Title INTRO TO COMPUTERS/PRO

Instructor: DESJARDINS, MAR

Enrollment:

40 Questionnaires: 17 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 415 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions					NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	§ 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did	vou gain net	Genera w insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	844/1649	4.35	4.28	4.28	4.11	4.35
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	464/1648	4.59	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.59
		estions reflec		_	0	0	0	0	1	2		4.76	283/1375	4.76	4.31	4.27		4.76
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	4	6		4.18	916/1595	4.18	4.26	4.20		4.18
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	8		4.18	695/1533	4.18	3.69	4.04		4.18
				o what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	9	4		966/1512		4.15	4.10		3.94
7. Was	the grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	272/1623	4.71	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.71
		was class canc			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 gr	rade the overa	ll tead	thing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	11	2	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.01	4.06	3.96	4.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	the instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	461/1568	4.76	4.40	4.43	4.39	4.76
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	355/1572	4.94	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.94
3. Was	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	897/1564	4.29	4.24	4.28	4.20	4.29
4. Did	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	736/1559	4.47	4.26	4.29	4.20	4.47
5. Did	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					0	0	0	2	9	6	4.24	528/1352	4.24	4.10	3.98	3.86	4.24
	Discussion																	
1. Did	class discus	ssions contrib	ute 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
				ed to participate	8	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	676/1382	4.44	3.90	4.29	4.03	4.44
				nd open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	2		4.50	654/1368	4.50	3.82	4.30	4.01	4.50
4. Were	special ted	chniques succe	ssful		9	5	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 948	****	3.58	3.95	3.75	****
		Labora																
5. Were	e requirement	ts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	14	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 555	****	4.41	4.29	4.14	***
		Semina	r															
5. Were	criteria fo	or grading mad	e 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 carr	y out f	ield 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 enoug	gh proctors fo	r all t	the students	14	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	3.20	3.99	3.83	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utior	ı									
Credits	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	asons	5			Тур	oe .			Majors	\$
 00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 5						 mir	ed fo	 or Ms			 1	Graduate		0	Majo		0
	28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 5					1/6/	2u11	cu i) I 11C	10ر	2	_	Graduate	-	5	ı-ıa J	-	J
	56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 3					Ger	nera:	1				6	Under-gi	rad 1	.7	Non-	major	17
	84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0					JCI	c. u.	-				-	onacı gı		- •	14011		± /
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0					Ele	ectiv	ves				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoue	rh
oraa.	P 0					Electives 2 #### - Means there are not er responses to be significant					_	,==						
				I O		Ot.1	her					5					-	
	I 0											-						

Course-Section: CMSC 100H 0101 Title

INTRO TO COMPUTERS/PRO

Instructor: DESJARDINS, MAR

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 416 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	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		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		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		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	
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	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	utior	ı									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	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	Electives		responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-	_		
				2	0						

Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR

Instructor: PARK, JOHN

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 20

K, JOHN Fall 2008

Page 417 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	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

Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR

Instructor: PARK, JOHN

Questionnaires: 20

Enrollment: 39

University of Maryland Page 417
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	ned Cum. GPA			d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4	
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	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		e are not enough		
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	9	-				
				?	0							

PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR

Title Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M

Enrollment:

48 Questionnaires: 22 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 418 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	=		Tnst	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	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		****/ 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		, -	****	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		****/ 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		****/ 41	****	2.00	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	2	0	0	0	1	1			****	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		3.99	3.83	***

Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR

Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M

Enrollment: 48
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 418 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	-		_	
				?	0						

Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR

Instructor: TANG, SHILANG

Enrollment: 38

Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 419 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
----------------	------------	---------------

			Fre	equer	cies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General														
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														
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		4.26	4.29		4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	303/1352			3.98		4.50
	_	_	_	-	-	_			,					
Discussion														
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		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		****/ 948		3.58	3.95	3.75	****
1. Were special techniques successivi		O	U	U	-	_	U	3.30	/ 510	1.05	3.30	3.73	3.73	
Laboratory														
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		****/ 243	4.50	4.40	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 212	5.00	4.75	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 209	4.67		4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 555		4.41	4.29	4.14	****
J. Were requirements for tab reports elearly specified		2	U	U	O	O	_	3.00	/ 333	1.15	1.11	1.27	1.11	
Seminar														
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
5. Note criteria for grading made orear		Ü	O	_	Ü	-	Ü	3.00	101/ 200	3.30	3.20	3.00	3.31	3.00
Field Work														
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
5. Bid conferences help you early out freid detivities		Ü	O	-	Ü	-	Ü	3.00	213/ 312	3.32	3.30	3.00	3.31	3.00
Self Paced														
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		****/ 30	****	1.50	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 41	****	2.00	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 24	****	2.00	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 110	3.67	3.20	3.99	3.83	****
J. Here there chough proceeds for all the students	±0	5	J	J	J	J		5.00	, 110	3.07	J. ZU	3.22	رن. ر	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	

I 0 Other 6 ? 0

PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR

Title

Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M

Enrollment: 45 Questionnaires: 30 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Page 420 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

				Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1	General 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
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	23	4.77	253/1648		4.26	4.23	4.11	4.77
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	192/1375		4.31	4.27	4.10	4.77
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	218/1595		4.26	4.20	4.03	4.78
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	0	2	_	10	4.53	342/1533	3.72	3.69		3.87	4.53
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	422/1512		4.15	4.10	3.86	4.48
	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	26	4.40	169/1623		4.13	4.16	4.08	4.40
	How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	266/1646			4.69	4.67	4.96
	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	3	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	225/1621		4.79	4.06	3.96	
9.	now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	۷	3	U	U	Т	0	10	4.00	225/1621	4.30	4.01	4.00	3.90	4.00
	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
		16	0	0	2	2	3	7	4.07	929/1382		3.74	4.08	4.03	4.07
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	654/1368				4.03	4.50
	Were special techniques successful	16	4	1	0	0	4		4.20	365/ 948		3.82	4.30 3.95		4.20
4.	were special techniques successiul	10	4	Т	U	U	4	5	4.20	303/ 940	4.03	3.30	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	****
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 85	****	3.79	4.47	4.30	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 81	****	3.58	4.43	4.39	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 92	****	4.00	4.35	4.01	****
	Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	2	0	4	2		173/ 288		3.26	3.68	3.54	3 75
٥.	were erreered for grading made erear	22	Ü	J	-	Ü	-	-	3.73	1737 200	3.30	3.20	3.00	3.31	3.73
	Field Work														
	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 52	****	2.00	4.06	3.72	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	2.00	4.09	3.65	****
	Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	1.50		4.37	****
			^				0								

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	****

Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR

Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M

Enrollment: 45
Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 420 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	 А	21	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19	-			
				?	0						

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Instructor: BERGERON, RYAN

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 421 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

				Fre	equer	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
	General														
1. Did you gain new in	nsights,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
	make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	5	5		1208/1648	4.37		4.23	4.25	3.93
	ions 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 evaluation	ons 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 reading	ngs 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 assignm	ments 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 sys	stem 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	e 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														
	r's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	1153/1568	4.50	4.40	4.43	4.39	4.2
	seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	0	5	7	4.14	1435/1572	4.54	4.66	4.70	4.73	4.1
	al presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	8	1	3.64	1344/1564	4.45	4.24	4.28	4.27	3.6
4. Did the lectures co	ontribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	8	3	3.79	1258/1559	4.36	4.26	4.29	4.33	3.7
5. Did audiovisual ted	chniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	556/1352	4.16	4.10	3.98	4.07	4.2
	Discussion														
1. Did class discussion	ons 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 a	actively encouraged to participate	3	0	3	1	5	2	1	2.75	1350/1382	3.45	3.90	4.29	4.19	2.7
	encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	2	7	1	0	2.73	1334/1368	2.71	3.82	4.30	4.21	2.7
4. Were special techni	iques successful	4	10	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 948	2.78	3.58	3.95	3.89	***
	Laboratory														
	se understanding of the material	13	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 221	4.25	4.12	4.16	4.45	***
	with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 243	4.36	4.40	4.12	4.47	***
	erials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 212	4.73	4.75	4.40	4.62	***
	ctor provide assistance	13	0	0	1	0	0			****/ 209		4.77		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	2.7
	Seminar														
5. Were criteria for o	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 he	lp 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 p	proctors for all the students	13	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 110	2.00	3.20	3.99	3.72	***
	Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Res	asons	=			Ту	ne.			Majors	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0		2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55 56-83	2 1	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0 3	B C	2 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 P	1 0	Electives	0	#### - Means responses to		are not enough mificant	ı
				I ?	0	Other	10				

