.28  4.29  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1648   4.63  4.26  4.23  4.25  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1375   4.53  4.31  4.27  4.37  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1595   4.62  4.26  4.20  4.22  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1441/1533   3.43  3.69  4.04  4.04  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1512   4.74  4.15  4.10  4.14  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1623   4.70  4.32  4.16  4.21  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1646   4.99  4.79  4.69  4.63  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1504/1621   3.97  4.01  4.06  4.01  3.67


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  0  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1254/1384   3.76  3.74  4.08  3.99  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  0  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  946/1382   3.95  3.90  4.29  4.19  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1286/1368   3.56  3.82  4.30  4.21  3.00


                                        Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 202  0202                    University of Maryland                              Page  435
Title          COMPUTER SCIENCE II                  Baltimore County                                 FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:                    (Instr. C)              Fall   2008                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      18
Questionnaires:  1                            Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                   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  1  5.00    1/1649   4.48  4.28  4.28  4.29  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1648   4.63  4.26  4.23  4.25  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1375   4.53  4.31  4.27  4.37  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1595   4.62  4.26  4.20  4.22  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1441/1533   3.43  3.69  4.04  4.04  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1512   4.74  4.15  4.10  4.14  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1623   4.70  4.32  4.16  4.21  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1646   4.99  4.79  4.69  4.63  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0  1  0  0  3.00 1504/1621   3.97  4.01  4.06  4.01  3.67

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1254/1384   3.76  3.74  4.08  3.99  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  946/1382   3.95  3.90  4.29  4.19  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1286/1368   3.56  3.82  4.30  4.21  3.00
```

```
                                            Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 202  0301              University of Maryland                        Page  436
Title      COMPUTER SCIENCE II              Baltimore County                              FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   FREY, DENNIS                  Fall   2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    19
Questionnaires: 18                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                             Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                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  6 12 4.67  433/1649 4.48  4.28  4.28 4.29  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  1  1  4 12 4.50  556/1648 4.63  4.26  4.23 4.25  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  2  4  2 10 4.11  908/1375 4.53  4.31  4.27 4.37  4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  3  0  0  1  4 10 4.60  383/1595 4.62  4.26  4.20 4.22  4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 10  0  0  3  2  3 4.00  815/1533 3.43  3.69  4.04 4.04  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 9  0  0  1  1  6 4.63  294/1512 4.74  4.15  4.10 4.14  4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  2  2 14 4.67  321/1623 4.70  4.32  4.16 4.21  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0 18 5.00    1/1646 4.99  4.79  4.69 4.63  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  1  6  9 4.50  374/1621 3.97  4.01  4.06 4.01  4.50

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  1  0  4 12 4.59  755/1568 4.60  4.40  4.43 4.39  4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  1 17 4.94  355/1572 4.86  4.66  4.70 4.73  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0  0  0  5 13 4.72  390/1564 4.46  4.24  4.28 4.27  4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  1  0  0  2  0 15 4.76  376/1559 4.65  4.26  4.29 4.33  4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1  0  0  1  2 13 4.75  157/1352 4.45  4.10  3.98 4.07  4.75

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0  0  0  3  4  9 4.38  571/1384 3.76  3.74  4.08 3.99  4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0  0  2  0  7  7 4.19  875/1382 3.95  3.90  4.29 4.19  4.19
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  2  0  3  1 10 4.06  931/1368 3.56  3.82  4.30 4.21  4.06
4. Were special techniques successful                  3 12  0  0  0  1  2 4.67 ****/ 948  ****  3.58  3.95 3.89  ****

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 14  0  0  1  0  1  2 4.00 ****/ 221 3.56  4.12  4.16 4.45  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0 1 1 2  0 3.25 ****/ 243 4.50  4.40  4.12 4.47  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 14 0 0 0 0 1  3 4.75 ****/ 212 4.71  4.75  4.40 4.62  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          14  0  0  0  3  0  1 3.50 ****/ 209 5.00  4.77  4.35 4.64  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  8  0  0  0  1  0  9 4.80  238/ 555 4.83  4.41  4.29 4.33  4.80

                Seminar
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   17  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  92  ****  4.00  4.35 5.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               11  0  0  0  0  4  3 4.43   49/ 288 4.21  3.26  3.68 3.65  4.43

                Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 12  0  0  0  0  6  0 4.00   68/ 312 4.33  3.56  3.68 3.59  4.00

                Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    16  0  0  0  0  2  0 4.00 ****/ 110 4.00  3.20  3.99 3.72  ****
```

```
                             Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                  Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1       0.00-0.99   0       A    4       Required for Majors  0    Graduate      0     Major        7
 28-55      5       1.00-1.99   0       B    9
 56-83      3       2.00-2.99   3       C    2       General              0    Under-grad   18     Non-major   11
 84-150     0       3.00-3.49   3       D    1
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   2       F    0       Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other               15
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 202  0302                    University of Maryland                                    Page  437
Title       COMPUTER SCIENCE II                    Baltimore County                                        FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   FREY, DENNIS                          Fall  2008                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    19
Questionnaires:  8                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                   Questions                  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  2  5  4.50  644/1649  4.48  4.28  4.28  4.29  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  4  4  4.50  556/1648  4.63  4.26  4.23  4.25  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  1  0  0  4  3  4.00  950/1375  4.53  4.31  4.27  4.37  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  1  1  1  5  4.25  818/1595  4.62  4.26  4.20  4.22  4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  4  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  624/1533  3.43  3.69  4.04  4.04  4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  310/1512  4.74  4.15  4.10  4.14  4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  2  0  6  4.50  502/1623  4.70  4.32  4.16  4.21  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1646  4.99  4.79  4.69  4.63  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  0  0  5  3  4.38  547/1621  3.97  4.01  4.06  4.01  4.38

                   Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  287/1568  4.60  4.40  4.43  4.39  4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  665/1572  4.86  4.66  4.70  4.73  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1564  4.46  4.24  4.28  4.27  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  390/1559  4.65  4.26  4.29  4.33  4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1  0  0  1  2  3  4.33  457/1352  4.45  4.10  3.98  4.07  4.33

                   Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  1  2  4  4.43  520/1384  3.76  3.74  4.08  3.99  4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  3  0  4  4.14  899/1382  3.95  3.90  4.29  4.19  4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0  0  0  2  2  3  4.14  900/1368  3.56  3.82  4.30  4.21  4.14
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   6  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/ 948  ****  3.58  3.95  3.89  ****

                   Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  7   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 221  3.56  4.12  4.16  4.45  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 243  4.50  4.40  4.12  4.47  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 212  4.71  4.75  4.40  4.62  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           7   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 209  5.00  4.77  4.35  4.64  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  4  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/ 555  4.83  4.41  4.29  4.33  5.00

                   Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                5   0  0  0  0  3  0  4.00   83/ 288  4.21  3.26  3.68  3.65  4.00

                   Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  5  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   21/ 312  4.33  3.56  3.68  3.59  4.67

                   Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     5   0  0  0  0  3  0  4.00   40/ 110  4.00  3.20  3.99  3.72  4.00
```

                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 202  0401                University of Maryland                                      Page  438
Title      COMPUTER SCIENCE II                    Baltimore County                                       FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   MITCHELL, SUSAN                        Fall  2008                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    19
Questionnaires:  9                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                   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  2  3  3  3.89 1287/1649  4.48  4.28  4.28 4.29  3.89
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  2  2  5  4.33  797/1648  4.63  4.26  4.23 4.25  4.33
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  1  0  0  2  6  4.33  733/1375  4.53  4.31  4.27 4.37  4.33
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2  0  0  0  3  4  4.57  417/1595  4.62  4.26  4.20 4.22  4.57
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   4  2  0  1  0  2  3.00 1441/1533  3.43  3.69  4.04 4.04  3.00
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 4  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  687/1512  4.74  4.15  4.10 4.14  4.25
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  1  0  4  4  4.22  849/1623  4.70  4.32  4.16 4.21  4.22
 8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1646  4.99  4.79  4.69 4.63  5.00
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1  0  1  1  5  0  3.57 1314/1621  3.97  4.01  4.06 4.01  3.57


              Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  1  0  0  6  2  3.89 1354/1568  4.60  4.40  4.43 4.39  3.89
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  4  5  4.56 1193/1572  4.86  4.66  4.70 4.73  4.56
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  1  0  2  4  2  3.67 1336/1564  4.46  4.24  4.28 4.27  3.67
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  2  1  6  4.44  777/1559  4.65  4.26  4.29 4.33  4.44
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  6  0  0  1  1  1  4.00  690/1352  4.45  4.10  3.98 4.07  4.00


              Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40  541/1384  3.76  3.74  4.08 3.99  4.40
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0  0  1  1  1  2  3.80 1069/1382  3.95  3.90  4.29 4.19  3.80
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40  752/1368  3.56  3.82  4.30 4.21  4.40


              Laboratory
 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   0   0  0  0  3  2  4  4.11  127/ 221  3.56  4.12  4.16 4.45  4.11
 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 1  0  1  0  0  4  3  4.00  155/ 243  4.50  4.40  4.12 4.47  4.00
 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 0  2  1  0  0  0  6  4.43  118/ 212  4.71  4.75  4.40 4.62  4.43
 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            0   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/ 209  5.00  4.77  4.35 4.64  5.00
 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  0   6  0  0  1  0  2  4.33  338/ 555  4.83  4.41  4.29 4.33  4.33

              Seminar
 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 8   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 288  4.21  3.26  3.68 3.65  ****

              Field Work
 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  8   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 312  4.33  3.56  3.68 3.59  ****

                                     Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 202  0402                    University of Maryland                                  Page  439
Title       COMPUTER SCIENCE II                     Baltimore County                                     FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  MITCHELL, SUSAN                           Fall   2008                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      9
Questionnaires:  2                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                   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  1  0  3.50 1498/1649  4.48  4.28   4.28 4.29  3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  556/1648  4.63  4.26   4.23 4.25  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1375  4.53  4.31   4.27 4.37  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  497/1595  4.62  4.26   4.20 4.22  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1441/1533  3.43  3.69   4.04 4.04  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1512  4.74  4.15   4.10 4.14  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1623  4.70  4.32   4.16 4.21  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1646  4.99  4.79   4.69 4.63  5.00

               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  852/1568  4.60  4.40   4.43 4.39  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1572  4.86  4.66   4.70 4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 1127/1564  4.46  4.24   4.28 4.27  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  695/1559  4.65  4.26   4.29 4.33  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0  0  0  1  1  4.50  303/1352  4.45  4.10   3.98 4.07  4.50

               Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 0   0  1  0  0  0  1  3.00  216/ 221  3.56  4.12   4.16 4.45  3.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 0 0 0 0 0 0  2  5.00    1/ 243  4.50  4.40   4.12 4.47  5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 0 1 0 0 0  0  1  5.00    1/ 212  4.71  4.75   4.40 4.62  5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/ 209  5.00  4.77   4.35 4.64  5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 0  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 555  4.83  4.41   4.29 4.33  5.00
```

                          Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 203  0101                University of Maryland                         Page  440
Title         DISCRETE STRUCTURES               Baltimore County                            FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   ARTOLA, PAUL                      Fall  2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      44
Questionnaires:  29                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                     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  3  0  9 14  4.07 1136/1649  3.71  4.28  4.28  4.29  4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      1  0  1  2  2  7 16  4.25  897/1648  3.89  4.26  4.23  4.25  4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     1  0  0  3  1  6 18  4.39  674/1375  4.15  4.31  4.27  4.37  4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      2  4  1  1  2  5 14  4.30  759/1595  4.13  4.26  4.20  4.22  4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  1 11  2  3  3  3  6  3.47 1269/1533  3.56  3.69  4.04  4.04  3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  8  2  0  2  6 10  4.10  835/1512  3.85  4.15  4.10  4.14  4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              1  0  0  1  2  2 23  4.68  308/1623  4.27  4.32  4.16  4.21  4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled                    1  1  0  1  0  8 18  4.59 1112/1646  4.79  4.79  4.69  4.63  4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6  0  0  1  2 11  9  4.22  731/1621  3.53  4.01  4.06  4.01  4.22


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          2  0  0  1  1  2 23  4.74  498/1568  4.16  4.40  4.43  4.39  4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     2  0  0  0  1  5 21  4.74  949/1572  4.47  4.66  4.70  4.73  4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  2  0  2  1  1  4 19  4.37  812/1564  3.90  4.24  4.28  4.27  4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       2  1  2  0  1  5 18  4.42  804/1559  3.87  4.26  4.29  4.33  4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 14  2  0  1  4  5  3.83  860/1352  3.42  4.10  3.98  4.07  3.83


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18  0  2  1  1  2  5  3.64 1025/1384  2.99  3.74  4.08  3.99  3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18  0  1  1  1  2  6  4.00  946/1382  3.28  3.90  4.29  4.19  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18  0  0  0  2  1  8  4.55  624/1368  3.82  3.82  4.30  4.21  4.55
4. Were special techniques successful                   17  3  2  0  1  2  4  3.67  645/ 948  3.67  3.58  3.95  3.89  3.67


                Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 25  0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50 ****/ 243  ****  4.40  4.12  4.47  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 25  2  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/ 212  ****  4.75  4.40  4.62  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            25  2  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/ 209  ****  4.77  4.35  4.64  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  21  2  0  0  0  1  5  4.83 ****/ 555  4.82  4.41  4.29  4.33  ****


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 25  2  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/  88  ****  3.97  4.54  3.75  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 25  2  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  85  ****  3.79  4.47  3.33  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 25  2  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  81  ****  3.58  4.43  3.67  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     25  1  1  0  0  1  1  3.33 ****/  92  ****  4.00  4.35  5.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 23  0  1  0  0  2  3  4.00 ****/ 288  ****  3.26  3.68  3.65  ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  26  0  0  1  0  1  1  3.67 ****/  52  ****  2.00  4.06  3.93  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  26  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/  48  ****  2.00  4.09  4.05  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        26  0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47  4.49  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    26  0  0  1  0  1  1  3.67 ****/  39  ****  1.50  4.38  3.66  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  23  0  0  0  1  4  1  4.00 ****/ 312  ****  3.56  3.68  3.59  ****