COMPUTER SCIENCE I Baltimore County

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0104

20

BERGERON, RYAN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland Page 422 FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

- · ·			A
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

			Fr	eque:	ncie	3		Inst	tructor	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		1/1382		3.90	4.29	4.19	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	0	0		1365/1368		3.82	4.30		1.00
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	3			Ty	pe			Majors	
00_27								n	Craduat		0	Maio	~~~~~	0

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_	_		
				?	0						

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Instructor: BERGERON, RYAN

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 17 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 423 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncie	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		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		4.26	4.29	4.33	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	3	6	5	4.00					4.07	
									,					
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	****
- 1														
Laboratory				•		_								
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 221	4.25	4.12	4.16	4.45	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	3	0		****/ 243	4.36	4.40	4.12	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 212		4.75	4.40	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 209		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		****/ 48	2.00	2.00	4.09	4.05	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 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		****/ 312		3.56	3.68	3.59	****
J. Did conferences help you carry out fred accivities	14	_	U	_	U	ی	U	3.30	/ 312	J.∠J	3.30	3.00	3.33	
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	****

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0105
Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Instructor: BERGERON, RYAN

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 423 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l 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	В	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	1
				Р	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-			
				?	0						

COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Title Instructor: BERGERON, RYAN

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 19

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00 5

0

0

Р

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 424 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	MD	NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncie: 3	s 4	E	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	
								Mean			Mean	Mean	Mean	
General														
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
Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	533/1648		4.26	4.23	4.25	4
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
Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	11		4.31	746/1595		4.26	4.20	4.22	
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
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
Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	6			838/1623		4.32	4.16		
How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3		4.82			4.79	4.69	4.63	4
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
Lecture														
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
Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94			4.66	4.70	4.73	4
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
Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	6	9	4.38			4.26	4.29	4.33	
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
Discussion														
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
Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	2	4	4	4		1203/1382		3.90	4.29	4.19	
Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	0	1	6	5		1129/1368		3.82	4.30	4.21	
Were special techniques successful	4	10	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	578/ 948			3.95		
Laboratory														
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
Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	- ,		4.40	4.12	4.47	
Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	1	0	0	0	1		4.80	50/ 212		4.75	4.40		
Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	45/ 209		4.77	4.35	4.64	
Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	2	0	0	0	1	7	4.88			4.41		4.33	
Seminar														
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	4
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	4
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	*
Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 288	3.00	3.26	3.68	3.65	4
Field Work														
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
Self Paced														
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	*
Freq	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	3
								0			0			
0-27 2 0.00-0.99 1 A 5 8-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 8		Kee	quir(eu f	or Ma	ajor	ö	0	Graduat	C	0	Majo).T	
6-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 1		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad 1	.9	Non-	major	
			a.	_				_	011401 9		-	2.011		

Electives

Other

1

13

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

? 0

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0201 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 9

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 425 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Ouestion	æ		MP	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 54		Genera		. Abia manna	0	0	0	2	0	2	5	1 11	1106/1640	4 20	4 20	4 20	4 20	4 11
		, insights,ski or make clear			0	0	0	1	0 1	2 1	5 6	4.11	1106/1649 797/1648		4.28	4.28	4.29 4.25	4.11 4.33
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67			4.31	4.27	4.37	4.67
		tions reflect			0	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	782/1595		4.26	4.20	4.22	4.29
				hat you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67			3.69	4.04	4.04	4.67
				what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67			4.15	4.10	4.14	4.67
		system clearly			0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	,		4.32	4.16	4.21	4.89
		as class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00			4.79	4.69	4.63	5.00
				ing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25				4.06	4.01	4.25
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	ne instruc	tor's lecture	s well p	repared	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	636/1568	4.50	4.40	4.43	4.39	4.67
2. Did the	e instruct	or seem inter	ested 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 led	cture mate	rial presente	d and ex	plained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	971/1564	4.45	4.24	4.28	4.27	4.22
		contribute to			0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	987/1559	4.36	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.22
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance yo	ur understanding	0	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	624/1352	4.16	4.10	3.98	4.07	4.11
	Discussion id class discussions contribute to what you learr																	
			3	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	,			4.08	3.99	4.00		
		to participate	3	0	1	0	3	1	1		1298/1382		3.90	4.29	4.19	3.17		
		open discussion	3	0 3	1	0	4	1	0		1322/1368		3.82	4.30	4.21	2.83		
4. Were sp	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discuss Were special techniques successful						0	0	2	1	0	3.33	776/ 948	2.78	3.58	3.95	3.89	3.33
		Labora	_															
		ease understa			6	0	0	0	1	1	1		- ,		4.12	4.16	4.45	4.00
				round information	6	0	0	0	2	0		3.67			4.40	4.12	4.47	3.67
				r lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33			4.75	4.40	4.62	4.33
		ructor provid			6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33			4.77	4.35	4.64	4.33
5. Were re	equirement	s for lab rep	orts cle	arly specified	5	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	338/ 555	4.29	4.41	4.29	4.33	4.33
_		Semina			_													
5. Were cr	riteria fo	or grading made	e clear		6	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	83/ 288	3.00	3.26	3.68	3.65	4.00
!!		Field			5	0			•									
5. Dia cor	Did conferences help you carry out field activities						0	Ü	U	4	0	4.00	68/ 312	3.25	3.56	3.68	3.59	4.00
		Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	ution	1											
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3	
00-27	0	A б		Red	 quire	ed fo	or Ma	 ajors	 ;	0	 Graduat		0	Majo	 r	2		
28-55							_			-						3 -		
56-83							neral	l				0	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	major	7
84-150																		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### -				_	βh	
				P 0									respons	es to b	oe sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otł	her					7						
			? 1															

COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Title Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 4 Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 426 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

University of Maryland

							Fre	equer	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 General	 I															
1. Did vo	u gain new	insights, ski		this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	644/1649	4.30	4.28	4.28	4.29	4.50
		or make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	556/1648	4.37	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.50
		stions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	296/1375	4.56	4.31	4.27	4.37	4.75
		tions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	497/1595	4.37	4.26	4.20	4.22	4.50
				what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	_	5.00	1/1512		4.15	4.10	4.14	5.00
		system clearl		_	0	0	0	0	0	1	3		220/1623		4.32		4.21	
		as class cance	_	ica	0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1646		4.79	4.69	4.63	5.00
	-			ing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	1		687/1621		4.01			4.25
		Lecture	2															
1 Were t	he instruc	tor's lecture	-	repared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	480/1568	4.50	4.40	4.43	4.39	4.75
		or seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	2	2		1241/1572	4.54	4.66	4.70	4.73	4.50
				plained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3		342/1564		4.24	4.70	4.27	4.75
		contribute to			0	0	0	0	0	1	-	4.75	390/1559		4.24	4.29	4.33	4.75
				ur understanding	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.75				3.98		4.75
5. Did au	laiovisuai	recumiques em	lance you	ir understanding	U	U	U	U	2	U	2	4.00	690/1352	4.16	4.10	3.98	4.07	4.00
1 5 1 1	7.1		2	0	0	0	0		-	4 50	425 /1204	2 01	2 54	4 00	2 00	4 50		
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learn Were all students actively encouraged to participa						0	0	0	1	1		437/1384			4.08	3.99	4.50
			2	0	0	0	1	0		4.00	946/1382		3.90	4.29	4.19	4.00		
3. Did th	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discuss:						1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1356/1368	2.71	3.82	4.30	4.21	2.00
		Labora	cory															
1. Did th	e lab incr	ease understa	nding 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 y	ou provide	d with adequat	e backgı	round information	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	49/ 243	4.36	4.40	4.12	4.47	4.67
3. Were n	ecessary ma	aterials avai:	lable for	lab activities	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 212	4.73	4.75	4.40	4.62	5.00
		ructor provide			1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 209	4.72	4.77	4.35	4.64	5.00
				arly specified	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	293/ 555	4.29	4.41	4.29	4.33	4.50
		Semina	2															
5. Were d	riteria fo	r grading made	e clear		3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	266/ 288	3.00	3.26	3.68	3.65	2.00
		Self 1	Paced															
5. Were t	here enough	h proctors for		e students	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	107/ 110	2.00	3.20	3.99	3.72	2.00
		Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	ı											
Credits E	'awn a d	Expected Grades				Dor	asons				Тт г				Madama			
	arneu	Expected Grades						; 			Ту]				Majors	· 		
00-27							quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	5	0	Graduate	е	0	Majo	r	3
28-55				_	_						1							
56-83	0	C 0		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	1		
84-150	0	D 0								_								
Grad.	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh		
				P 0									response	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner					4						
			? 0															

COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Title Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 9

Baltimore County Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Page 427 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did voi	u gain ne	General w insights skill	s from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	723/1649	4.30	4.28	4.28	4.29	4.44
_	_	-	the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	-,		4.26	4.23	4.25	4.44
			the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56			4.31	4.27	4.37	
	_		the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	,		4.26	4.20	4.22	4.22
			te to what you learned	0	5	0	0	3	0	1		1249/1533		3.69	4.04	4.04	
	_		oute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	2			595/1512		4.15		4.14	
		system clearly	-	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	720/1623	4.60	4.32	4.16	4.21	4.33
		was class cancel	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	4.93	4.79	4.69	4.63	5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	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 th	he instru	ctor'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	e instruc	tor seem interes	sted 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 led	cture mat	erial 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	e lecture	s 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 aud	diovisual	techniques enha	ance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	534/1352	4.16	4.10	3.98	4.07	4.22
	Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learn																
1. Did cla	Did class discussions contribute to what you learn				0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	737/1384	3.91	3.74	4.08	3.99	4.14
2. Were a	Were all students actively encouraged to participa				0	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	1187/1382	3.45	3.90	4.29	4.19	3.57
3. Did the	ere all students actively encouraged to participa oid the instructor encourage fair and open discuss				0	2	0	0	3	0	2.80	1326/1368	2.71	3.82	4.30	4.21	2.80
4. Were sp	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discuss Were special techniques successful			3	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	2.78	3.58	3.95	3.89	***
		Laborato	pry														
1. Did the	e lab ind	rease understand	ling 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 yo	ou provid	led with adequate	e 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 ne	ecessary	materials availa	able 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	e lab ins	structor 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 re	equiremer	its for lab repor	rts 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 ci	riteria f	for grading made	clear	6	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	3.00	3.26	3.68	3.65	***
		Field Wo	ork														
5. Did com	Field Work Did conferences help you carry out field activitie					0	3	0	0	0	2.00	291/ 312	3.25	3.56	3.68	3.59	2.00
	Self Paced																
5. Were th	Were there enough proctors for all the students					0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	2.00	3.20	3.99	3.72	****
						trib	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected G						Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	
													-				
00-27 28-55						quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	6
56-83						nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	major	3
84-150						c. a.	-				~	onaci -g		-	14011		5
Grad.						ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	h

Other

9

Ρ

Ι

?

0

0

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0204 University of Maryland Title

COMPUTER SCIENCE I Baltimore County Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A Fall 2008

Enrollment: 19 Ouestionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 428 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Ouestions 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1649 4.30 4.28 4.29 5.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 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 0 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 0 1 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 4.507. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1623 4.60 4.32 4.16 4.21 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 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 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 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 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 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 2 5.00 1/243 4.36 4.40 4.12 4.47 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 1 5.00 1/88 3.75 3.97 4.54 3.75 5.00 Frequency Distribution Expected Grades Reasons Type Credits Earned Cum. GPA Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 3 0 Under-grad 4 Non-major 1 General

Electives

Other

0

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

F 0

P 0

I 0

? 0

Title

COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 429 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		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		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		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		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	_		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		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	_		1149/1352	4.16	4.10	3.98	4.07	3.29
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		U		4		U	3	3.29	1149/1332	4.10	4.10	3.90	4.07	3.49
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	4.12	4.12	4.47	3.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	0	1		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		4.40	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		464/ 555	4.29	4.41	4.29	4.33	3.60
or here requirements for tax reports oredring specifical	_	_	ŭ	-	_	Ü	_	3.00	101, 333	1.27		1.27	1.55	3.00
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		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		****/ 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	_	_	_	_	_	_	_		-0.					
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		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

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 429 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	 А	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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 sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	-			
				?	1						

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 7 Fall 2008

Page 430 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	eauer	ncies	S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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		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		1/ 212		4.75	4.40	4.62	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	0		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	_	0	0	•	0	•	-	F 00	****	2 55	2 0 17	4 = 4	2 55	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 88	3.75	3.97	4.54	3.75	~ ~ ~ ~
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85	3.33	3.79	4.47	3.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0 1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, -	3.67	3.58	4.43	3.67	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	Τ	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	Λ	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		****/ 312	3.25	3.56	3.68	3.59	****
5. Dia conferences help you early out litera accivities	J	_	J	J	J	_	U	1.00	/ 512	ر ۵ . د د	3.30	5.00	رد. د	
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	****
	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	,	,					

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0206 Title

COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Instructor: Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 7

Baltimore County EVANS, SUSAN A

Page 430 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	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 sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7	-			
				?	0						

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Instructor: FREY, DENNIS

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 431 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did you	ı gain new	v insights,skil		this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	1037/1649	4.48	4.28	4.28	4.29	4.19
		or make clear			0	0	0	0	4	3	9	4.31	825/1648	4.63	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.31
3. Did the	e exam que	estions reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	2	0	2	4	8	4.00	950/1375	4.53	4.31	4.27	4.37	4.00
4. Did oth	er evalua	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	2	0	2	2	2	8	4.14	956/1595	4.62	4.26	4.20	4.22	4.14
				hat 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 wri	tten assi	lgnments contri	bute 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
		system clearly		-	1	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	469/1623	4.70	4.32	4.16	4.21	4.53
		vas class cance			0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	714/1646	4.99	4.79	4.69	4.63	4.88
				ing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	875/1621	3.97	4.01	4.06	4.01	4.07
		Lecture	ž															
1. Were th	e instruc	ctor's lectures		repared	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	480/1568	4.60	4.40	4.43	4.39	4.75
		or seem intere			0	0	0	0	1				815/1572	4.86			4.73	
				olained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	6			939/1564				4.27	
		contribute to			0	0	0	0	2	5			790/1559					
				ur understanding	0	1	1	0	2	3			508/1352					
3. 21d ddd	.10 / 15 441	ar anaorboanarng	Ü	_	_	Ü	_			,	300, 1332	1.15	1.10	3.70	1.07	,		
1 54 -1-			0	0	1	2	2	7	2	2 20	1127/1204	2 76	2 74	4 00	2 00	2 20		
		hat you learned	0	0 0	1 3	3	3	1			1137/1384				3.99	3.38		
	Were all students actively encouraged to particip						3 4	2	3	4			1275/1382				4.19	
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discus Were special techniques successful						4 0	1	3 1	6 2			1284/1368	3.56			4.21	3.06 ****
4. Were sp	ecial teo	enniques succes	ssiul		0	13	U	U	Τ	2	Ü	3.67	****/ 948	****	3.58	3.95	3.89	****
		Laborat																
5. Were re	quirement	s for lab repo	orts clea	arly 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 cr	riteria fo	or grading made	clear		14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 288	4.21	3.26	3.68	3.65	***
		Field V	Jork															
5. Did con	ferences	help you carry	out fi	eld activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	4.33	3.56	3.68	3.59	****
		Self E	Paced															
5. Were th	ere enoug	gh proctors for	all th	e students	13	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 110	4.00	3.20	3.99	3.72	****
		Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	1											
			_															
Credits Ea	ırned	Expected Grades				Rea	sons	; 			Тур 	e 			Majors			
00-27	2	A 3		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduate	:	0	Majo	or	12		
28-55	3	в 10																
56-83							neral	_				0	Under-gr	ad 1	.6	Non-	-major	4
84-150	2	D 0																
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0 P 0		Ele	ectiv	res				1	#### - M response				_	h
				I 0		Otł	nor				1	5	response	a co E	e sign	ıııcar	IL	
		? 0		061	ICT				1	J								

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0201 University of Maryland Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II