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 26  0  0  1  0  1  1  3.67 ****/  53  ****  2.50  4.30  4.07  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     26  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/  30  ****  1.50  4.16  1.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       26  0  1  0  0  0  2  3.67 ****/  41  ****  2.00  4.43  3.50  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        26  1  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  24  ****  2.00  4.42  2.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      24  1  0  1  0  2  1  3.75 ****/ 110  ****  3.20  3.99  3.72  ****
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 203  0101          University of Maryland                    Page  440
Title          DISCRETE STRUCTURES      Baltimore County                        FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    ARTOLA, PAUL             Fall   2008                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       44
Questionnaires:  29                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                       Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades           Reasons                Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1        0.00-0.99   1       A   14        Required for Majors   0    Graduate     0     Major          4
 28-55      7        1.00-1.99   0       B    5
 56-83      6        2.00-2.99   2       C    4        General               1    Under-grad  29     Non-major     25
 84-150     2        3.00-3.49   3       D    0
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   9       F    0        Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                22
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 203  0201           University of Maryland                                    Page  441
Title       DISCRETE STRUCTURES          Baltimore County                                         FEB 11, 2009
Instructor: YESHA, YAACOV                Fall   2008                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      38
Questionnaires: 21                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                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  2 10  3  2 2.86 1625/1649  3.71  4.28  4.28 4.29  2.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     3   0  1  2  9  4  2 3.22 1567/1648  3.89  4.26  4.23 4.25  3.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  1  4  7  1  8 3.52 1200/1375  4.15  4.31  4.27 4.37  3.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   4  1  2  4  4  5 3.63 1359/1595  4.13  4.26  4.20 4.22  3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   4  4  2  6  3  2 2.82 1487/1533  3.56  3.69  4.04 4.04  2.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4  4  1  6  2  4 3.06 1422/1512  3.85  4.15  4.10 4.14  3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  1  3  4  2 11 3.90 1180/1623  4.27  4.32  4.16 4.21  3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  4 17 4.81  833/1646  4.79  4.79  4.69 4.63  4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0  3  1  6  4  0 2.79 1557/1621  3.53  4.01  4.06 4.01  2.79

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  1  1  7  5  6 3.70 1418/1568  4.16  4.40  4.43 4.39  3.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  0  0  6  5  8 4.11 1449/1572  4.47  4.66  4.70 4.73  4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  1  0 12  3  3 3.37 1435/1564  3.90  4.24  4.28 4.27  3.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  2  2 10  4  2 3.10 1468/1559  3.87  4.26  4.29 4.33  3.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  1  0  3  7  5  4 3.53 1039/1352  3.42  4.10  3.98 4.07  3.53

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8   0  3  3  5  2  0 2.46 1349/1384  2.99  3.74  4.08 3.99  2.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8   0  2  5  5  0  1 2.46 1365/1382  3.28  3.90  4.29 4.19  2.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8  0  2  1  5  3  2 3.15 1274/1368  3.82  3.82  4.30 4.21  3.15
4. Were special techniques successful                   8  12  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/ 948  3.67  3.58  3.95 3.89  ****

              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0  2  0  2  0  0 2.00 ****/ 243  ****  4.40  4.12 4.47  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 4  0  1  0  0  0 2.00 ****/ 212  ****  4.75  4.40 4.62  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            16  3  0  1  0  0  1 3.50 ****/ 209  ****  4.77  4.35 4.64  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified   0  4  0  1  0  0 16 4.82  236/ 555  4.82  4.41  4.29 4.33  4.82

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16  2  1  0  1  0  1 3.00 ****/  88  ****  3.97  4.54 3.75  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 3  1  0  1  0  0 2.00 ****/  85  ****  3.79  4.47 3.33  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16  4  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  81  ****  3.58  4.43 3.67  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     16  3  1  0  1  0  0 2.00 ****/  92  ****  4.00  4.35 5.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 16  3  1  1  0  0  0 1.50 ****/ 288  ****  3.26  3.68 3.65  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  17  0  3  0  1  0  0 1.50 ****/  52  ****  2.00  4.06 3.93  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  17  0  2  0  2  0  0 2.00 ****/  48  ****  2.00  4.09 4.05  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        17  3  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47 4.49  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    17  2  1  0  1  0  0 2.00 ****/  39  ****  1.50  4.38 3.66  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  16  3  0  0  1  1  0 3.50 ****/ 312  ****  3.56  3.68 3.59  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16  0  2  1  1  1  0 2.20 ****/  53  ****  2.50  4.30 4.07  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     16  3  0  1  1  0  0 2.50 ****/  30  ****  1.50  4.16 1.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       16  2  1  0  2  0  0 2.33 ****/  41  ****  2.00  4.43 3.50  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        16  3  1  0  1  0  0 2.00 ****/  24  ****  2.00  4.42 2.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      15  3  1  0  1  1  0 2.67 ****/ 110  ****  3.20  3.99 3.72  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: CMSC 203  0301                  University of Maryland                              Page  442
Title          DISCRETE STRUCTURES                 Baltimore County                                 FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    LOMONACO JR, SA                      Fall   2008                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      42
Questionnaires:  26                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                      Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                     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   2  11  11  4.19 1027/1649  3.71  4.28  4.28  4.29  4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   1   4  10  11  4.19  966/1648  3.89  4.26  4.23  4.25  4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   0   0   2   8  16  4.54  521/1375  4.15  4.31  4.27  4.37  4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   7   0   0   1   8  10  4.47  538/1595  4.13  4.26  4.20  4.22  4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  3   0   0   4   6  13  4.39  485/1533  3.56  3.69  4.04  4.04  4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 8  0   0   2   7   9  4.39  543/1512  3.85  4.15  4.10  4.14  4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0   2   2  10  12  4.23  838/1623  4.27  4.32  4.16  4.21  4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0   0   0   1  25  4.96  266/1646  4.79  4.79  4.69  4.63  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 1   3   5  11   4  3.58 1310/1621  3.53  4.01  4.06  4.01  3.58

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0   0   3   2  11   9  4.04 1261/1568  4.16  4.40  4.43  4.39  4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0   0   2   0   5  18  4.56 1184/1572  4.47  4.66  4.70  4.73  4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  1   3   2   9  10  3.96 1163/1564  3.90  4.24  4.28  4.27  3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0   1   1   6   4  13  4.08 1084/1559  3.87  4.26  4.29  4.33  4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 16 2   2   2   1   2  2.89 1260/1352  3.42  4.10  3.98  4.07  2.89

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 2   0   4   1   1  2.88 1304/1384  2.99  3.74  4.08  3.99  2.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 0   2   2   3   1  3.38 1240/1382  3.28  3.90  4.29  4.19  3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0  1   2   3   2  3.75 1095/1368  3.82  3.82  4.30  4.21  3.75
4. Were special techniques successful                 18   5   1   0   2   0   0  2.33 ****/ 948  3.67  3.58  3.95  3.89  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades            Reasons                   Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0        0.00-0.99   0         A   12        Required for Majors   0      Graduate       0      Major       11
  28-55      5        1.00-1.99   0         B    9                                     
  56-83      3        2.00-2.99   2         C    4        General               0      Under-grad    26      Non-major   15
  84-150     1        3.00-3.49   5         D    0                                     
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   4         F    0        Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                            I    0        Other                24
                                            ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 304  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  443
Title        SOCIAL/ETHICAL ISS IN            Baltimore County                               FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  WILSON, RICHARD                  Fall  2008                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      37
Questionnaires:  19                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                    Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions           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  2  1  3  8  5  3.68 1415/1649 3.68  4.28  4.28 4.27  3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  1  1  1  9  7  4.05 1094/1648 4.05  4.26  4.23 4.18  4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  2  2  7  8  4.11  915/1375 4.11  4.31  4.27 4.22  4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  1  6 12  4.58  417/1595 4.58  4.26  4.20 4.21  4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 6  0  2  3  4  4  3.77 1055/1533 3.77  3.69  4.04 4.05  3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 7 10 4.37  564/1512 4.37  4.15  4.10 4.11  4.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  2  8  5  2  2  2.68 1589/1623 2.68  4.32  4.16 4.08  2.68
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  1 18  4.95  398/1646 4.95  4.79  4.69 4.67  4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 0 1 5 8 0 3.50 1345/1621 3.50  4.01  4.06 4.02  3.50

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  1  2  3  9  4  3.68 1422/1568 3.68  4.40  4.43 4.39  3.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  1  1 17  4.84  740/1572 4.84  4.66  4.70 4.64  4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 2 3 6 7  3.84 1251/1564 3.84  4.24  4.28 4.25  3.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  2  2  3  6  6  3.63 1333/1559 3.63  4.26  4.29 4.23  3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 10 4 0 2 2 0  2.25 1328/1352 2.25  4.10  3.98 3.97  2.25

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 1 0 3 5 1  3.50 1081/1384 3.50  3.74  4.08 4.11  3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 4 0 3 3  3.50 1216/1382 3.50  3.90  4.29 4.37  3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 1 2 2 5 4.10  920/1368 4.10  3.82  4.30 4.39  4.10
4. Were special techniques successful                 9  2  2  0  4  1  1  2.88  883/ 948 2.88  3.58  3.95 4.00  2.88

            Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 0 0 0 0 0 3  5.00 ****/ 555 **** 4.41  4.29 4.22  ****

            Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear              17  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/ 288 **** 3.26  3.68 3.58  ****

            Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13 0 0 0 0 6 0  4.00   68/ 312 4.00  3.56  3.68 3.60  4.00

            Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students   18  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 110 **** 3.20  3.99 4.05  ****

                                Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 313  0101              University of Maryland                                        Page  444
Title       COMP ORGAN & ASSEMB LA           Baltimore County                                            FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  MOHAMMADPOURRAD                  Fall  2008                                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     37
Questionnaires: 27                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept UMBC Level Sect
                Questions              NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1  0  1  1  9  5 10 3.85 1319/1649 3.92 4.28 4.28 4.27 3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  3 12  8  4 3.48 1490/1648 3.33 4.26 4.23 4.18 3.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  2  2 13  6  4 3.30 1269/1375 3.40 4.31 4.27 4.22 3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  6  3  1  9  6  1 3.05 1532/1595 3.15 4.26 4.20 4.21 3.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 8  0  3  6  6  4 3.58 1200/1533 3.25 3.69 4.04 4.05 3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 9 1  0  8  6  3 3.56 1234/1512 3.08 4.15 4.10 4.11 3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  5  4 12  2  4 2.85 1565/1623 2.89 4.32 4.16 4.08 2.85
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  2  0  0  1 14  9 4.33 1340/1646 4.48 4.79 4.69 4.67 4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 2  4 11  5  2 3.04 1497/1621 2.87 4.01 4.06 4.02 3.04


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  1  4 10  6  5 3.38 1483/1568 3.60 4.40 4.43 4.39 3.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  3  1  8  7  7 3.54 1535/1572 3.61 4.66 4.70 4.64 3.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0  2  5 12  4  2 2.96 1505/1564 2.89 4.24 4.28 4.25 2.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  1  4  6  6  6  3 2.92 1498/1559 3.05 4.26 4.29 4.23 2.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 5 3  3  8  6  0 2.85 1264/1352 3.07 4.10 3.98 3.97 2.85


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 24 0 1  1  1  0  0 2.00 ****/1384 **** 3.74 4.08 4.11 ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 25 0 0  0  0  1  1 4.50 ****/1382 **** 3.90 4.29 4.37 ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 25 0 0  0  1  0  1 4.00 ****/1368 **** 3.82 4.30 4.39 ****


                Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 19  0  0  0  0  0  8 5.00    1/ 555 5.00 4.41 4.29 4.22 5.00


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 26 0 0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  88 **** 3.97 4.54 4.63 ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 26 0 0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  85 **** 3.79 4.47 4.55 ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                22  1  0  0  0  4  0 4.00 ****/ 288 **** 3.26 3.68 3.58 ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 26 0 1  0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/  52 **** 2.00 4.06 3.59 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 26 0 0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  48 **** 2.00 4.09 4.21 ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       26  0  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/  39 **** **** 4.47 4.43 ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   26  0  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/  39 **** 1.50 4.38 4.32 ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 21  0  0  0  0  6  0 4.00 ****/ 312 3.67 3.56 3.68 3.60 ****


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 26 0 0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  53 **** 2.50 4.30 4.32 ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    26  0  0  1  0  0  0 2.00 ****/  30 **** 1.50 4.16 4.44 ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      26  0  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/  41 **** 2.00 4.43 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   0     Graduate      0      Major       21
28-55      1        1.00-1.99    0      B    5                                Under-grad   27      Non-major    6
56-83      8        2.00-2.99    2      C   11     General               1     Under-grad   27      Non-major    6
84-150     4        3.00-3.49    4      D    2
Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    6      F    0     Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                22
```

? 2

```
Course-Section: CMSC 313  0201             University of Maryland                                    Page  445
Title     COMP ORGAN & ASSEMB LA            Baltimore County                                         FEB 11, 2009
Instructor: MOHAMMADPOURRAD                 Fall  2008                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    23
Questionnaires: 16                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept UMBC Level Sect
           Questions                 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  3  4  7  4.00 1183/1649  3.92  4.28  4.28 4.27 4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  2  3  5  2  4  3.19 1574/1648  3.33  4.26  4.23 4.18 3.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  1  4  2  4  5  3.50 1208/1375  3.40  4.31  4.27 4.22 3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  3  2  3  2  0  5  3.25 1490/1595  3.15  4.26  4.20 4.21 3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2  5  1  2  2  4  2.93 1469/1533  3.25  3.69  4.04 4.05 2.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  6  3  4  0  0  3  2.60 1491/1512  3.08  4.15  4.10 4.11 2.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  4  3  2  4  3  2.94 1551/1623  2.89  4.32  4.16 4.08 2.94
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  6 10  4.63 1081/1646  4.48  4.79  4.69 4.67 4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  0  3  2  5  2  1  2.69 1568/1621  2.87  4.01  4.06 4.02 2.69


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  1  5  6  4  3.81 1381/1568  3.60  4.40  4.43 4.39 3.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  1  3  3  2  7  3.69 1523/1572  3.61  4.66  4.70 4.64 3.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  4  3  4  2  3  2.81 1525/1564  2.89  4.24  4.28 4.25 2.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  2  4  4  1  5  3.19 1452/1559  3.05  4.26  4.29 4.23 3.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  2  3  2  2  2  5  3.29 1149/1352  3.07  4.10  3.98 3.97 3.29


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13  0  1  1  0  0  1  2.67 ****/1384  ****  3.74  4.08 4.11 ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13  0  2  0  0  0  1  2.33 ****/1382  ****  3.90  4.29 4.37 ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13  0  2  0  0  0  1  2.33 ****/1368  ****  3.82  4.30 4.39 ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  13  2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 948  ****  3.58  3.95 4.00 ****


           Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13  0  1  0  0  0  2  3.67 ****/ 555  5.00  4.41  4.29 4.22 ****


           Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                12  1  0  0  0  3  0  4.00 ****/ 288  ****  3.26  3.68 3.58 ****


           Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 10  0  0  1  0  5  0  3.67  207/ 312  3.67  3.56  3.68 3.60 3.67

                                         Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 331  0101              University of Maryland                        Page  446
Title      PRIN OF PROG LANGUAGES            Baltimore County                             FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   FININ, TIMOTHY                 Fall  2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    31
Questionnaires: 21                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                      Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions              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  7  6  8  4.05 1156/1649  4.15  4.28  4.28  4.27  4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  1  2  2 12  4  3.76 1340/1648  3.91  4.26  4.23  4.18  3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  2  7  8  4  3.67 1150/1375  3.99  4.31  4.27  4.22  3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  1  1  0  3  9  7  4.05 1038/1595  4.32  4.26  4.20  4.21  4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  5  0  6  6  4  3.19 1388/1533  3.68  3.69  4.04  4.05  3.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 1 1  3  6  7  3.94  966/1512  4.08  4.15  4.10  4.11  3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  4  4  8  5  3.67 1318/1623  4.05  4.32  4.16  4.08  3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  2 19  4.90  664/1646  4.42  4.79  4.69  4.67  4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0  6  8  3  3.82 1132/1621  3.75  4.01  4.06  4.02  3.82

               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  1  1  2  9  8  4.05 1261/1568  4.24  4.40  4.43  4.39  4.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  5 16  4.76  912/1572  4.57  4.66  4.70  4.64  4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0  3  1 11  6  3.95 1173/1564  4.10  4.24  4.28  4.25  3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  1  2  4  6  8  3.86 1221/1559  4.16  4.26  4.29  4.23  3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2 1  0  6  4  8  3.95  766/1352  4.05  4.10  3.98  3.97  3.95

               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 1 1  5  3  0  3.00 1254/1384  3.38  3.74  4.08  4.11  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 2 1  2  2  3  3.30 1259/1382  3.84  3.90  4.29  4.37  3.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 1 0 3  3  3  3.70 1120/1368  4.04  3.82  4.30  4.39  3.70
4. Were special techniques successful                  11  8  0  2  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 948  3.50  3.58  3.95  4.00  ****

               Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  3  0  0  0  0  0 18  5.00    1/ 555  5.00  4.41  4.29  4.22  5.00

               Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                18  0  0  0  0  3  0  4.00 ****/ 288  ****  3.26  3.68  3.58  ****

               Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  20  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 312  3.50  3.56  3.68  3.60  ****

               Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     20  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 110  ****  3.20  3.99  4.05  ****
```

                         Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0      A   7      Required for Majors  1    Graduate      1     Major       18
28-55      0       1.00-1.99    1      B   9                                Under-grad   20     Non-major    3
56-83      7       2.00-2.99    1      C   2      General              0    Under-grad   20     Non-major    3
84-150     2       3.00-3.49    2      D   0
Grad.      1       3.50-4.00    7      F   0      Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P   0                                responses to be significant
                                      I   0      Other               20
                                      ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 331  0201              University of Maryland                                 Page  447
Title          PRIN OF PROG LANGUAGES          Baltimore County                                    FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    VICK, SHON                       Fall  2008                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     25
```

```
Questionnaires: 16                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	965/1649	4.15	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	6	6	4.07	1088/1648	3.91	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	753/1375	3.99	4.31	4.27	4.22	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	405/1595	4.32	4.26	4.20	4.21	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	703/1533	3.68	3.69	4.04	4.05	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	723/1512	4.08	4.15	4.10	4.11	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	595/1623	4.05	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	5	7	4	3.94	1586/1646	4.42	4.79	4.69	4.67	3.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	2	5	3	3.67	1261/1621	3.75	4.01	4.06	4.02	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	943/1568	4.24	4.40	4.43	4.39	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	1339/1572	4.57	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	0	3	10	4.25	939/1564	4.10	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	749/1559	4.16	4.26	4.29	4.23	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	599/1352	4.05	4.10	3.98	3.97	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	965/1384	3.38	3.74	4.08	4.11	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	740/1382	3.84	3.90	4.29	4.37	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	771/1368	4.04	3.82	4.30	4.39	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	699/ 948	3.50	3.58	3.95	4.00	3.50
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 243	****	4.40	4.12	3.89	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 212	****	4.75	4.40	4.21	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	5.00	4.41	4.29	4.22	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	3.79	4.47	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.26	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	2.00	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	2.00	4.09	4.21	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	217/ 312	3.50	3.56	3.68	3.60	3.50
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	2.50	4.30	4.32	****