FREY, DENNIS

Instructor: Enrollment: 20

Fall 2008 Questionnaires: 18 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 432 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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 4.2 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 6 9 4.33 733/1375 4.53 4.31 4.27 4.3 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 4.6 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 4.7 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 13 0 0 0 1 1 6 10 4.39 659/1623 4.70 4.32 4.16 4.2 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 5.00 1/1646 4.99 4.79 4.69 4.6 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 4.0 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 4.3 1. Was lecture material presented in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 3 14 4.82 790/1572 4.86 4.66 4.70 4.7 1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 1 4 12 4.65 536/1559 4.65 4.26 4.29 4.3 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 1 4 12 4.65 536/1559 4.65 4.26 4.29 4.3 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 4 2 9 4.33 457/1352 4.45 4.10 3.98 4.0 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 4 5 8 4.24 844/1382 3.95 3.90 4.29 4.3 1. 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 4.2 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 6 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 948 **** 3.58 3.95 3.8 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 6 0 1 0 1 0 1 5 0 0 2.00 ****/ 948 *** 3.58 3.95 3.6 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 6 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 948 *** 3.58 3.95 3.6 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 6 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 948 *** 3.58 3.95 3.6 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 948 *** 3.58 3.95 3.6 1. Did the lab instructor provided with adequate background informa						Fr	_	ncies	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
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 4.22 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 4.10 did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 4 12 4.56 498/1648 4.63 4.26 4.23 4.25 4.10 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 5 11 4.50 497/1595 4.62 4.26 4.20 4.2 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 4.66 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 10 1 1 2 2 2 3.38 1326/1533 3.43 3.69 4.04 4.66 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 10 1 1 6 10 4.39 659/1623 4.70 4.32 4.16 4.2 8 How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 1 1 6 10 4.39 659/1623 4.70 4.32 4.16 4.2 9 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 2 9 6 4.24 709/1621 3.97 4.01 4.06 4.0 9 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 2 9 6 4.24 709/1621 3.97 4.01 4.06 4.0 9 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 2 9 6 4.24 709/1621 3.97 4.01 4.06 4.0 9 How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes 1 0 0 0 0 2 9 6 4.24 709/1621 3.97 4.01 4.06 4.0 9 How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes 1 0 0 0 0 2 9 6 4.24 709/1621 3.97 4.01 4.06 4.0 9 How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes 1 0 0 0 0 2 9 6 4.24 709/1621 3.97 4.01 4.06 4.0 9 How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes 1 0 0 0 0 2 9 6 4.24 709/1621 3.97 4.01 4.06 4.0 9 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 550/1625 4.64 4.09 4.44 9.0 4.44 9.0 4.44 9.0 4.44 9.0 4.44 9.0 4.44 9.0 4.44 9.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 1 6 11 4.56 577/1649 4.48 4.28 4.28 4.2 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 4.2 4.1 4.1 4.1 5 1.2 5 1.2 4.56 498/1648 4.63 4.26 4.2 5 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3		General															
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 4.2 4. 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 4.3 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 4.2 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 4.6 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 4.1 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 1 6 10 4.39 659/1623 4.70 4.32 4.16 4.2 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 1 1 6 5.00 1/1646 4.99 4.79 4.69 4.69 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 4.0 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 4.3 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 3 1 4 4.82 790/1572 4.86 4.66 4.70 4.7 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 2 3 11 4.65 590/1504 4.46 4.24 4.28 4.2 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 1 4 12 4.65 536/1559 4.65 4.26 4.29 4.3 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 1 0 0 4 2 9 4.33 457/1352 4.5 4.10 3.98 4.6 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 3 2 12 4.53 424/1384 3.76 3.74 4.08 3.5 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 4.2 4. Were special techniques successful 1 5 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 241 3.56 4.12 4.16 4.2 4.26 4.29 4.2 4.27 4.28 4.2 4.28 4.24 8.44/1382 3.95 3.90 4.29 4.3 4. Were represented the dequate background information 16 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 241 3.56 4.12 4.16 4.2 4.28 4.24 8.44 8.44/1382 3.95 3.80 4.29 4.3 4. Were recessary materials available for lab activities 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 243 4.50 4.40 4.12 4.6 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 0 0 0	1. Did you gain new	insights, skills fr	rom this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	577/1649	4.48	4.28	4.28	4.29	4.5
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 6 9 4.33 733/1375 4.53 4.31 4.27 4.2 d.51 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 5 11 4.50 497/1595 4.62 4.26 4.20 4.2 d.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 4.6 d. 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 4.1 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 1 6 10 4.39 659/1623 4.70 4.32 4.16 4.2 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 5.00 1/1646 4.99 4.79 4.69 4.6 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 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0				0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	498/1648	4.63	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.5
Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 10 1 1 1 2 2 2 3.38 1326/1533 3.43 3.69 4.04 4.05 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 4.15 Read the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 1 6 10 4.39 659/1623 4.70 4.32 4.16 4.2 Read the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 1 6 1.00 1 1.00				0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	733/1375	4.53	4.31	4.27	4.37	4.3
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 4.15 4.15 4.10 4.15 4.15 4.10 4.15 4.15 4.10 4.15 4.15 4.15 4.10 4.15 4.15 4.15 4.10 4.15 4.15 4.15 4.10 4.15 4.15 4.15 4.15 4.15 4.15 4.15 4.15	. Did other evalua	tions reflect the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	497/1595	4.62	4.26	4.20	4.22	4.
. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 1 6 10 4.39 659/1623 4.70 4.32 4.16 4.2 How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 0 16 5.00 1/1646 4.99 4.79 4.69 4.6 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 2 9 6 4.24 709/1621 3.97 4.01 4.06 4.6 Lecture . Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 12 4.61 715/1568 4.60 4.40 4.43 4.5 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 4.7 Leach 4.28 Lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 2 3 11 4.56 590/1564 4.46 4.24 4.28 4.2 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 1 0 0 4 2 9 4.33 457/1352 4.45 4.10 3.98 4.0 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 4 2 9 4.33 457/1352 4.45 4.10 3.98 4.0 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 4.2 Were special techniques successful 1 15 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/948 **** 3.58 3.95 3.8 Laboratory . Did the lab increase understanding of the material 16 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/243 4.50 4.40 4.12 4.2 Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/243 4.50 4.40 4.12 4.6 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/221 3.56 4.12 4.16 4.6 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/221 4.71 4.75 4.40 4.6 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/255 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.5 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/255 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.5 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/255 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.5 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/255 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.5 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/255 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.5 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/255 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.5 Mere requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/255 4.83	. Did assigned rea	dings 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.
How many times was class cancelled	. Did written assi	gnments 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.
Lecture . Were the instructor's lectures well prepared . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Was lecture material presented and explained clearly . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned . Discussion . Did class discussions contribute to what you learned . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Did the lecture material presented and explained clearly . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned . Did calcas discussions contribute to what you learned . Did class discussions contribute to what you learned . Did class discussions contribute to was a contribute . Did the instructor encouraged to participate . Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion . Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion . Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion . Did the lab increase understanding of the material . Laboratory . Did the lab increase understanding of the material . Were you provided with adequate background information . Were necessary materials available for lab activities . Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified . Did the lab instructor provide assistance . Did the lab reports clearly specified . Did the lab repo	. Was the grading	system clearly expl	lained	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	659/1623	4.70	4.32	4.16	4.21	4.
Lecture . Were the instructor's lectures well prepared . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding . Did class discussions contribute to what you learned . Did class discussions contribute to what you learned . Did the instructor encouraged to participate . Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion . Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion . Were special techniques successful . Laboratory . Did the lab increase understanding of the material . Were you provided with adequate background information . Were necessary materials available for lab activities . Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 201 3.56 4.12 4.16 4.6 . Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 255 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.5 . Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	. How many times w	as class cancelled		2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	4.99	4.79	4.69	4.63	5.
. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 5 12 4.61 715/1568 4.60 4.40 4.43 4.3 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 4.7 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 2 3 11 4.56 590/1564 4.46 4.24 4.28 4.2 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 4.2 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 1 0 0 4 2 9 4.33 457/1352 4.45 4.10 3.98 4.6 Discussion Discussion 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 3.9 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 4 5 8 4.24 844/1382 3.95 3.90 4.29 4.3 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 4.2 Were special techniques successful 1 15 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 948 **** 3.58 3.95 3.8 Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material 16 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 221 3.56 4.12 4.16 4.4 Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 221 3.56 4.12 4.16 4.4 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 221 4.71 4.75 4.40 4.6 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 209 5.00 4.77 4.35 4.6 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.3 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.3 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.3 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.3 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.3 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.3 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41	. How would you gr	ade the overall tea	aching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	9	6	4.24	709/1621	3.97	4.01	4.06	4.01	4.
Discussion Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned Did the instructor encouraged to participate Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Did the lecture material presented and explained clearly Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Discussion Discussion Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned Did the instructor encouraged fair and open discussion Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion Did the lab increase understanding of the material Did the lab increase understanding of the material Did the lab increase understanding of the material Did the lab instructor provided with adequate background information Did the lab instructor provide assistance Did the lab inst		Lecture															
. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 2 3 11 4.56 590/1564 4.46 4.24 4.28 4.2 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 4.3 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 1 0 0 4 2 9 4.33 457/1352 4.45 4.10 3.98 4.00 Discussion 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 3.9 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 4 5 8 4.24 844/1382 3.95 3.90 4.29 4.1 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 4.2 Were special techniques successful 1 15 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 948 **** 3.58 3.95 3.8 Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material 16 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 948 **** 3.58 3.95 3.8 Were provided with adequate background information 16 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 243 4.50 4.40 4.12 4.4 Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 243 4.50 4.40 4.12 4.4 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 255 5.00 ****/ 255 5.00 5.00 4.77 4.35 4.6 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.3 Did the lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.3 Did the lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.3 Did the lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.3 Did the lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.3 Did the lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.3 Did the lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.3 Did the lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.3 Did the lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.3 Did the lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.3 Did the lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0	. Were the instruc	tor's lectures well	l prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	715/1568	4.60	4.40	4.43	4.39	4.
Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned Did class discussions contribute Did class discussions Did did class discussions Did did he lab increase understanding open discussion Did the lab increase understanding of the material Did did he lab increase understanding of the material Did did he lab increase understanding of the material Did did he lab increase understanding of the material Did did he lab increase understanding of the material Did did he lab increase understanding of the material Did did he lab increase understanding of the material Did did he lab increase understanding of the material Did did he lab increase understanding of the material Did did he lab increase understanding of the material Did did he lab increase understanding of the material Did did he lab increase understan	. Did the instruct	or 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.
Discussion Discussion 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 3.98 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 4 5 8 4.24 844/1382 3.95 3.90 4.29 4.15 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 4.25 Were special techniques successful 1 15 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 948 **** 3.58 3.95 3.80 Laboratory 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 Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 243 4.50 4.40 4.12 4.46 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 212 4.71 4.75 4.40 4.66 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 20 5.00 4.77 4.35 4.66 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.35	. Was lecture mate	rial presented and	explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	590/1564	4.46	4.24	4.28	4.27	4.
Discussion 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 3.5 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 4 5 8 4.24 844/1382 3.95 3.90 4.29 4.1 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 4.2 Were special techniques successful 1 15 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 948 **** 3.58 3.95 3.8 Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material 16 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 221 3.56 4.12 4.16 4.4 Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 243 4.50 4.40 4.12 4.4 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 212 4.71 4.75 4.40 4.6 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 209 5.00 4.77 4.35 4.6 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.3	. 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.
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 3.50 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 4 5 8 4.24 844/1382 3.95 3.90 4.29 4.10 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 4.20 Were special techniques successful 1 15 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 948 **** 3.58 3.95 3.80 Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material 16 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 221 3.56 4.12 4.16 4.40 Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 243 4.50 4.40 4.12 4.40 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 212 4.71 4.75 4.40 4.60 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 209 5.00 4.77 4.35 4.60 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.30 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.30 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.30 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.30 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.30 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.30 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.30 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.30 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.30 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.30 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	. 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.
Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		Discussion															
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 4.2 Were special techniques successful 1 15 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 948 **** 3.58 3.95 3.8 Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material 16 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 221 3.56 4.12 4.16 4.4 Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 243 4.50 4.40 4.12 4.4 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 212 4.71 4.75 4.40 4.6 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 209 5.00 4.77 4.35 4.6 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.3	. Did class discus	sions 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.
Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material 16 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 221 3.56 4.12 4.16 4.4 4.6 Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 243 4.50 4.40 4.12 4.4 4.4 4.4 4.4 4.4 4.4 4.4 4.4 4.4 4.	. Were all student	s actively encourag	ged to participate	1	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	844/1382	3.95	3.90	4.29	4.19	4.
Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material 16 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 221 3.56 4.12 4.16 4.4 4.6 4.4 4.6 4.4 4.6 4.4 4.6 4.4 4.6 4.4 4.6 4.4 4.6 4.4 4.6 4.4 4.6 4.6	. Did the instruct	or encourage fair a	and open discussion	1	0	0	1	7	3	6	3.82	1063/1368	3.56	3.82	4.30	4.21	3.
Did the lab increase understanding of the material 16 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 221 3.56 4.12 4.16 4.4 Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 243 4.50 4.40 4.12 4.4 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 212 4.71 4.75 4.40 4.6 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 209 5.00 4.77 4.35 4.6 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.3	. Were special tec	hniques successful		1	15	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 948	****	3.58	3.95	3.89	*
. Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 243 4.50 4.40 4.12 4.4 . Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 212 4.71 4.75 4.40 4.6 . Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 209 5.00 4.77 4.35 4.6 . Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.3		Laboratory															
. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 212 4.71 4.75 4.40 4.6 . Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 209 5.00 4.77 4.35 4.6 . Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.3	. Did the lab incr	ease understanding	of the material	16	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 221	3.56	4.12	4.16	4.45	* *
Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 209 5.00 4.77 4.35 4.60. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.30.	. Were you provide	d with adequate bac	ckground information	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	4.50	4.40	4.12	4.47	* *
. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 555 4.83 4.41 4.29 4.3	. Were necessary m	aterials available	for lab activities	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	4.71	4.75	4.40	4.62	* *
. Here requirements for two reports ereating spectrum in it is to the true from the results and the results are the results and the results are the results ar	. Did the lab inst	ructor provide assi	İstance	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 209	5.00	4.77	4.35	4.64	* *
Frequency Distribution	. Were requirement	s for lab reports o	clearly specified	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	4.83	4.41	4.29	4.33	* *
			Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majo	Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	S			Ту	pe			Majors	5

Baltimore County

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	=			
				2	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0202 University of Maryland Page 433 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: FREY, DENNIS (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 1

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Ins	ructor	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		4.10	3.98	4.07	5.00
_, ,														
Discussion				•	_	•	_					4 00		
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	Τ	0	0		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	Τ	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	Τ	U	U	3.00	1286/1368	3.56	3.82	4.30	4.21	3.00
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ıtior	ı									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-	-		
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0202 University of Maryland Page 434 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 18

Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sid	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-	-		
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0202 University of Maryland Page 435 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sid	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-	-		
				2	Λ						

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Instructor: FREY, DENNIS

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 436 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eguei	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	e 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		4.26	4.23	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	2	10	4.11			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		4.26	4.20	4.22	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	3	2	3	4.00			3.69	4.04		4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		9	0	0	1	1	6	4.63			4.15	4.10	4.14	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	Ó	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	321/1623		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		4.79	4.69		5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes	ss 2	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	374/1621			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	,		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			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			4.26	4.29		4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		1	0	0	1	2			,		4.10		4.07	
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		3.90	4.29	4.19	4.19
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	2	0	3	1	10	4.06	931/1368		3.82	4.30	4.21	4.06
4. Were special techniques successful	. 3	12	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 948		3.58	3.95	3.89	****
1. Hold sheetal committant paccessia	J		Ü	Ü	Ü	-	_	1.07	, , , , ,		3.33	3.75	3.03	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00			4.12	4.16	4.45	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25			4.40	4.12	4.47	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities		0	0	0	0	1	3		****/ 212		4.75	4.40	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.30	,		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	, -		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	****
Fro	equenc	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	es.			Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	
										- 				
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 28-55 5 1.00-1.99 0 B 9		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	`S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	7
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 3 C 2		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	L8	Non-	-major	11
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 3 D 1														
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	ſh
P 0			_						respons	es to k	oe sign	nificar	ıt	