```
                                    Frequency Distribution
```

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: CMSC 341  0101              University of Maryland                              Page  448
Title      DATA STRUCTURES                  Baltimore County                                   FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   EDELMAN, MITCHE               Fall   2008                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    27
Questionnaires: 14                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions               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  0  3  9  4.29   933/1649  4.45  4.28  4.28 4.27  4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  1  0  0  4  8  4.38   729/1648  4.46  4.26  4.23 4.18  4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  1  1  1  5  6  4.00   950/1375  4.19  4.31  4.27 4.22  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   3  2  0  4  5  0  3.09  1528/1595  3.73  4.26  4.20 4.21  3.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   3  1  1  4  4  1  3.27  1358/1533  3.38  3.69  4.04 4.05  3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 9  1  0  0  3  1  3.60  1202/1512  3.73  4.15  4.10 4.11  3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  1  1  1  8  3  3.79  1252/1623  4.41  4.32  4.16 4.08  3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  1 13  4.93   531/1646  4.91  4.79  4.69 4.67  4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  1  0  1  4  5  4.09   864/1621  4.24  4.01  4.06 4.02  4.09

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  1  0  0  2 11  4.57   767/1568  4.52  4.40  4.43 4.39  4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  2  0 12  4.71  1003/1572  4.68  4.66  4.70 4.64  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  1  1  0  2 10  4.36   833/1564  4.44  4.24  4.28 4.25  4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  2  0  0  1 11  4.36   881/1559  4.43  4.26  4.29 4.23  4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  1  0  3  3  7  4.07   650/1352  4.53  4.10  3.98 3.97  4.07

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11  0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00  ****/1384  3.80  3.74  4.08 4.11  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33  ****/1382  4.60  3.90  4.29 4.37  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33  ****/1368  4.80  3.82  4.30 4.39  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   12  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/ 221  ****  4.12  4.16 4.07  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 0  0  1  1  0  3.50  ****/ 243  ****  4.40  4.12 3.89  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 12 1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/ 212  ****  4.75  4.40 4.21  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            13  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/ 209  ****  4.77  4.35 4.12  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  10  1  1  0  0  1  1  3.33  ****/ 555  ****  4.41  4.29 4.22  ****

              Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  85  ****  3.79  4.47 4.55  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     13  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  92  ****  4.00  4.35 4.46  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                  9  0  0  1  0  4  0  3.60   184/ 288  3.60  3.26  3.68 3.58  3.60

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  13  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  52  ****  2.00  4.06 3.59  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  13  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  48  ****  2.00  4.09 4.21  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        13  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47 4.43  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    13  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  39  ****  1.50  4.38 4.32  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  10  0  0  0  2  2  0  3.50   217/ 312  3.50  3.56  3.68 3.60  3.50

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  53  ****  2.50  4.30 4.32  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     13  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  30  ****  1.50  4.16 4.44  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       13  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  41  ****  2.00  4.43 5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        13  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  24  ****  2.00  4.42 5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      10  0  1  1  0  2  0  2.75   106/ 110  2.75  3.20  3.99 4.05  2.75
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: CMSC 341  0201                    University of Maryland                                           Page  449
Title        DATA STRUCTURES                         Baltimore County                                            FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  HOOD, DANIEL J                          Fall   2008                                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     28
Questionnaires: 19                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 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   4  14  4.68  408/1649  4.45  4.28  4.28  4.27  4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0   0   0   3  15  4.83  195/1648  4.46  4.26  4.23  4.18  4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   5  14  4.74  321/1375  4.19  4.31  4.27  4.22  4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   1   0   0   2   5  10  4.47  538/1595  3.73  4.26  4.20  4.21  4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  4   0   2   3   3   7  4.00  815/1533  3.38  3.69  4.04  4.05  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6  0   1   2   0  10  4.46  436/1512  3.73  4.15  4.10  4.11  4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   1   1  17  4.84  149/1623  4.41  4.32  4.16  4.08  4.84
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   4  15  4.79  865/1646  4.91  4.79  4.69  4.67  4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0   0   0   0  14  5.00    1/1621  4.24  4.01  4.06  4.02  5.00


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   2  17  4.89  259/1568  4.52  4.40  4.43  4.39  4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0  19  5.00    1/1572  4.68  4.66  4.70  4.64  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   0   0   2  16  4.89  187/1564  4.44  4.24  4.28  4.25  4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0   0   1   2  15  4.78  361/1559  4.43  4.26  4.29  4.23  4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 1  0   0   0   1  14  4.93   71/1352  4.53  4.10  3.98  3.97  4.93


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/1384  3.80  3.74  4.08  4.11  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/1382  4.60  3.90  4.29  4.37  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/1368  4.80  3.82  4.30  4.39  ****


              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 17  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 555  ****  4.41  4.29  4.22  ****


              Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                18  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 288  3.60  3.26  3.68  3.58  ****


              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16  0   0   1   0   2   0  3.33 ****/ 312  3.50  3.56  3.68  3.60  ****


              Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     18  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 110  2.75  3.20  3.99  4.05  ****

                                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades           Reasons                 Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1        0.00-0.99    1        A   5        Required for Majors  0      Graduate      0       Major        15
  28-55      1        1.00-1.99    0        B   9                                    Under-grad   19       Non-major     4
  56-83      2        2.00-2.99    1        C   4        General              0
  84-150     3        3.00-3.49    1        D   0
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    5        F   0        Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P   0                                    responses to be significant
                                            I   0        Other               17
                                            ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 341  0301              University of Maryland                        Page  450
Title       DATA STRUCTURES                   Baltimore County                           FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  BERGERON, RYAN                     Fall   2008                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     28
Questionnaires: 13                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                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  4  7 4.38  803/1649  4.45  4.28  4.28 4.27  4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  1  1  6  5 4.15 1010/1648  4.46  4.26  4.23 4.18  4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  2  3  3  5 3.85 1065/1375  4.19  4.31  4.27 4.22  3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  2  1  0  3  5  2 3.64 1353/1595  3.73  4.26  4.20 4.21  3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  4  1  2  3  1  1 2.88 1480/1533  3.38  3.69  4.04 4.05  2.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6  1  1  2  2  1 3.14 1408/1512  3.73  4.15  4.10 4.11  3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  1  3  9 4.62  382/1623  4.41  4.32  4.16 4.08  4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  0  0  0  0  0 12 5.00    1/1646  4.91  4.79  4.69 4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  0  6  6  1 3.62 1295/1621  4.24  4.01  4.06 4.02  3.62


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1  0  0  0  2  7  3 4.08 1243/1568  4.52  4.40  4.43 4.39  4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1  0  0  0  1  6  5 4.33 1365/1572  4.68  4.66  4.70 4.64  4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  1  9  2 4.08 1091/1564  4.44  4.24  4.28 4.25  4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1  0  0  0  4  2  6 4.17 1031/1559  4.43  4.26  4.29 4.23  4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 3  0  0  1  1  5 4.57  263/1352  4.53  4.10  3.98 3.97  4.57


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  0  2  2  1 3.80  937/1384  3.80  3.74  4.08 4.11  3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0  0  0  0  2  3 4.60  540/1382  4.60  3.90  4.29 4.37  4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0  0  0  0  1  4 4.80  369/1368  4.80  3.82  4.30 4.39  4.80
4. Were special techniques successful                   8  4  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 948  ****  3.58  3.95 4.00  ****


              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 10  0  0  0  1  0  2 4.33 ****/ 555  ****  4.41  4.29 4.22  ****


              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 11  0  0  1  0  1  0 3.00 ****/ 312  3.50  3.56  3.68 3.60  ****

                                  Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 341H 0101            University of Maryland                              Page  451
Title      DATA STRUCTURES                   Baltimore County                                FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   OATES, TIMOTHY                    Fall   2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      9
Questionnaires:  8                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                 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  6  4.75  328/1649  4.75  4.28  4.28 4.27  4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  1  1  6  4.63  414/1648  4.63  4.26  4.23 4.18  4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  2  1  5  4.38  694/1375  4.38  4.31  4.27 4.22  4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  1  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  272/1595  4.71  4.26  4.20 4.21  4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  7  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1533  ****  3.69  4.04 4.05  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7 0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/1512  ****  4.15  4.10 4.11  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  220/1623  4.75  4.32  4.16 4.08  4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  7  1  0  3.13 1642/1646  3.13  4.79  4.69 4.67  3.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0  0  0  2  5  4.71  191/1621  4.71  4.01  4.06 4.02  4.71


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63  699/1568  4.63  4.40  4.43 4.39  4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1  0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  715/1572  4.86  4.66  4.70 4.64  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  216/1564  4.86  4.24  4.28 4.25  4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1  0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  261/1559  4.86  4.26  4.29 4.23  4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0  0  0  3  3  4.50  303/1352  4.50  4.10  3.98 3.97  4.50


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1384  ****  3.74  4.08 4.11  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1382  ****  3.90  4.29 4.37  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1368  ****  3.82  4.30 4.39  ****


             Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  6  0  1  0  1  0  0  2.00  522/ 555  2.00  4.41  4.29 4.22  2.00


             Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  6  0  0  1  0  1  0  3.00  256/ 312  3.00  3.56  3.68 3.60  3.00


             Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      6  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00   40/ 110  4.00  3.20  3.99 4.05  4.00

                                    Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 345  0101            University of Maryland                                    Page  452
Title      SOFTWARE DESIGN/DEVELO          Baltimore County                                         FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   MITCHELL, SUSAN              Fall   2008                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     24
Questionnaires:  24                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                      Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                 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  3  5 14  4.25  965/1649  3.95 4.28 4.28 4.27 4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  1 10 13  4.50  556/1648  4.03 4.26 4.23 4.18 4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  1  3  5 15  4.42  653/1375  4.41 4.31 4.27 4.22 4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  0  0  1  1  5 17  4.58  405/1595  4.51 4.26 4.20 4.21 4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  1  2  5  6  9  3.87  955/1533  3.83 3.69 4.04 4.05 3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 5 2 15  4.30  627/1512  4.30 4.15 4.10 4.11 4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  3  5 16  4.54  459/1623  4.18 4.32 4.16 4.08 4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  1  2 21  4.83  782/1646  4.30 4.79 4.69 4.67 4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 0 0 0 11 8  4.42  483/1621  4.21 4.01 4.06 4.02 4.42

          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  1  4 19  4.75  480/1568  4.01 4.40 4.43 4.39 4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  1  4 19  4.75  931/1572  4.30 4.66 4.70 4.64 4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  1 10 13  4.50  651/1564  4.05 4.24 4.28 4.25 4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  2  8 14  4.50  695/1559  4.12 4.26 4.29 4.23 4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 4 0 0 5 5 10  4.25  515/1352  4.08 4.10 3.98 3.97 4.25

          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0  0  1  2  2  6  4.18  714/1384  4.18 3.74 4.08 4.11 4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0  0  0  1  2  8  4.64  511/1382  4.64 3.90 4.29 4.37 4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 1 1 9  4.73  461/1368  4.73 3.82 4.30 4.39 4.73
4. Were special techniques successful                   13 1  0  0  1  3  6  4.50  203/ 948  4.50 3.58 3.95 4.00 4.50

          Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  20 0  0  0  2  0  2  4.00 ****/ 555  4.00 4.41 4.29 4.22 ****

          Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 18 0  0  1  0  5  0  3.67  181/ 288  3.67 3.26 3.68 3.58 3.67

          Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  20 0  0  1  0  3  0  3.50 ****/ 312  3.67 3.56 3.68 3.60 ****

          Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      22 0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/ 110  **** 3.20 3.99 4.05 ****
```

```
                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     0       0.00-0.99    0      A  16       Required for Majors  0    Graduate     0      Major      22
28-55     0       1.00-1.99    0      B   6                                 Under-grad  24      Non-major   2
56-83     4       2.00-2.99    0      C   0       General              1    Under-grad  24      Non-major   2
84-150    2       3.00-3.49    0      D   0
Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    6      F   0       Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                      I   0       Other               21
                                      ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 345  0201                  University of Maryland                            Page  453
Title      SOFTWARE DESIGN/DEVELO               Baltimore County                                  FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    VICK, SHON                       Fall   2008                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     23
Questionnaires:  19                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions              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  0  2  6  5  4  3.65 1443/1649  3.95  4.28  4.28  4.27  3.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  1  1  5  9  2  3.56 1464/1648  4.03  4.26  4.23  4.18  3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1 13  0  0  1  1  3  4.40  665/1375  4.41  4.31  4.27  4.22  4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  0  0  0  3  4 11  4.44  580/1595  4.51  4.26  4.20  4.21  4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 12  1  0  1  0  3  3.80 1017/1533  3.83  3.69  4.04  4.05  3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  3  0  0  4  2  8  4.29  651/1512  4.30  4.15  4.10  4.11  4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2  0  1  2  3  4  7  3.82 1228/1623  4.18  4.32  4.16  4.08  3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  1  1  1  3  8  4  3.76 1620/1646  4.30  4.79  4.69  4.67  3.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  2  0  0  3  7  3  4.00  914/1621  4.21  4.01  4.06  4.02  4.00


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4  0  2  2  3  6  2  3.27 1495/1568  4.01  4.40  4.43  4.39  3.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   5  0  1  0  2  8  3  3.86 1502/1572  4.30  4.66  4.70  4.64  3.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0  1  1  3  8  2  3.60 1360/1564  4.05  4.24  4.28  4.25  3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4  0  0  2  5  3  5  3.73 1289/1559  4.12  4.26  4.29  4.23  3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  4  1  0  2  4  4  3.91  818/1352  4.08  4.10  3.98  3.97  3.91


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16  0  1  0  1  1  0  2.67 ****/1384  4.18  3.74  4.08  4.11  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16  0  0  1  0  1  1  3.67 ****/1382  4.64  3.90  4.29  4.37  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16  0  0  1  0  1  1  3.67 ****/1368  4.73  3.82  4.30  4.39  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  16  1  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/ 948  4.50  3.58  3.95  4.00  ****


                Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13  0  1  0  1  0  4  4.00  388/ 555  4.00  4.41  4.29  4.22  4.00


                Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                16  0  0  1  0  2  0  3.33 ****/ 288  3.67  3.26  3.68  3.58  ****


                Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13  0  0  1  0  5  0  3.67  207/ 312  3.67  3.56  3.68  3.60  3.67


                Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     18  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 110  ****  3.20  3.99  4.05  ****

                             Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades           Reasons                Type                 Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0         0.00-0.99   0      A  10      Required for Majors  0       Graduate      0       Major        15
  28-55     1         1.00-1.99   0      B   6                                                         
  56-83     3         2.00-2.99   4      C   0      General              1       Under-grad   19       Non-major     4
  84-150    4         3.00-3.49   2      D   0                                                         
  Grad.     0         3.50-4.00   3      F   0      Electives            1       #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   1                                  responses to be significant
                                         I   0      Other               14
                                         ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 411  0101                 University of Maryland                                Page  454
Title          COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE            Baltimore County                                   FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    SQUIRE, JON S                    Fall  2008                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      51
Questionnaires:  27                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions             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   7  12   7  3.93 1254/1649  4.07  4.28  4.28 4.50  3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   5  11  11  4.22  931/1648  4.42  4.26  4.23 4.36  4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0   1   0   1  12  12  4.31  763/1375  4.39  4.31  4.27 4.48  4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   4   0   0   6   8   9  4.13  970/1595  4.30  4.26  4.20 4.36  4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  9   3   3   7   1   4  3.00 1441/1533  3.36  3.69  4.04 4.14  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 12  0   0   5   5   5  4.00  883/1512  4.13  4.15  4.10 4.26  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   3   6  18  4.56  448/1623  4.60  4.32  4.16 4.27  4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0  27  5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.79  4.69 4.71  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1  0   0  13   6   5  3.67 1261/1621  3.81  4.01  4.06 4.24  3.67


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   1   1  10  15  4.44  930/1568  4.64  4.40  4.43 4.54  4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   5  22  4.81  815/1572  4.86  4.66  4.70 4.79  4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   1   0   8   8  10  3.96 1163/1564  4.19  4.24  4.28 4.40  3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   2   5   4   5  11  3.67 1322/1559  4.05  4.26  4.29 4.41  3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 1  1   2   3  11   7  3.88  836/1352  4.25  4.10  3.98 4.07  3.88


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 22 0  3   0   0   1   1  2.40 ****/1384  ****  3.74  4.08 4.35  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22 0  1   1   2   0   1  2.80 ****/1382  4.33  3.90  4.29 4.56  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 1   0   0   1   3  4.00 ****/1368  ****  3.82  4.30 4.58  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  22   3   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/ 948  ****  3.58  3.95 4.31  ****


              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 23   0   2   0   0   0   2  3.00 ****/ 555  ****  4.41  4.29 4.41  ****


              Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                19   0   1   0   0   7   0  3.63  183/ 288  3.63  3.26  3.68 3.71  3.63


              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 19   0   0   3   0   5   0  3.25  247/ 312  3.25  3.56  3.68 3.95  3.25


              Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     25   0   0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/ 110  ****  3.20  3.99 4.22  ****

                                      Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                 Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1       0.00-0.99    0      A   18     Required for Majors  0      Graduate     0      Major       19
 28-55     1       1.00-1.99    0      B    4                                                     
 56-83     3       2.00-2.99    3      C    1     General              0      Under-grad  27      Non-major    8
 84-150   11       3.00-3.49    3      D    0
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   11      F    0     Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0     Other               26
                                       ?    3
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 411  0201                    University of Maryland                                    Page  455
Title      COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE                    Baltimore County                                        FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  SQUIRE, JON S                          Fall  2008                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     40
Questionnaires:  23                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                               Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                  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  3 12  8  4.22 1007/1649  4.07  4.28  4.28 4.50  4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  2  5 16  4.61  441/1648  4.42  4.26  4.23 4.36  4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  2  8 13  4.48  581/1375  4.39  4.31  4.27 4.48  4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   6  0  0  1  7  9  4.47  538/1595  4.30  4.26  4.20 4.36  4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   2  2  0  7  5  7  3.71 1103/1533  3.36  3.69  4.04 4.14  3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  7  0  0  4  4  8  4.25  687/1512  4.13  4.15  4.10 4.26  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  0  3  2 17  4.64  358/1623  4.60  4.32  4.16 4.27  4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0 23  5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.79  4.69 4.71  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  0  1  1  3  8  7  3.95  987/1621  3.81  4.01  4.06 4.24  3.95


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  4 19  4.83  358/1568  4.64  4.40  4.43 4.54  4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  0  2 20  4.91  591/1572  4.86  4.66  4.70 4.79  4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  1 11 10  4.41  780/1564  4.19  4.24  4.28 4.40  4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  2  1  5 15  4.43  790/1559  4.05  4.26  4.29 4.41  4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  7  0  0  1  4 11  4.63  234/1352  4.25  4.10  3.98 4.07  4.63


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18  0  1  0  1  1  2  3.60 ****/1384  ****  3.74  4.08 4.35  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17  0  0  0  2  0  4  4.33  774/1382  4.33  3.90  4.29 4.56  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18  0  0  0  2  0  3  4.20 ****/1368  ****  3.82  4.30 4.58  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   18  3  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 948  ****  3.58  3.95 4.31  ****

              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  22  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 312  3.25  3.56  3.68 3.95  ****
```

```
                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades           Reasons               Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27       0       0.00-0.99    0       A  17        Required for Majors  0      Graduate      0      Major       16
 28-55       0       1.00-1.99    0       B   6                                                         
 56-83       5       2.00-2.99    2       C   0        General              0      Under-grad   23      Non-major    7
 84-150      7       3.00-3.49    6       D   0                                                         
 Grad.       0       3.50-4.00    8       F   0        Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P   0                                    responses to be significant
                                          I   0        Other               20
                                          ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 421  0101           University of Maryland                                    Page  456
Title      PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS          Baltimore County                                      FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    KALPAKIS, KONST            Fall   2008                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    50
Questionnaires: 41                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions              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  3 10 27  4.54  603/1649  4.46  4.28  4.28 4.50  4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      0   0   0  0 12 13 16  4.10 1070/1648  3.92  4.26  4.23 4.36  4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     0   0   0  1  8 10 22  4.29  771/1375  4.03  4.31  4.27 4.48  4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      0   5   1  1  7 14 13  4.03 1055/1595  3.72  4.26  4.20 4.36  4.03
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   5   2  0  7 13 14  4.03  801/1533  3.65  3.69  4.04 4.14  4.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 12  1  0 10  9  9  3.86 1048/1512  3.24  4.15  4.10 4.26  3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              0   1   0  4  5 11 20  4.18  904/1623  3.90  4.32  4.16 4.27  4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled                    0   0   0  0  0 12 29  4.71  993/1646  4.43  4.79  4.69 4.71  4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8  0   1  0  4 11 17  4.30  632/1621  3.94  4.01  4.06 4.24  4.30


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          0   0   1  0  2 10 28  4.56  779/1568  4.32  4.40  4.43 4.54  4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     1   0   0  0  0  1 39  4.97  178/1572  4.76  4.66  4.70 4.79  4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0   0   1  2  8  9 21  4.15 1046/1564  3.96  4.24  4.28 4.40  4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       0   0   1  2  9  6 23  4.17 1023/1559  3.97  4.26  4.29 4.41  4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1   5   0  3  7 11 14  4.03  678/1352  3.38  4.10  3.98 4.07  4.03


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 31  0   0  2  2  1  5  3.90 ****/1384  3.20  3.74  4.08 4.35  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 32  0   0  0  1  2  6  4.56 ****/1382  4.60  3.90  4.29 4.56  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 32  0  0  0  1  1  7  4.67 ****/1368  4.20  3.82  4.30 4.58  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   32  6   0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 948  ****  3.58  3.95 4.31  ****


                Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  40  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 555  ****  4.41  4.29 4.41  ****


                Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 40  0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 288  3.50  3.26  3.68 3.71  ****


                Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  40  0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 312  4.00  3.56  3.68 3.95  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                Type               Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0      A   10      Required for Majors   0    Graduate      1      Major      24
 28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0      B   15
 56-83      1       2.00-2.99    4      C   11      General               0    Under-grad   40      Non-major  17
 84-150    21       3.00-3.49    8      D    1
 Grad.      1       3.50-4.00   17      F    0      Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                38
                                        ?    3
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 421  0201                 University of Maryland                              Page  457
Title          PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS           Baltimore County                                   FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    CHETTRI, SAMIR                  Fall   2008                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      30
Questionnaires: 15                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                             Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                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   0   1   1   3   8  4.38   803/1649  4.46  4.28  4.28  4.50  4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    3   0   1   0   4   3   4  3.75  1347/1648  3.92  4.26  4.23  4.36  3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2   0   1   0   4   4   4  3.77  1107/1375  4.03  4.31  4.27  4.48  3.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2   1   1   2   3   3   3  3.42  1440/1595  3.72  4.26  4.20  4.36  3.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  2   1   2   3   3   2  3.27  1358/1533  3.65  3.69  4.04  4.14  3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 4  3   1   1   2   1  2.63  1489/1512  3.24  4.15  4.10  4.26  2.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0   1   2   2   4   4  3.62  1342/1623  3.90  4.32  4.16  4.27  3.62
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0   0   0   0  11   2  4.15  1469/1646  4.43  4.79  4.69  4.71  4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0   1   3   8   0  3.58  1310/1621  3.94  4.01  4.06  4.24  3.58

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   1   0   3   2   7  4.08  1248/1568  4.32  4.40  4.43  4.54  4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   0   1   4   8  4.54  1212/1572  4.76  4.66  4.70  4.79  4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   0   2   3   4   4  3.77  1292/1564  3.96  4.24  4.28  4.40  3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   1   1   3   3   5  3.77  1270/1559  3.97  4.26  4.29  4.41  3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 2  3   0   6   1   1  2.73  1281/1352  3.38  4.10  3.98  4.07  2.73

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0  1   0   2   1   1  3.20  1209/1384  3.20  3.74  4.08  4.35  3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0  0   0   0   2   3  4.60   540/1382  4.60  3.90  4.29  4.56  4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0   0   2   0   3  4.20   876/1368  4.20  3.82  4.30  4.58  4.20

              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12  0   0   0   1   0   2  4.33  ****/ 555  ****  4.41  4.29  4.41  ****

              Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                11  0   0   1   0   3   0  3.50   190/ 288  3.50  3.26  3.68  3.71  3.50

              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  9  0   0   0   0   6   0  4.00    68/ 312  4.00  3.56  3.68  3.95  4.00
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                 Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1      0.00-0.99    0        A    3       Required for Majors   0     Graduate     0       Major      10
  28-55     0      1.00-1.99    0        B    4
  56-83     0      2.00-2.99    5        C    5       General               0     Under-grad   15      Non-major   5
  84-150    4      3.00-3.49    4        D    0
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    1        F    0       Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                12
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 426  0101            University of Maryland                                    Page  458
Title       PRINC COMPUTER SECURIT        Baltimore County                                         FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  PHATAK, DHANANJ              Fall   2008                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    25
Questionnaires:  19                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1  0  1  5  3  1  8 3.56 1484/1649  3.56  4.28  4.28 4.50  3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     2  0  1  3  2  5  6 3.71 1382/1648  3.71  4.26  4.23 4.36  3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1  0  3  3  5  2  5 3.17 1305/1375  3.17  4.31  4.27 4.48  3.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1  3  4  1  2  3  5 3.27 1488/1595  3.27  4.26  4.20 4.36  3.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  4  3  3  1  3  2 2.83 1485/1533  2.83  3.69  4.04 4.14  2.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 5 2  2  1  3  3 3.27 1367/1512  3.27  4.15  4.10 4.26  3.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2  0  3  6  3  2  3 2.76 1577/1623  2.76  4.32  4.16 4.27  2.76
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2  2  0  0  0  1 14 4.93  465/1646  4.93  4.79  4.69 4.71  4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1  2  6  5  2 3.31 1436/1621  3.31  4.01  4.06 4.24  3.31


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2  0  3  2  6  3  3 3.06 1512/1568  3.06  4.40  4.43 4.54  3.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2  0  0  1  1  4 11 4.47 1265/1572  4.47  4.66  4.70 4.79  4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  1  3  5  6  2 3.29 1450/1564  3.29  4.24  4.28 4.40  3.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2  1  2  2  3  4  5 3.50 1370/1559  3.50  4.26  4.29 4.41  3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0 1  2  6  3  3 3.33 1130/1352  3.33  4.10  3.98 4.07  3.33


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 1  0  1  2  2 3.67 1011/1384  3.67  3.74  4.08 4.35  3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0  1  0  4  1 3.83 1057/1382  3.83  3.90  4.29 4.56  3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0  1  2  3 4.33  796/1368  4.33  3.82  4.30 4.58  4.33
4. Were special techniques successful                   13 1  1  1  1  1  1 3.00  844/ 948  3.00  3.58  3.95 4.31  3.00


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   17 1  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 221  ****  4.12  4.16 4.73  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  15 0  0  0  2  0  2 4.00 ****/ 555  ****  4.41  4.29 4.41  ****


              Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 15 0  0  0  0  4  0 4.00 ****/ 288  ****  3.26  3.68 3.71  ****


              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  12 0  0  0  0  7  0 4.00   68/ 312  4.00  3.56  3.68 3.95  4.00


              Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      17 0  0  0  0  2  0 4.00 ****/ 110  ****  3.20  3.99 4.22  ****

                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    0      0.00-0.99  0      A  5      Required for Majors  1     Graduate     3      Major       11
  28-55    0      1.00-1.99  0      B  5
  56-83    0      2.00-2.99  2      C  1      General              6     Under-grad  16      Non-major    8
  84-150   5      3.00-3.49  1      D  0
  Grad.    3      3.50-4.00  1      F  0      Electives            1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                    P  0                                responses to be significant
                                    I  0      Other                6
                                    ?  2
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 435  0101            University of Maryland                                      Page  459
Title          COMPUTER GRAPHICS          Baltimore County                                           FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    RHEINGANS, PENN            Fall  2008                                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       38
Questionnaires:   28                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                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  11  17  4.61   510/1649  4.61  4.28  4.28  4.50  4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   2   1   8  10   7  3.68  1401/1648  3.68  4.26  4.23  4.36  3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   5   4  11   8  3.79  1097/1375  3.79  4.31  4.27  4.48  3.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2   0   1   5   8  12  4.19   890/1595  4.19  4.26  4.20  4.36  4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   3   3   4   7   5   5  3.21  1385/1533  3.21  3.69  4.04  4.14  3.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 14   1   2   0   4   6  3.92   994/1512  3.92  4.15  4.10  4.26  3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0   0   2   3   9  13  4.22   849/1623  4.22  4.32  4.16  4.27  4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0   0   0   4  23  4.85   748/1646  4.85  4.79  4.69  4.71  4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0   0   0   8  11   3  3.77  1175/1621  3.77  4.01  4.06  4.24  3.77


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   1   5  13   9  4.07  1248/1568  4.07  4.40  4.43  4.54  4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   0   7  21  4.75   931/1572  4.75  4.66  4.70  4.79  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   2   9   8   9  3.86  1246/1564  3.86  4.24  4.28  4.40  3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   1   2   8   4  13  3.93  1181/1559  3.93  4.26  4.29  4.41  3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0   0   0   1   8  19  4.64   221/1352  4.64  4.10  3.98  4.07  4.64


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21  0   0   0   4   1   2  3.71   987/1384  3.71  3.74  4.08  4.35  3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21  0   0   0   1   1   5  4.57   562/1382  4.57  3.90  4.29  4.56  4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 21 0   0   0   0   2   5  4.71   472/1368  4.71  3.82  4.30  4.58  4.71
4. Were special techniques successful                   21  2   1   1   0   2   1  3.20  ****/ 948  ****  3.58  3.95  4.31  ****


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   27  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 221  ****  4.12  4.16  4.73  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 27 0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 243  ****  4.40  4.12  4.61  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 27 0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 212  ****  4.75  4.40  4.57  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            27  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 209  ****  4.77  4.35  4.63  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  25  0   0   0   2   0   1  3.67  ****/ 555  ****  4.41  4.29  4.41  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 27  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  88  ****  3.97  4.54  4.66  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 27 0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  85  ****  3.79  4.47  4.54  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 27  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  81  ****  3.58  4.43  4.57  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     27  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00  ****/  92  ****  4.00  4.35  4.44  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 27  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 288  ****  3.26  3.68  3.71  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  27  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  52  ****  2.00  4.06  4.86  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  27  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  48  ****  2.00  4.09  4.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        27  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47  4.52  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    27  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  39  ****  1.50  4.38  4.59  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  25  1   0   0   0   2   0  4.00  ****/ 312  ****  3.56  3.68  3.95  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 27  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  53  ****  2.50  4.30  4.64  ****
```