Other

15

0

0

I

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Instructor: FREY, DENNIS

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Page 437 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
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	4.5
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.
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.
1. 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.
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.
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
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
3. 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
. 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
Lecture														
. 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
. 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
. 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
. 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
. 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
Discussion														
. 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
. 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
. 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
. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 948	****	3.58	3.95	3.89	*
Laboratory														
. 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	*
. 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	*
. 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	*
. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	5.00	4.77	4.35	4.64	4
. 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	į
Seminar														
. 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
Field Work														
. 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
Self Paced														
. 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
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 3 5			anir						Graduat		0	 Maic		

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	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 sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-			
				?	0						

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Instructor: MITCHELL, SUSAN

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 438 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Questions		NR	NA	Fre	eque:	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
1 54			General			_	0	_	1	_	2	2	2 00	1007/1640	4 40	4 00	4 00	4 00	2 00
			v insights,skil tor make clear			0	0	0	1	2 2	3 2	3	4.33	1287/1649 797/1648	4.48 4.63	4.28 4.26	4.28	4.29	3.89
			or make clear estions reflect	_	_	0	0	1	0	0	2	5 6	4.33	733/1375	4.63	4.26	4.23	4.25 4.37	4.33
		_	ations reflect	_	-	0	2	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	417/1595	4.62	4.26	4.20	4.22	4.57
			adings contribu			0	4	2	0	1	0	2		1441/1533	3.43	3.69	4.04	4.04	3.00
		_	ignments contri		-	1	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	687/1512	4.74	4.15	4.10	4.14	4.25
			system clearly			0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22		4.70	4.32	4.16	4.21	4.22
			vas class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	4.99	4.79	4.69	4.63	5.00
			rade the overal		effectiveness	1	1	0	1	1	5	0		1314/1621		4.01	4.06	4.01	3.57
			Lecture																
1. We:	re the	e instruc	ctor's lectures	well prepa	ared	0	0	1	0	0	6	2	3.89	1354/1568	4.60	4.40	4.43	4.39	3.89
2. Di	d the	instruct	or seem intere	sted in the	e subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1193/1572	4.86	4.66	4.70	4.73	4.56
3. Wa	s lect	ure mate	erial presented	and expla	ined clearly	0	0	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1336/1564	4.46	4.24	4.28	4.27	3.67
4. Die	d the	lectures	s 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. Di	d audi	ovisual	techniques enh	ance your	understanding	0	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	690/1352	4.45	4.10	3.98	4.07	4.00
			Discuss																
			ssions contribu		-	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	541/1384		3.74	4.08	3.99	4.40
			s actively end			4	0	0	1	1	1	2		1069/1382	3.95	3.90	4.29	4.19	3.80
3. Di	d the	instruct	cor encourage f	air and op	en discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	752/1368	3.56	3.82	4.30	4.21	4.40
			Laborat	-															
			rease understan	_		0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11		3.56	4.12	4.16	4.45	4.11
			ed with adequat			1	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	155/ 243	4.50	4.40	4.12	4.47	4.00
			materials avail			0	2	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	118/ 212	4.71	4.75	4.40	4.62	4.43
			tructor provide			0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 209	5.00	4.77	4.35	4.64	5.00
5. We:	re rec	quirement	s for lab repo	rts clearl	y specified	0	6	0	U	Τ	0	2	4.33	338/ 555	4.83	4.41	4.29	4.33	4.33
E Wo	ro ari	torio fo	Seminar or grading made			8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 288	1 21	2 26	3.68	2 65	****
5. We.	ie cii	iceria ic				0	U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	/ 200	4.21	3.20	3.00	3.03	
5 Die	d conf	erences	Field W help you carry		activities	8	0	Ο	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 312	4 33	3 56	3 68	3 59	****
J. DI.	u com	er enecs	neip you earry	out ficia		_				Ü	-	Ü	1.00	, 312	1.33	3.30	3.00	3.33	
				Frequ	lency	Dist	tribu	atio	n										
Credi	ts Ear	rned	Cum. GPA	xpected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	1	
00-2	 7	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	7
28-5		2	1.00-1.99	0	В 3														
56-8		1	2.00-2.99	0	C 3		Ger	neral	l				1	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	-major	2
84-1		0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad		0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1				_	h
	P C												-	respons	es to b	e sign	ıticar	ıt	
					3 0 I 0		Oth	ner					7						
					: U														

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0402 University of Maryland COMPUTER SCIENCE II Instructor: MITCHELL, SUSAN

Title

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

9

Page 439 Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

						Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1498/1649	4.48	4.28	4.28	4.29	3.50
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	556/1648	4.63	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.50
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	4.53	4.31	4.27	4.37	5.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	497/1595	4.62	4.26	4.20	4.22	4.50
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	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	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1623	4.70	4.32	4.16	4.21	5.00
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	4.99	4.79	4.69	4.63	5.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	852/1568	4.60	4.40	4.43	4.39	4.50
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	4.86	4.66	4.70	4.73	5.00
		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	e lectur	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 au	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understan						0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1352	4.45	4.10	3.98	4.07	4.50
		Labora	torv															
1. Did the	e lab in	crease understa	-	of the material	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	216/ 221	3.56	4.12	4.16	4.45	3.00
			_	ground information	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 243	4.50	4.40	4.12	4.47	5.00
_	_	_		for lab activities	0	1	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 212	4.71	4.75	4.40	4.62	5.00
	_	structor provid			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 209	5.00	4.77	4.35	4.64	5.00
5. Were re	equireme	nts for lab rep	orts cl	learly specified	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	4.83	4.41	4.29	4.33	5.00
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
					_			_					_					
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	:	
00-27							quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	\$	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83						Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	1
84-150																		
Grad.							ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ſh
				Р 0	~								respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Other						2						

Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES

Instructor: ARTOLA, PAUL

Enrollment: 44

Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 440 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Tns	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		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		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		731/1621			4.06	4.01	
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		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	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														
	٥٦	0	0	0	1	0	2	4 50	++++/ 0/10	****	4 40	4 10	4 47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0 1	1	0	3		****/ 243	****	4.40	4.12	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25 25	2	0	0 T	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 212	****	4.75	4.40	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25 21	2 2	1	0	0	0 1	1 5		****/ 209		4.77	4.35	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	2	U	U	U	Т	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		****/ 92	****	4.00	4.35	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	1	0	0	2			****/ 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		****/ 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		****/ 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	****

Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES

Instructor: ARTOLA, PAUL

Enrollment: 44
Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 440 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate		Major	4	
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	are not enough	e not enough		
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	22	-				
				?	0							

Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES

YESHA, YAACOV Instructor:

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 21

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 441 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

			Fre	Frequencies			Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		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		1487/1533		3.69	4.04	4.04	2.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	4	1	6	2			1422/1512		4.15	4.10	4.14	3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	4	2	11		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		833/1646		4.79	4.69	4.63	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	3	1	6	4	0		1557/1621			4.06	4.01	
J. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	,	U	5	_	O	-	U	2.15	1337/1021	3.33	1.01	4.00	4.01	2.15
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		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	-		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			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	_		1039/1352			3.98	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	Τ.	U	3	,	5	4	3.55	1039/1352	3.42	4.10	3.90	4.07	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	3	5	2	Λ	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		1365/1382	3.28	3.90	4.29	4.19	2.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	2	1	5	3	2			3.82				3.15
	8 8	12	0	0	5 1	0			1274/1368		3.82	4.30	4.21	3.15 ****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	12	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	****/ 948	3.07	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	****
		4	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 212	****	4.75		4.62	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	3	-	1	0	0	1		,	****	4.75	4.40		****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16		0	1	-	-	_		****/ 209			4.35	4.64	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	4	0	Τ	0	0	16	4.82	236/ 555	4.82	4.41	4.29	4.33	4.82
Seminar														
	1.0	2	1	0	1	0	1	2 00	****/ 88	****	2 07	4 54	2 75	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	2	_	0	1	-	_		,	****	3.97	4.54	3.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	3	1			0	0		****/ 85	****	3.79	4.47	3.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	4	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 81		3.58	4.43	3.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	3	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 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	****
T 11 T														
Field Work			_		_	•	•							****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	3	0	1	0	0		****/ 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		_	_	_	_	_	_	0 00		4.4 * *	0 = 0	4 22	4 0=	4.4
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	1	1	1	0		****/ 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	****

Course-Section: CMSC 203 0201

Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES

Instructor: YESHA, YAACOV

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 441 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	16	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 203 0301 DISCRETE STRUCTURES Baltimore County LOMONACO JR, SA

University of Maryland Page 442 FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	42			
Questionnaires:	26	Student Cou	urse Evaluation	Questionnaire

Title

Instructor:

		Question		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		Genera	_					_	_						4 00	4 00		4 40
		new insights,ski			0	0	0	2	2	11	11		1027/1649		4.28	4.28	4.29	4.19
		uctor make clear			0	0	0	1	4	10	11	4.19	966/1648		4.26	4.23	4.25	4.19
		questions reflec			0	0 7	0	0	1	8	16	4.54	521/1375	4.15	4.31	4.27	4.37	4.54 4.47
		luations reflect			0	3	0	0	4	8 6	10	4.47	538/1595 485/1533		3.69	4.20	4.22	4.47
	_	-		what you learned	-	3 8	0	0	2								4.04	
				o what you learned	0	8	0	2	2	7	9	4.39			4.15	4.10	4.14	4.39
		ng system clearl		ınea	0	0	0	0	0	1	12 25	4.23	,		4.32 4.79	4.16	4.21	
		s was class canc		bina effections	2	0	1	3	5	11			266/1646 1310/1621			4.69	4.63	
9. HOV	w would you	grade the overa	II tead	hing effectiveness	2	U	Τ	3	5	11	4	3.58	1310/1621	3.53	4.01	4.06	4.01	3.58
		Lectur	_															
1 170-				1	0	0	2	2	11	0	1 01	1061/1560	1 10	4.40	4.43	4.39	4.04	
		ructor's lecture uctor seem inter		1	0	0	3 2	0	11	9 18		1261/1568 1184/1572		4.40	4.43	4.39	4.04	
			xplained clearly	1	0	1	3	2	9			1163/1564		4.24	4.70	4.73	3.96	
		aterial presente res contribute t			1	0	1	1	6	-	13		1084/1559		4.24	4.29	4.33	4.08
				our understanding	1	-	2	2	2	_			1260/1352			3.98	4.33	
5. DIC	a audiovisu	ar tecinirques en	nance y	our understanding	1	10	2	2	_	1		2.09	1200/1332	3.44	4.10	3.90	4.07	2.09
		Discus	aion															
1 Did	d alace die			what you learned	18	0	2	0	4	1	1	2 88	1304/1384	2 99	3.74	4.08	3.99	2.88
				d to participate	18	0	0	2	2	3	1		1240/1382		3.90	4.29	4.19	3.38
				d open discussion	18	0	0	1	2	3	2		1095/1368		3.82	4.30	4.21	3.75
		techniques succe		a open arscassion	18	5	1	0	2	0	0		****/ 948			3.95	3.89	****
T. WEI	re special	cecinitques succe	ssrur		10	,		U	2	U	U	2.33	/ 540	3.07	3.30	3.93	3.05	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ıtior	ı									
Credit	ts Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	ре			Majors	3
00-27	7 0	0.00-0.99	A 12		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	 ajor	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	11	
28-55	5 5	1.00-1.99	В 9						-						_			
56-83	3 3	2.00-2.99	C 4		Gei	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 2	6	Non-	major	15	
84-15	50 1	3.00-3.49	D 0													-		
Grad.	. 0	3.50-4.00	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh	
				Р 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her				2	4	_		_			
				? 0														

Course-Section: CMSC 304 0101

SOCIAL/ETHICAL ISS IN

Title Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD

Enrollment: 37 Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Page 443 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
<ol> <li>Did you gain new insights, skills from this course</li> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> <li>Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals</li> <li>Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals</li> </ol>	0 0 0	0 0 0	2 1 0 0	1 1 2 0	3 1 2 1	8 9 7 6	5 7 8 12	4.05 4.11	1415/1649 1094/1648 915/1375 417/1595	4.05 4.11	4.28 4.26 4.31 4.26	4.28 4.23 4.27 4.20	4.27 4.18 4.22 4.21	3.68 4.05 4.11 4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	0 0 0	6 0 0	0 0 2 0	2 1 8 0	3 1 5 0	4 7 2 1	2 18	4.37 2.68 4.95	1055/1533 564/1512 1589/1623 398/1646	4.37 2.68 4.95	3.69 4.15 4.32 4.79	4.04 4.10 4.16 4.69	4.05 4.11 4.08 4.67	2.68 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  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned  5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	1 0 1 2 4	2 0 2 2 0	3 1 3 3 2	9 1 6 6 2	17 7	4.84 3.84 3.63	1422/1568 740/1572 1251/1564 1333/1559 1328/1352	4.84 3.84 3.63	4.40 4.66 4.24 4.26 4.10	4.70	4.39 4.64 4.25 4.23 3.97	3.84 3.63
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  4. Were special techniques successful	9 9 9 9	0 0 0 2	1 0 0 2	0 4 1 0	3 0 2 4	5 3 2 1	3 5	3.50 4.10	1081/1384 1216/1382 920/1368 883/ 948	3.50 4.10	3.74 3.90 3.82 3.58	4.08 4.29 4.30 3.95	4.11 4.37 4.39 4.00	3.50 3.50 4.10 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	****
Frequ	ıency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 13 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 3		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	S	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	13
56-83 5 2.00-2.99 2 C 0 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0		Ger	neral	L				2	Under-g	rad 1	9	Non-	major	6
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 1		Ele Otl	ectiv ner	res			1	0	#### - 1 respons				_	h

Course-Section: CMSC 313 0101

Title COMP ORGAN & ASSEMB LA

Instructor: MOHAMMADPOURRAD

Enrollment: 37
Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 444 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	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		1319/1649			4.28	4.27	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	12	8	4		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		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		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		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		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		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		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		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		1498/1559		4.26	4.29		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 20	4.22	5 00
J. Were requirements for lab reports creatry specified	10	U	U	U	U	U	O	3.00	1/ 555	3.00	1.11	4.27	7.22	3.00
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		****/ 52	****	2.00	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 48	***	2.00	4.09	4.21	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	***	****	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 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		****/ 41	****	2.00	4.43	5.00	****
•	-	-	-	-			-		,					

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
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	n
				F 0 Electives P 0				responses to	be sid	nificant	
				I	0	Other	22	-	-		

? 2

Course-Section: CMSC 313 0201 University of Maryland Title COMP ORGAN & ASSEMB LA

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: MOHAMMADPOURRAD

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 445 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect 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		1574/1648		4.26	4.23	4.18	3.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	2	4	5		1208/1375		4.31	4.27		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			1381/1568		4.40	4.43	4.39	3.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	3	3	2			1523/1572		4.66	4.70		3.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	3	4	2			1525/1564		4.24	4.28	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4 2	4	1 2			1452/1559		4.26	4.29		3.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	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
Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			ТУ	pe			Majors	3
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5		Rec	 auir	ed fo	or Ma	ior	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	14
28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 4						,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	-	-			-	) 0		
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 2		Gei	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	2
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0									J				-	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0		Ele	ecti	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
GIAG. 0 3.30-4.00 4 F 0														
P 0									respons			ifican	ıt	
			her				1	4				nifican	ıt	