                                                Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
  00-27   1   0.00-0.99   1   A   7   Required for Majors   1   Graduate   4   Major   28
  28-55   1   1.00-1.99   0   B   13
  56-83   0   2.00-2.99   2   C   4   General   10   Under-grad   24   Non-major   0
  84-150   7   3.00-3.49   5   D   0
  Grad.   4   3.50-4.00   7   F   0   Electives   1   #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P   0   responses to be significant
                                           I   0   Other   14
                                           ?   2

Questionnaires: 24   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                              Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                  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  0  5  3 15  4.29  922/1649  4.42  4.28  4.28  4.50  4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  3  1  2  8 10  3.88 1254/1648  3.89  4.26  4.23  4.36  3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  3  2  3  6 10  3.75 1112/1375  3.98  4.31  4.27  4.48  3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   6  2  2  0  7  7  3.83 1242/1595  4.07  4.26  4.20  4.36  3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   8  1  0  2  8  5  4.00  815/1533  4.15  3.69  4.04  4.14  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7 1  0  1  8  7  4.18  773/1512  4.37  4.15  4.10  4.26  4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  1  4  3 15  4.25  815/1623  4.22  4.32  4.16  4.27  4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  3 20  4.87  731/1646  4.93  4.79  4.69  4.71  4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 1  1  3  8  9  4.05  892/1621  3.74  4.01  4.06  4.24  4.05

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  1  3  4 15  4.43  943/1568  4.47  4.40  4.43  4.54  4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  2  2 19  4.74  967/1572  4.87  4.66  4.70  4.79  4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  1  2  3  8  9  3.96 1173/1564  4.13  4.24  4.28  4.40  3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  1  0  3  3 16  4.43  790/1559  4.38  4.26  4.29  4.41  4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 13 2  1  2  1  4  3.40 1101/1352  3.49  4.10  3.98  4.07  3.40

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21  0  1  0  1  0  1  3.00 ****/1384  ****  3.74  4.08  4.35  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21  0  0  0  2  0  1  3.67 ****/1382  ****  3.90  4.29  4.56  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 21 0 0  0  2  0  1  3.67 ****/1368  ****  3.82  4.30  4.58  ****

              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 22  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 555  ****  4.41  4.29  4.41  ****

              Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                23  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 288  1.67  3.26  3.68  3.71  ****

              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 20  0  1  0  0  3  0  3.25 ****/ 312  ****  3.56  3.68  3.95  ****

              Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     22  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/ 110  ****  3.20  3.99  4.22  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                  Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1      0.00-0.99    0      A    5        Required for Majors  0    Graduate      0        Major        21
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0      B   12
 56-83      0      2.00-2.99    3      C    6        General              1    Under-grad   24        Non-major     3
 84-150    12      3.00-3.49    5      D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    6      F    0        Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I    0        Other               22
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 441  0201                University of Maryland                              Page  461
Title      ALGORITHMS                          Baltimore County                                 FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    SHERMAN, ALAN                    Fall   2008                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      17
Questionnaires:  11                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                 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   3   7  4.55  590/1649  4.42  4.28  4.28  4.50  4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   1   1   0   5   4  3.91 1229/1648  3.89  4.26  4.23  4.36  3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0   0   0   3   2   5  4.20  855/1375  3.98  4.31  4.27  4.48  4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1   0   0   3   1   6  4.30  759/1595  4.07  4.26  4.20  4.36  4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1   1   0   0   3   6  4.30  575/1533  4.15  3.69  4.04  4.14  4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  1   0   0   0   4   5  4.56  345/1512  4.37  4.15  4.10  4.26  4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   1   2   2   6  4.18  894/1623  4.22  4.32  4.16  4.27  4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   0  11  5.00    1/1646  4.93  4.79  4.69  4.71  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0   0   1   4   3   1  3.44 1381/1621  3.74  4.01  4.06  4.24  3.44


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0   0   0   0   5   5  4.50  852/1568  4.47  4.40  4.43  4.54  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0   0   0   0   0  10  5.00    1/1572  4.87  4.66  4.70  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   0   0   0   7   3  4.30  887/1564  4.13  4.24  4.28  4.40  4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0   0   0   1   4   4  4.33  901/1559  4.38  4.26  4.29  4.41  4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  2   0   2   2   0   3  3.57 1016/1352  3.49  4.10  3.98  4.07  3.57


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/1384  ****  3.74  4.08  4.35  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/1382  ****  3.90  4.29  4.56  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/1368  ****  3.82  4.30  4.58  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   9   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/ 948  ****  3.58  3.95  4.31  ****


           Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 10   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 555  ****  4.41  4.29  4.41  ****


           Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 8   0   1   2   0   0   0  1.67  278/ 288  1.67  3.26  3.68  3.71  1.67


           Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  9   0   0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/ 312  ****  3.56  3.68  3.95  ****


                                        Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 445  0101              University of Maryland                                   Page  462
Title        SOFTWARE ENGINEERING           Baltimore County                                        FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  RAOUF, SAAD                     Fall   2008                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     17
Questionnaires: 15                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                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  3  4  8  4.33  871/1649  4.33  4.28  4.28 4.50  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  8  6  4.43  672/1648  4.43  4.26  4.23 4.36  4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  3 12  4.80  233/1375  4.80  4.31  4.27 4.48  4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  1  0  5  9  4.47  552/1595  4.47  4.26  4.20 4.36  4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2  0  1  3  1  8  4.23  643/1533  4.23  3.69  4.04 4.14  4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4 1 2 1 1 6 3.82 1082/1512 3.82 4.15 4.10 4.26 3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  1  1 13  4.80  169/1623  4.80  4.32  4.16 4.27  4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  7  8  4.53 1166/1646  4.53  4.79  4.69 4.71  4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 6 7 4.54 348/1621 4.54 4.01 4.06 4.24 4.54


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  3 11  4.79  424/1568  4.79  4.40  4.43 4.54  4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  3 11  4.79  876/1572  4.79  4.66  4.70 4.79  4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  2 12  4.86  216/1564  4.86  4.24  4.28 4.40  4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  0  4 10  4.71  448/1559  4.71  4.26  4.29 4.41  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 0 2 1 10 4.62 240/1352 4.62 4.10 3.98 4.07 4.62


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1384 **** 3.74 4.08 4.35 ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1382 **** 3.90 4.29 4.56 ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1368 **** 3.82 4.30 4.58 ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  13   0  1  0  1  0  0  2.00 ****/ 948  **** 3.58  3.95 4.31  ****


            Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 14   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 555  **** 4.41  4.29 4.41  ****


            Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 14   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 312  **** 3.56  3.68 3.95  ****

                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0        0.00-0.99    0        A   6        Required for Majors  0     Graduate      0      Major      13
 28-55     0        1.00-1.99    0        B   6                                                        
 56-83     0        2.00-2.99    3        C   1        General              8     Under-grad   15      Non-major   2
 84-150    5        3.00-3.49    0        D   0                                                        
 Grad.     0        3.50-4.00    2        F   0        Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P   0                                  responses to be significant
                                          I   0        Other                5
                                          ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 451  0101              University of Maryland                          Page  463
Title       AUTOMATA THRY& FORM LA           Baltimore County                             FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   CHANG, RICHARD                 Fall   2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    22
Questionnaires: 14                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions               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   1  12  4.71  372/1649  4.71  4.28  4.28  4.50  4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   2  11  4.71  300/1648  4.71  4.26  4.23  4.36  4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   1   0   0   1   1  11  4.77  283/1375  4.77  4.31  4.27  4.48  4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   5   0   0   0   0   8  5.00    1/1595  5.00  4.26  4.20  4.36  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1   0   1   1   3   8  4.38  495/1533  4.38  3.69  4.04  4.14  4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 3  0   0   0   1   9  4.90  110/1512  4.90  4.15  4.10  4.26  4.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   0   0   3  10  4.77  210/1623  4.77  4.32  4.16  4.27  4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0  14  5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.79  4.69  4.71  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0   0   0   1  12  4.92   75/1621  4.92  4.01  4.06  4.24  4.92


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   0   0   0  13  5.00    1/1568  5.00  4.40  4.43  4.54  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   0   0  13  5.00    1/1572  5.00  4.66  4.70  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   0   0   4   9  4.69  434/1564  4.69  4.24  4.28  4.40  4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0   0   1   2  10  4.69  475/1559  4.69  4.26  4.29  4.41  4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 4  0   0   2   0   6  4.50  303/1352  4.50  4.10  3.98  4.07  4.50


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/1384  ****  3.74  4.08  4.35  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/1382  ****  3.90  4.29  4.56  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/1368  ****  3.82  4.30  4.58  ****

              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00  ****/ 555  ****  4.41  4.29  4.41  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  88  ****  3.97  4.54  4.66  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 0 0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  85  ****  3.79  4.47  4.54  ****

                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0       0.00-0.99   0        A   9         Required for Majors  0     Graduate     0      Major        13
 28-55      0       1.00-1.99   0        B   2
 56-83      2       2.00-2.99   2        C   3         General              8     Under-grad  14      Non-major     1
 84-150     7       3.00-3.49   0        D   0
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   8        F   0         Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0                                    responses to be significant
                                         I   0         Other                4
                                         ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 455  0101                 University of Maryland                                    Page  464
Title      NUMERICAL COMPUTATIONS                   Baltimore County                                    FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  STEPHENS, ARTHU                         Fall   2008                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     6
Questionnaires:  3                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                  Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              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   1   0  3.33 1540/1649  3.33  4.28   4.28 4.50  3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   2   1   0  3.33 1546/1648  3.33  4.26   4.23 4.36  3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   1   1   1  4.00  950/1375  4.00  4.31   4.27 4.48  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  497/1595  4.50  4.26   4.20 4.36  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 1441/1533  3.00  3.69   4.04 4.14  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0   0   1   1   0  3.50 1266/1512  3.50  4.15   4.10 4.26  3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   1   1   1  4.00 1029/1623  4.00  4.32   4.16 4.27  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67 1037/1646  4.67  4.79   4.69 4.71  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0   0   2   0   0  3.00 1504/1621  3.00  4.01   4.06 4.24  3.00

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   1   1   1  4.00 1279/1568  4.00  4.40   4.43 4.54  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 1241/1572  4.50  4.66   4.70 4.79  4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   1   2   0  3.67 1336/1564  3.67  4.24   4.28 4.40  3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   1   2   0   0  2.67 1522/1559  2.67  4.26   4.29 4.41  2.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1  1   0   0   1   0  2.50 1301/1352  2.50  4.10   3.98 4.07  2.50

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 1380/1384  1.00  3.74   4.08 4.35  1.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 1378/1382  1.00  3.90   4.29 4.56  1.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0   0   1   0   0  3.00 1286/1368  3.00  3.82   4.30 4.58  3.00


                                      Frequency Distribution

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

```
                                             Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                   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  4 10  4.60  510/1649  4.60  4.28  4.28  4.50  4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  1  3 11  4.67  362/1648  4.67  4.26  4.23  4.36  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  1 14  4.93  116/1375  4.93  4.31  4.27  4.48  4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  2  0  0  1  0 12  4.85  168/1595  4.85  4.26  4.20  4.36  4.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  2  2 11  4.60  288/1533  4.60  3.69  4.04  4.14  4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 3 0 0 0 3 8  4.73  217/1512  4.73  4.15  4.10  4.26  4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  0  0 15  5.00    1/1623  5.00  4.32  4.16  4.27  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.79  4.69  4.71  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 2 6 5  4.23  709/1621  4.23  4.01  4.06  4.24  4.23

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  2 13  4.87  301/1568  4.87  4.40  4.43  4.54  4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  1  0 14  4.87  690/1572  4.87  4.66  4.70  4.79  4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  3 12  4.80  263/1564  4.80  4.24  4.28  4.40  4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  0  2 13  4.87  250/1559  4.87  4.26  4.29  4.41  4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2 0 0 3 5 5  4.15  590/1352  4.15  4.10  3.98  4.07  4.15

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  0  2  0  5  4.43  520/1384  4.43  3.74  4.08  4.35  4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1382  5.00  3.90  4.29  4.56  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 0 0 1 6  4.86  316/1368  4.86  3.82  4.30  4.58  4.86
4. Were special techniques successful                  8  4  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 948  ****  3.58  3.95  4.31  ****

             Laboratory
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 14 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/ 212  ****  4.75  4.40  4.57  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 11  0  0  0  3  0  1  3.50  470/ 555  3.50  4.41  4.29  4.41  3.50

             Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                11  0  0  2  0  2  0  3.00  229/ 288  3.00  3.26  3.68  3.71  3.00

             Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/ 312  ****  3.56  3.68  3.95  ****

             Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     14  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 110  ****  3.20  3.99  4.22  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 471  0101              University of Maryland                                        Page  466
Title      ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENC           Baltimore County                                             FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   MINER, DONALD P               Fall   2008                                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      39
Questionnaires:  35                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                     Frequencies       Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                         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  13  20  4.56   577/1649  4.56  4.28  4.28  4.50  4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0   1   2  11  20  4.47   599/1648  4.47  4.26  4.23  4.36  4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2   2   0   1   1   6  23  4.65   422/1375  4.65  4.31  4.27  4.48  4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2   5   0   0   3   8  17  4.50   497/1595  4.50  4.26  4.20  4.36  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  8   2   3   6   6   8  3.60  1180/1533  3.60  3.69  4.04  4.14  3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 2  1   4   5   7  14  3.94   980/1512  3.94  4.15  4.10  4.26  3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0   0   1   3   6  23  4.55   459/1623  4.55  4.32  4.16  4.27  4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   1   0   0   0   0  32  5.00     1/1646  5.00  4.79  4.69  4.71  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0   0   2  17  15  4.38   535/1621  4.38  4.01  4.06  4.24  4.38

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4   0   0   1   7  10  13  4.13  1220/1568  4.13  4.40  4.43  4.54  4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   4   0   0   0   0   6  25  4.81   840/1572  4.81  4.66  4.70  4.79  4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0   0   0   6  11  14  4.26   939/1564  4.26  4.24  4.28  4.40  4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4   0   0   0   2   7  22  4.65   536/1559  4.65  4.26  4.29  4.41  4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0  0   0   2  15  14  4.39   415/1352  4.39  4.10  3.98  4.07  4.39

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 27 0  0   0   1   3   4  4.38  ****/1384  ****  3.74  4.08  4.35  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 27 0  0   0   1   2   5  4.50  ****/1382  ****  3.90  4.29  4.56  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 27 0 0   0   0   3   5  4.63  ****/1368  ****  3.82  4.30  4.58  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  27   3   0   0   1   1   3  4.40  ****/ 948  ****  3.58  3.95  4.31  ****

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  34   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 221  ****  4.12  4.16  4.73  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 34 0 0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 243  ****  4.40  4.12  4.61  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 34 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 212  ****  4.75  4.40  4.57  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           34   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 209  ****  4.77  4.35  4.63  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  27  0   0   0   2   1   5  4.38  ****/ 555  ****  4.41  4.29  4.41  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 34  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  88  ****  3.97  4.54  4.66  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 34 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  85  ****  3.79  4.47  4.54  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 34  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  81  ****  3.58  4.43  4.57  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    34   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  92  ****  4.00  4.35  4.44  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                29   0   0   0   0   5   1  4.17  ****/ 288  ****  3.26  3.68  3.71  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 34  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  52  ****  2.00  4.06  4.86  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  34  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  48  ****  2.00  4.09  4.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       34   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47  4.52  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   34   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  39  ****  1.50  4.38  4.59  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  23  0   0   0   0  11   1  4.08    66/ 312  4.08  3.56  3.68  3.95  4.08

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 34  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  53  ****  2.50  4.30  4.64  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    34   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  30  ****  1.50  4.16  4.24  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      34   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  41  ****  2.00  4.43  4.84  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       34   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  24  ****  2.00  4.42  4.85  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     28   0   0   0   0   6   1  4.14  ****/ 110  ****  3.20  3.99  4.22  ****
```

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 35   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	31
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	16	Under-grad	35	Non-major	4
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	2						

```
Course-Section: CMSC 473  0101              University of Maryland                                Page  467
Title      NATURAL LANG PROCESSIN               Baltimore County                                 FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    NIRENBURG, SERG                    Fall   2008                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     14
Questionnaires: 12                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                     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  4  6  4.33  871/1649  4.33  4.28  4.28  4.50  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  3  4  4  4.09 1070/1648  4.09  4.26  4.23  4.36  4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   6  0  0  4  2  0  3.33 1259/1375  3.33  4.31  4.27  4.48  3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  1  0  3  7  4.45  566/1595  4.45  4.26  4.20  4.36  4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  1  3  7  4.33  545/1533  4.33  3.69  4.04  4.14  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5 0 0 1 4 2 4.14 799/1512  4.14  4.15  4.10  4.26  4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  3  4  5  4.17  915/1623  4.17  4.32  4.16  4.27  4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.79  4.69  4.71  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 6 3 4.20 754/1621  4.20  4.01  4.06  4.24  4.20

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  1  1  4  6  4.25 1121/1568  4.25  4.40  4.43  4.54  4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  1  1 10  4.75  931/1572  4.75  4.66  4.70  4.79  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  1  3  3  5  4.00 1127/1564  4.00  4.24  4.28  4.40  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  3  4  5  4.17 1031/1559  4.17  4.26  4.29  4.41  4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 1 1 3 4 3 3.58 1011/1352  3.58  4.10  3.98  4.07  3.58

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  0  1  2  1  4.00  795/1384  4.00  3.74  4.08  4.35  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50  616/1382  4.50  3.90  4.29  4.56  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 844/1368  4.25  3.82  4.30  4.58  4.25
4. Were special techniques successful                  8   2  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 948  ****  3.58  3.95  4.31  ****

            Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  7  0  0  1  3  0  1  3.20  487/ 555  3.20  4.41  4.29  4.41  3.20

            Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                9   0  0  2  0  1  0  2.67  250/ 288  2.67  3.26  3.68  3.71  2.67

            Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 10  0  0  1  0  1  0  3.00 ****/ 312  ****  3.56  3.68  3.95  ****

            Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     8   0  0  0  0  4  0  4.00   40/ 110  4.00  3.20  3.99  4.22  4.00
```

                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 481  0101              University of Maryland                              Page  468
Title       COMPUTER NETWORKS                 Baltimore County                               FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  GREEN, FRANK E.                      Fall  2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    30
Questionnaires:  22                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                     Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions            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  4 10  7  4.05 1156/1649  4.05  4.28  4.28  4.50  4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  4 12  6  4.09 1070/1648  4.09  4.26  4.23  4.36  4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  2  1 11  8  4.14  895/1375  4.14  4.31  4.27  4.48  4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  4  0  2  5  6  5  3.78 1275/1595  3.78  4.26  4.20  4.36  3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  1  5  5 10  4.00  815/1533  4.00  3.69  4.04  4.14  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 10  1  1  2  5  3  3.67 1170/1512  3.67  4.15  4.10  4.26  3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  1  2  3  7  9  3.95 1104/1623  3.95  4.32  4.16  4.27  3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  0  0  0  0 11 10  4.48 1221/1646  4.48  4.79  4.69  4.71  4.48
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  0  0  1 10  4  3  3.50 1345/1621  3.50  4.01  4.06  4.24  3.50


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2  0  1  1  2  9  7  4.00 1279/1568  4.00  4.40  4.43  4.54  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2  0  0  2  2  8  8  4.10 1449/1572  4.10  4.66  4.70  4.79  4.10
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  1  2  4  8  5  3.70 1321/1564  3.70  4.24  4.28  4.40  3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2  0  1  3  6  5  5  3.50 1370/1559  3.50  4.26  4.29  4.41  3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  2  1  1  5  2  7  3.81  872/1352  3.81  4.10  3.98  4.07  3.81


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16  0  0  1  2  3  0  3.33 1159/1384  3.33  3.74  4.08  4.35  3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16  0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  616/1382  4.50  3.90  4.29  4.56  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16  0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  654/1368  4.50  3.82  4.30  4.58  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                   17  4  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 948  ****  3.58  3.95  4.31  ****


                Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  20  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 555  ****  4.41  4.29  4.41  ****


                Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 15  0  1  1  0  5  0  3.29  212/ 288  3.29  3.26  3.68  3.71  3.29


                Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  14  0  0  4  0  4  0  3.00  256/ 312  3.00  3.56  3.68  3.95  3.00


                Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      16  1  0  0  0  5  0  4.00 ****/ 110  ****  3.20  3.99  4.22  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     0         0.00-0.99   0       A    5       Required for Majors  2    Graduate     0      Major      13
28-55     0         1.00-1.99   0       B    9                                Under-grad   22     Non-major   9
56-83     0         2.00-2.99   1       C    3       General              8
84-150    9         3.00-3.49   5       D    1
Grad.     0         3.50-4.00   4       F    0       Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                8
                                        ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 491G 0101           University of Maryland                              Page  469
Title          COMP GRAPHICS FOR GAME     Baltimore County                                   FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    BAKER, DAN                 Fall  2008                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    10
Questionnaires: 9                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions               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  9  5.00    1/1649   5.00  4.28  4.28  4.50  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  168/1648   4.88  4.26  4.23  4.36  4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   6  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1375   5.00  4.31  4.27  4.48  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  144/1595   4.89  4.26  4.20  4.36  4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1  0  0  1  1  6  4.63  272/1533   4.63  3.69  4.04  4.14  4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  3  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  142/1512   4.83  4.15  4.10  4.26  4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   2  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1623   5.00  4.32  4.16  4.27  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  881/1646   4.78  4.79  4.69  4.71  4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  165/1621   4.75  4.01  4.06  4.24  4.75


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1568   5.00  4.40  4.43  4.54  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1572   5.00  4.66  4.70  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  197/1564   4.88  4.24  4.28  4.40  4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1559   5.00  4.26  4.29  4.41  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1352   5.00  4.10  3.98  4.07  5.00


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1384   ****  3.74  4.08  4.35  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1382   ****  3.90  4.29  4.56  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1368   ****  3.82  4.30  4.58  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  7   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 948   ****  3.58  3.95  4.31  ****


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  8   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 221   ****  4.12  4.16  4.73  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 243   ****  4.40  4.12  4.61  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 212   ****  4.75  4.40  4.57  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           8   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 209   ****  4.77  4.35  4.63  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 7   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 555   ****  4.41  4.29  4.41  ****


              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 8   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 312   ****  3.56  3.68  3.95  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  53   ****  2.50  4.30  4.64  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    8   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  30   ****  1.50  4.16  4.24  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      8   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  41   ****  2.00  4.43  4.84  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       8   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  24   ****  2.00  4.42  4.85  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     8   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 110   ****  3.20  3.99  4.22  ****


                          Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 491Q 0101            University of Maryland                              Page  470
Title      QUANTUM COMPUTATION             Baltimore County                                 FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   LOMONACO JR, SA              Fall   2008                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    12
Questionnaires:  2                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                       Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                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  1  4.50   644/1649  4.50  4.28  4.28  4.50  4.50
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50   556/1648  4.50  4.26  4.23  4.36  4.50
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50   546/1375  4.50  4.31  4.27  4.48  4.50
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50   497/1595  4.50  4.26  4.20  4.36  4.50
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   1   0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/1533  5.00  3.69  4.04  4.14  5.00
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0   0   0  0  1  0  1  4.00   883/1512  4.00  4.15  4.10  4.26  4.00
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/1623  5.00  4.32  4.16  4.27  5.00
 8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1646  5.00  4.79  4.69  4.71  5.00
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  0   0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50   374/1621  4.50  4.01  4.06  4.24  4.50


              Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50   852/1568  4.50  4.40  4.43  4.54  4.50
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50  1241/1572  4.50  4.66  4.70  4.79  4.50
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0   0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50   651/1564  4.50  4.24  4.28  4.40  4.50
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50   695/1559  4.50  4.26  4.29  4.41  4.50
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  0   0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50   303/1352  4.50  4.10  3.98  4.07  4.50


              Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/1384  5.00  3.74  4.08  4.35  5.00
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  1   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/1382  5.00  3.90  4.29  4.56  5.00
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/1368  5.00  3.82  4.30  4.58  5.00
 4. Were special techniques successful                 1   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/ 948  5.00  3.58  3.95  4.31  5.00

              Laboratory
 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  1   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/ 555  5.00  4.41  4.29  4.41  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         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     0       3.00-3.49    0         D    0
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    0         F    0        Electives             0       #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                       responses to be significant
                                          I    0        Other                 1
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 491S 0101           University of Maryland                              Page  471
Title      SRVC ORIENTED COMPUTIN         Baltimore County                                  FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    HALEM, MILTON              Fall  2008                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     16
Questionnaires: 11                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                   Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                     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  0  1  2  7  4.27  943/1649  4.27  4.28  4.28  4.50  4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  3  1  2  5  3.82 1304/1648  3.82  4.26  4.23  4.36  3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   6  0  1  1  1  2  3.80 1087/1375  3.80  4.31  4.27  4.48  3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  1  2  2  1  4  3.50 1397/1595  3.50  4.26  4.20  4.36  3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  6  0  0  1  1  3  4.40  476/1533  4.40  3.69  4.04  4.14  4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 3 1 0 3  1  2  3.43 1309/1512  3.43  4.15  4.10  4.26  3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  2  2  1  5  3.64 1332/1623  3.64  4.32  4.16  4.27  3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91  664/1646  4.91  4.79  4.69  4.71  4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 1 0 2  4  2  3.67 1261/1621  3.67  4.01  4.06  4.24  3.67


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  1  0  0  5  5  4.18 1176/1568  4.18  4.40  4.43  4.54  4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91  591/1572  4.91  4.66  4.70  4.79  4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  1  0  1  5  4  4.00 1127/1564  4.00  4.24  4.28  4.40  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  1  2  0  3  5  3.82 1241/1559  3.82  4.26  4.29  4.41  3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 2 0  1  6  4.22  534/1352  4.22  4.10  3.98  4.07  4.22


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  2  2  4  4.25  673/1384  4.25  3.74  4.08  4.35  4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63  521/1382  4.63  3.90  4.29  4.56  4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0  4  4  4.50  654/1368  4.50  3.82  4.30  4.58  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   2  0  1  0  1  4  4.33  310/ 948  4.33  3.58  3.95  4.31  4.33


                Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/ 243  ****  4.40  4.12  4.61  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/ 212  ****  4.75  4.40  4.57  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           10  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 209  ****  4.77  4.35  4.63  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  2  0  0  0  1  0  8  4.78  246/ 555  4.78  4.41  4.29  4.41  4.78


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  88  ****  3.97  4.54  4.66  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  85  ****  3.79  4.47  4.54  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/  81  ****  3.58  4.43  4.57  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    10  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  92  ****  4.00  4.35  4.44  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 9  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/ 288  ****  3.26  3.68  3.71  ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/  52  ****  2.00  4.06  4.86  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 10 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/  48  ****  2.00  4.09  4.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       10  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47  4.52  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   10  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  39  ****  1.50  4.38  4.59  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  9  0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/ 312  ****  3.56  3.68  3.95  ****


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  53  ****  2.50  4.30  4.64  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    10  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  30  ****  1.50  4.16  4.24  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      10  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  41  ****  2.00  4.43  4.84  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       10  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  24  ****  2.00  4.42  4.85  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     10  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 110  ****  3.20  3.99  4.22  ****
```

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 11   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 491V 0101              University of Maryland                                    Page  472
Title        ELECTRONIC VOTING SYS          Baltimore County                                         FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  SHERMAN, ALAN                   Fall   2008                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      4
Questionnaires:  3                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions               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  2  4.67  433/1649   4.67  4.28  4.28  4.50  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 1124/1648   4.00  4.26  4.23  4.36  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  546/1375   4.50  4.31  4.27  4.48  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  497/1595   4.50  4.26  4.20  4.36  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00  815/1533   4.00  3.69  4.04  4.14  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00  883/1512   4.00  4.15  4.10  4.26  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 1533/1623   3.00  4.32  4.16  4.27  3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 1193/1646   4.50  4.79  4.69  4.71  4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  914/1621   4.00  4.01  4.06  4.24  4.00

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  852/1568   4.50  4.40  4.43  4.54  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1572   5.00  4.66  4.70  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  651/1564   4.50  4.24  4.28  4.40  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1559   5.00  4.26  4.29  4.41  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1352   5.00  4.10  3.98  4.07  5.00

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1384   5.00  3.74  4.08  4.35  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1382   5.00  3.90  4.29  4.56  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1368   5.00  3.82  4.30  4.58  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 948   5.00  3.58  3.95  4.31  5.00


                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 611  0101            University of Maryland                           Page  473
Title      ADV COMPUTER ARCHITECT         Baltimore County                                FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   OLANO, MARC                 Fall   2008                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     56
Questionnaires: 42                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level Sect
              Questions               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  2  7 12 20  4.22 1007/1649  4.22  4.28  4.28 4.46  4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     2  0  0  0  5 17 18  4.32  811/1648  4.32  4.26  4.23 4.34  4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1  0  0  3  8 16 14  4.00  950/1375  4.00  4.31  4.27 4.44  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1  1  1  2 10 14 13  3.90 1202/1595  3.90  4.26  4.20 4.35  3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1  0  3 12 11 14  3.90  915/1533  3.90  3.69  4.04 4.28  3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  1  5  5 18 12  3.85 1055/1512  3.85  4.15  4.10 4.35  3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1  0  0  1  1  9 30  4.66  333/1623  4.66  4.32  4.16 4.29  4.66
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  0  0  0  0  1 40  4.98  199/1646  4.98  4.79  4.69 4.81  4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0  1  0  3 15 17  4.31  632/1621  4.31  4.01  4.06 4.20  4.31


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2  0  0  0  5 10 25  4.50  852/1568  4.50  4.40  4.43 4.52  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2  0  0  2  2  6 30  4.60 1146/1572  4.60  4.66  4.70 4.83  4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  1  0  4 13 21  4.36  833/1564  4.36  4.24  4.28 4.41  4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2  0  0  3  6 11 20  4.20 1009/1559  4.20  4.26  4.29 4.41  4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 3  3  1  6  9 17  4.00  690/1352  4.00  4.10  3.98 4.10  4.00


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0  0  2  7 12  9  3.93  858/1384  3.93  3.74  4.08 4.30  3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0  2  1  3 13 11  4.00  946/1382  4.00  3.90  4.29 4.52  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0  0  2  3  7 17  4.34  790/1368  4.34  3.82  4.30 4.56  4.34
4. Were special techniques successful                   14 14 3  1  2  5  3  3.29  793/ 948  3.29  3.58  3.95 4.03  3.29


              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 40 0  2  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 243  ****  4.40  4.12 4.61  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  40  0  1  0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/  52  ****  2.00  4.06 4.51  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  40  0  1  1  0  0  0  1.50 ****/  48  ****  2.00  4.09 4.47  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        40  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47 4.58  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    40  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  1.50  4.38 4.44  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  38  1  0  1  0  1  1  3.67 ****/ 312  ****  3.56  3.68 3.83  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 39  0  1  0  1  0  1  3.00 ****/  53  ****  2.50  4.30 4.37  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     39  1  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/  30  ****  1.50  4.16 4.49  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       39  1  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  41  ****  2.00  4.43 4.43  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        39  1  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/  24  ****  2.00  4.42 4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      39  2  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 110  ****  3.20  3.99 3.92  ****


                                 Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      5       0.00-0.99    6     A   19       Required for Majors   0     Graduate    22      Major       28
  28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0     B   16
  56-83      0       2.00-2.99    0     C    0       General               0     Under-grad  20      Non-major   14
  84-150     0       3.00-3.49    2     D    0
  Grad.     22       3.50-4.00    3     F    0       Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                39
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 621  0101                    University of Maryland                                    Page  474
Title       ADV OPERATING SYSTEMS                    Baltimore County                                     FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  SIDHU, DEEPINDE                         Fall  2008                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      41
Questionnaires:  34                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                            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   4   3   9  12   5  3.33 1540/1649  3.33  4.28  4.28 4.46  3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2   0   2   5   9  11   5  3.38 1535/1648  3.38  4.26  4.23 4.34  3.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0   4   5   7  12   5  3.27 1275/1375  3.27  4.31  4.27 4.44  3.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   2   7  12   7   5  3.18 1504/1595  3.18  4.26  4.20 4.35  3.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   3   7  17   6  3.79 1036/1533  3.79  3.69  4.04 4.28  3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  3   5  15   7   3  3.06 1421/1512  3.06  4.15  4.10 4.35  3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   2   9   6   6   5   5  2.71 1588/1623  2.71  4.32  4.16 4.29  2.71
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0  28   5  4.15 1469/1646  4.15  4.79  4.69 4.81  4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0  1   5   7  10   3  3.35 1426/1621  3.35  4.01  4.06 4.20  3.35


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   1   3   8  11  10  3.79 1391/1568  3.79  4.40  4.43 4.52  3.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   3   5  11  14  4.09 1450/1572  4.09  4.66  4.70 4.83  4.09
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   3   4   5  13   8  3.58 1368/1564  3.58  4.24  4.28 4.41  3.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   4   3   7   9  10  3.55 1359/1559  3.55  4.26  4.29 4.41  3.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  5   4   1   6   9   5  3.40 1101/1352  3.40  4.10  3.98 4.10  3.40


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0   4   2   5  11   4  3.35 1153/1384  3.35  3.74  4.08 4.30  3.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0   1   3   4  14   4  3.65 1151/1382  3.65  3.90  4.29 4.52  3.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8  0   1   3   4  10   8  3.81 1071/1368  3.81  3.82  4.30 4.56  3.81
4. Were special techniques successful                  7  16   0   2   3   4   2  3.55  690/ 948  3.55  3.58  3.95 4.03  3.55


           Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  23 10   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 221  ****  4.12  4.16 4.27  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 28 0  1   1   1   2   1  3.17 ****/ 243  ****  4.40  4.12 4.61  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 19  2   0   0   0   1  12  4.92  182/ 555  4.92  4.41  4.29 4.66  4.92


           Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 26  5   0   1   0   0   2  4.00 ****/  88  ****  3.97  4.54 4.63  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 1  0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/  85  ****  3.79  4.47 4.50  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31  2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  81  ****  3.58  4.43 4.43  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    31  1   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/  92  ****  4.00  4.35 4.42  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                30  1   0   0   1   1   1  4.00 ****/ 288  ****  3.26  3.68 3.87  ****


           Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 29  0   1   1   2   1   0  2.60 ****/  52  ****  2.00  4.06 4.51  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 32  0   1   1   0   0   0  1.50 ****/  48  ****  2.00  4.09 4.47  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       32  1   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47 4.58  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   32  1   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  39  ****  1.50  4.38 4.44  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 31  1   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/ 312  ****  3.56  3.68 3.83  ****


           Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 31  0   1   2   0   0   0  1.67 ****/  53  ****  2.50  4.30 4.37  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    31  1   0   1   1   0   0  2.50 ****/  30  ****  1.50  4.16 4.49  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      31  1   0   2   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  41  ****  2.00  4.43 4.43  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       31  1   1   1   0   0   0  1.50 ****/  24  ****  2.00  4.42 4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     31  1   0   2   0   0   0  2.00 ****/ 110  ****  3.20  3.99 3.92  ****
```

```
                                      Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons              Type              Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     5        0.00-0.99   5        A   14        Required for Majors  1     Graduate    19     Major        19
 28-55     0        1.00-1.99   0        B    8
 56-83     0        2.00-2.99   0        C    0        General              2     Under-grad  15     Non-major    15
 84-150    1        3.00-3.49   1        D    0
 Grad.    19        3.50-4.00   8        F    0        Electives            1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other               24
                                         ?    4
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 636  0101              University of Maryland                          Page  475
Title      DATA VISUALIZATION               Baltimore County                              FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   RHEINGANS, PENN               Fall   2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     11
Questionnaires:  11                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  3  8  4.73  361/1649   4.73  4.28  4.28 4.46  4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  4  7  4.64  401/1648   4.64  4.26  4.23 4.34  4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  10  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1375   **** 4.31  4.27 4.44  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91  133/1595   4.91  4.26  4.20 4.35  4.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  151/1533   4.80  3.69  4.04 4.28  4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  0  1  4  5  4.40  522/1512   4.40  4.15  4.10 4.35  4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  1  1  9  4.73  251/1623   4.73  4.32  4.16 4.29  4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1646   5.00  4.79  4.69 4.81  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  0  0  5  6  4.55  339/1621   4.55  4.01  4.06 4.20  4.55


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  1  6  4  4.27 1104/1568   4.27  4.40  4.43 4.52  4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1572   5.00  4.66  4.70 4.83  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  4  7  4.64  511/1564   4.64  4.24  4.28 4.41  4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  0  5  6  4.55  651/1559   4.55  4.26  4.29 4.41  4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1  0  0  0  5  5  4.50  303/1352   4.50  4.10  3.98 4.10  4.50


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1384   5.00  3.74  4.08 4.30  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1382   5.00  3.90  4.29 4.52  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1368   5.00  3.82  4.30 4.56  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  6   4  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 948   **** 3.58  3.95 4.03  ****

            Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 10  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 312   **** 3.56  3.68 3.83  ****


                                      Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section:  CMSC 643 0101                University of Maryland                                      Page   10
Title     Quantum Computation                 Baltimore County                                           FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  Lomonaco Jr., S.                 Fall  2008                                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      0
Questionnaires:  8                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                  Questions                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  1  6  4.63   484/1649  ****  4.52  4.28  4.11  4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  2  1  5  4.38   743/1648  ****  4.35  4.23  4.16  4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63   443/1375  ****  4.38  4.27  4.10  4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63   362/1595  ****  4.38  4.20  4.03  4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2  1  0  2  0  3  3.67  1139/1533  ****  4.01  4.04  3.87  3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  2  2  4  4.25   687/1512  ****  4.35  4.10  3.86  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  2  3  3  4.13   957/1623  ****  4.22  4.16  4.08  4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00     1/1646  ****  4.85  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0  0  0  0  3  3  4.50   374/1621  ****  4.07  4.06  3.96  4.50


                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  1  4  3  4.25  1121/1568  ****  4.50  4.43  4.39  4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00     1/1572  ****  4.82  4.70  4.64  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63   524/1564  ****  4.29  4.28  4.20  4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  1  1  6  4.63   561/1559  ****  4.34  4.29  4.20  4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  1  0  0  1  2  4  4.43   379/1352  ****  3.91  3.98  3.86  4.43


                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  1  0  1  1  1  3.25  1192/1384  ****  4.39  4.08  3.86  3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00     1/1382  ****  4.49  4.29  4.03  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00     1/1368  ****  4.43  4.30  4.01  5.00


                  Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  7   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 221  ****  4.91  4.16  4.05  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00     1/ 555  ****  4.01  4.29  4.14  5.00


                  Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                2   0  0  0  0  6  0  4.00    83/ 288  ****  3.36  3.68  3.54  4.00


                  Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  52  ****  4.18  4.06  3.72  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 7   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  48  ****  4.50  4.09  3.65  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       7   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  39  ****  4.40  4.47  4.36  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   7   0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00  ****/  39  ****  4.62  4.38  4.37  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 1   1  0  0  0  6  0  4.00    68/ 312  ****  3.81  3.68  3.51  4.00


                  Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  53  ****  3.67  4.30  4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    7   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  30  ****  ****  4.16  4.06  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      7   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  41  ****  ****  4.43  4.27  ****

                          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     5      Major       0
28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0       B    0
56-83      0       2.00-2.99    0       C    0        General               4      Under-grad   3      Non-major   0
84-150     0       3.00-3.49    0       D    0
Grad.      5       3.50-4.00    1       F    0        Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                     responses to be significant
```

```
I    0              Other              3
?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 671  0101                University of Maryland                                   Page  476
Title       PRIN ARTIFICIAL INTELL            Baltimore County                                        FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   PENG, YUN                       Fall   2008                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     14
Questionnaires: 10                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                       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  4  6  4.60   510/1649  4.60   4.28  4.28 4.46  4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0  0  0  4  6  4.60   441/1648  4.60   4.26  4.23 4.34  4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0  0  0  3  7  4.70   370/1375  4.70   4.31  4.27 4.44  4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0  0  0  3  7  4.70   291/1595  4.70   4.26  4.20 4.35  4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2   0  1  1  2  4  4.13   733/1533  4.13   3.69  4.04 4.28  4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 3  0  0  1  2  3  4.33   595/1512  4.33   4.15  4.10 4.35  4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0  0  2  1  7  4.50   502/1623  4.50   4.32  4.16 4.29  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0  0  0  0 10  5.00     1/1646  5.00   4.79  4.69 4.81  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0  0  1  5  3  4.22   720/1621  4.22   4.01  4.06 4.20  4.22

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0  0  0  3  6  4.67   636/1568  4.67   4.40  4.43 4.52  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0  0  0  1  8  4.89   640/1572  4.89   4.66  4.70 4.83  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0  1  0  3  5  4.33   854/1564  4.33   4.24  4.28 4.41  4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   1  1  0  1  6  4.11  1067/1559  4.11   4.26  4.29 4.41  4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0   0  0  3  4  2  3.89   830/1352  3.89   4.10  3.98 4.10  3.89

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0   2  0  1  3  1  3.14  1232/1384  3.14   3.74  4.08 4.30  3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0   1  0  3  1  2  3.43  1229/1382  3.43   3.90  4.29 4.52  3.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  0  0  2  3  2  4.00   948/1368  4.00   3.82  4.30 4.56  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   3   0  0  1  2  1  4.00   431/ 948  4.00   3.58  3.95 4.03  4.00

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  9   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 221  ****   4.12  4.16 4.27  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 9 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/ 243  ****   4.40  4.12 4.61  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/ 212  ****   4.75  4.40 4.73  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           9   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/ 209  ****   4.77  4.35 4.80  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 9   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/ 555  ****   4.41  4.29 4.66  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 9  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  88  ****   3.97  4.54 4.63  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 9 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  85  ****   3.79  4.47 4.50  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 9  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  81  ****   3.58  4.43 4.43  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    9   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  92  ****   4.00  4.35 4.42  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                9   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/ 288  ****   3.26  3.68 3.87  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9  0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  52  ****   2.00  4.06 4.51  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 9   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  48  ****   2.00  4.09 4.47  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       9   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  39  ****   ****  4.47 4.58  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   9   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  39  ****   1.50  4.38 4.44  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 8   0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/ 312  ****   3.56  3.68 3.83  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8  0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/  53  ****   2.50  4.30 4.37  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    8   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/  30  ****   1.50  4.16 4.49  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      8   0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/  41  ****   2.00  4.43 4.43  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       8   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/  24  ****   2.00  4.42 4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     8   0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/ 110  ****   3.20  3.99 3.92  ****
```

```
                                        Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 681  0101                University of Maryland                              Page  477
Title       ADVANCED COMP NETWORKS              Baltimore County                               FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  SIDHU, DEEPINDE                    Fall  2008                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      20
Questionnaires: 13                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              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  0  2  3  2  4 3.73 1391/1649  3.73  4.28  4.28  4.46  3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     2   0  2  1  1  4  3 3.45 1504/1648  3.45  4.26  4.23  4.34  3.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    2   0  2  1  1  5  2 3.36 1252/1375  3.36  4.31  4.27  4.44  3.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     3   0  2  1  3  1  3 3.20 1499/1595  3.20  4.26  4.20  4.35  3.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   0  0  0  2  5  4 4.18  688/1533  4.18  3.69  4.04  4.28  4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 0  2  3  2  2    3.44 1298/1512  3.44  4.15  4.10  4.35  3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0  0  2  3  3  3 3.64 1332/1623  3.64  4.32  4.16  4.29  3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled                   3   0  0  0  2  5  3 4.10 1506/1646  4.10  4.79  4.69  4.81  4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 0  0  2  2  1 3.80 1151/1621  3.80  4.01  4.06  4.20  3.80


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         4   0  1  1  1  0  6 4.00 1279/1568  4.00  4.40  4.43  4.52  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    4   0  1  0  0  0  8 4.56 1193/1572  4.56  4.66  4.70  4.83  4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4   0  2  0  1  2  4 3.67 1336/1564  3.67  4.24  4.28  4.41  3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      4   0  1  0  3  0  5 3.89 1206/1559  3.89  4.26  4.29  4.41  3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5  1  0  0  0  2  5 4.71  177/1352  4.71  4.10  3.98  4.10  4.71


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0  1  1  1  1  3 3.57 1051/1384  3.57  3.74  4.08  4.30  3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0  1  0  3  0  3 3.57 1187/1382  3.57  3.90  4.29  4.52  3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  1  0  2  1  3 3.71 1115/1368  3.71  3.82  4.30  4.56  3.71
4. Were special techniques successful                   6   2  2  0  1  0  2 3.00  844/ 948  3.00  3.58  3.95  4.03  3.00


                 Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  3   0  0  0  0  0 10 5.00    1/ 555  5.00  4.41  4.29  4.66  5.00


                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 8   0  0  0  0  3  2 4.40   58/  88  4.40  3.97  4.54  4.63  4.40
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 9  0  0  0  1  1  2 4.25   62/  85  4.25  3.79  4.47  4.50  4.25
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 9   0  1  0  1  0  2 3.50   77/  81  3.50  3.58  4.43  4.43  3.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     9   0  0  0  2  0  2 4.00   66/  92  4.00  4.00  4.35  4.42  4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 9   0  0  0  2  1  1 3.75  173/ 288  3.75  3.26  3.68  3.87  3.75


                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 12  0  0  1  0  0  0 2.00 ****/  53  ****  2.50  4.30  4.37  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       12  0  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/  41  ****  2.00  4.43  4.43  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        12  0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  24  ****  2.00  4.42  4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      12  0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/ 110  ****  3.20  3.99  3.92  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

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