Course-Section: CMSC 331 0101

Title PRIN OF PROG LANGUAGES

Instructor: FININ, TIMOTHY

Enrollment: 31

Questionnaires: 21

Fall 2008

Page 446 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

		Question		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean	
		Genera	 1															
1. Did voi	u gain new	insights, ski		this course	0	0	0	0	7	6	8	4.05	1156/1649	4.15	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.05
		or make clear			0	0	1	2	2	12	4		1340/1648		4.26	4.23	4.18	3.76
		stions reflec			0	0	0	2	7	8	4	3.67	1150/1375	3.99	4.31	4.27	4.22	3.67
4. Did oth	her evaluat	tions reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	1	1	0	3	9	7	4.05	1038/1595	4.32	4.26	4.20	4.21	4.05
				hat 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 wri	itten assig	gnments contr	ibute 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
		system clearly		ned	0	0	0	4	4	8			1318/1623		4.32	4.16	4.08	3.67
		as class canc			0	0	0	0	0	2	19		664/1646		4.79	4.69		4.90
9. How wor	uld you gra	ade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	6	8	3	3.82	1132/1621	3.75	4.01	4.06	4.02	3.82
		Lectur	е															
1. Were th	he instruct	tor's lecture	s well p	repared	0	0	1	1	2	9	8	4.05	1261/1568	4.24	4.40	4.43	4.39	4.05
		or seem inter		0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	912/1572		4.66	4.70	4.64	4.76	
			plained clearly	0	0	0	3	1	11	6		1173/1564		4.24	4.28	4.25	3.95	
		contribute to		0	0	1	2	4	6	8		1221/1559	4.16	4.26	4.29	4.23	3.86	
5. Did aud	diovisual t	techniques en	ur understanding	0	2	1	0	6	4	8	3.95	766/1352	4.05	4.10	3.98	3.97	3.95	
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discus	sions contrib	ate to w	hat 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 al	ll students	s actively en	couraged	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	e instructo	or 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 sp	pecial tech	nniques succe	ssful		11	8	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 948	3.50	3.58	3.95	4.00	****
		Labora	orv															
5. Were re	equirements		-	arly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.41	4.29	4.22	5.00
		Semina:	·															
5. Were ci	riteria fo	r grading mad			18	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.26	3.68	3.58	****
E 544	-£ l	Field !		-14	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	++++/ 212	2 50	2 56	2 60	2 60	++++
5. Dia cor	nierences i	neip you carr	y out ile	eld activities	20	U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	****/ 312	3.50	3.56	3.68	3.60	* * * *
		Self																
5. Were th	here enough	n proctors for	r all the	e students	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	3.20	3.99	4.05	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	ı									
Credits Ea	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	;		
00-27	0	 A 7			 quire					 1	Graduate		1	 Majo		18		
	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 1 B 9							u IC	)⊥ I⁴lċ	ijori	5	т	Graduat	=	т	Ma Jo	) <u>T</u>	ТО
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Ger	neral					0	Under-g	rad 2	20	Non-	major	3
84-150	2	D 0		001		-				•	onder 9.			1,011		3		
Grad.	1	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	2 7	F 0		$El\epsilon$	ectiv	res				0	#### - I	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	ıh
	_	- ,	•	P 0								-	response					•
				I 0		Oth	ner				2	0	_		3			
				? 0														

Course-Section: CMSC 331 0201

Title PRIN OF PROG LANGUAGES

Instructor: VICK, SHON

Enrollment: 25

Questionnaires: 16

Fall 2006

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 447 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Ouestions	MD	NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	_	UMBC Mean	Level	
Quescions									Raiik		Mean		Mean	
General														
. 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
. 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
. 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
. 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
. 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
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
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
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
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
Lecture														
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
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	
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	
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	
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	
Discussion														
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	
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	
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	
Were special techniques successful	8	4	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	699/ 948	3.50	3.58	3.95	4.00	
Laboratory														
Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 243	****	4.40	4.12	3.89	
Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 212	****	4.75	4.40	4.21	
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														
Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	3.79	4.47	4.55	
Were criteria for grading made clear	13	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.26	3.68	3.58	
Field Work														
Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0			****/ 52		2.00	4.06	3.59	
Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 48		2.00	4.09	4.21	
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	
Self Paced	1 -	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ ->	4444	0 50	4 20	4 20	
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	7
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio:	n									
edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	 s	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majc	 or	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0101
Title DATA STRUCTURES

Instructor: EDELMAN, MITCHE

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 14

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 448 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		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		4.26	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		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			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		1202/1512		4.15	4.10	4.11	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	8			1252/1623		4.32	4.16	4.08	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.93	531/1646		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		1003/1572		4.66	4.70	4.64	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	0			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		4.26	4.29	4.23	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.07				3.98	3.97	
Discussion			•			_	_	4 00						****
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/1384	3.80	3.74	4.08	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	1		****/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		****/ 243	****	4.40	4.12	3.89	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 212	****	4.75	4.40	4.21	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 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
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	,	U	U		U	-	U	3.00	104/ 200	3.00	3.20	3.00	3.30	3.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 52	****	2.00	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 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

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0101
Title DATA STRUCTURES
Instructor: EDELMAN, MITCHE
Enrollment: 27

Questionnaires: 14

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 448 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	 Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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 si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	-		-	
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0201 Title DATA STRUCTURES

Instructor: HOOD, DANIEL J

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 19

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 449 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 I															
1. Did v	ou gain ne	w insights,ski		this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	408/1649	4.45	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.68
		tor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	195/1648	4.46	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.83
		estions reflect	_	_	0	0	0	0	0	5		4.74	321/1375	4.19	4.31	4.27	4.22	4.74
	_	ations reflect		_	1	1	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	538/1595	3.73	4.26	4.20	4.21	4.47
				hat you learned	0	4	0	2	3	3	7		815/1533	3.38	3.69	4.04	4.05	4.00
	_	-		what you learned	0	6	0	1	2	0	10	4.46	436/1512	3.73	4.15	4.10	4.11	4.46
		system clearly			0	0	0	0	1		17	4.84		4.41	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.84
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0		15	4.79	865/1646	4.91	4.79	4.69	4.67	4.79
				ning effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1621			4.06	4.02	
	2												_,					
		Lecture	_	_														
		ctor's lecture	_	-	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	259/1568	4.52		4.43	4.39	4.89
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1572	4.68	4.66	4.70	4.64	5.00
				plained clearly	1	0	0	0	0		16	4.89	187/1564	4.44		4.28	4.25	4.89
		s contribute to			1	0	0	0	1		15	4.78	361/1559	4.43	4.26	4.29	4.23	4.78
5. Did a	udiovisual	techniques en	nance yo	our understanding	3	1	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	71/1352	4.53	4.10	3.98	3.97	4.93
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass discu			hat you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	3.80	3.74	4.08	4.11	****
				l to participate	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1382	4.60	3.90	4.29	4.37	****
				l open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1368		3.82	4.30	4.39	****
		3		-														
		Labora																
5. Were	requiremen	ts for lab repo	orts cle	early specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.41	4.29	4.22	****
		Semina	_															
5. Were	criteria f	or grading made			18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	3.60	3.26	3.68	3.58	****
	_	Field N																
5. Did c	onferences	help you carry	out fi	eld activities	16	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 312	3.50	3.56	3.68	3.60	****
		Self 1	Dagod															
5. Were	there enoug	gh proctors for		ne students	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	2.75	3.20	3.99	4.05	****
		5 1											,					
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	1									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	 1	 A 5		Pec	guire	 ad fo	or Ma	ior		0	Graduat		0	Majo		15
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 9		1/6	1011C	-u _(	) I 11C	יייני	D	U	Graduati	-	U	Ma JC	, <u> </u>	13
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 4		Ger	neral					0	Under-q	rad 1	9	Non-	major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		001		-				-	011001 9		-	2.011		-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
	-		-	P 0								-	respons				_	,
				I O		Oth	ner				1	7						
				? 0			-											

Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0301 University of Maryland Page 450 DATA STRUCTURES FEB 11, 2009 BERGERON, RYAN Instructor: Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	13	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
		Frequencies
	Questions	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 M

Title

Enrollment:

28

							Fr	equer	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights,skil	.ls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	803/1649	4.45	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.38
		tor make clear			0	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	1010/1648	4.46	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.15
3. Did th	e exam qu	estions reflect	the e	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 ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	2	1	0	3	5	2	3.64	1353/1595	3.73	4.26	4.20	4.21	3.64
5. Did as	signed re	adings contribu	ite 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 wr	itten ass	ignments contri	.bute t	o 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	e grading	system clearly	expla expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	382/1623	4.41	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.62
8. How max	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646	4.91	4.79	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overal	l teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	6	6	1	3.62	1295/1621	4.24	4.01	4.06	4.02	3.62
		Lecture	<u> </u>															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor'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	e instruc	tor seem intere	ested i	n 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 le	cture mat	erial presented	l and e	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 th	e lecture	s 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 au	diovisual	techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	3	3	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	263/1352	4.53	4.10	3.98	3.97	4.57
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contribu	ite 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
				d to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	540/1382	4.60	3.90	4.29	4.37	4.60
				d open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	369/1368	4.80		4.30	4.39	4.80
		chniques succes			8	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	***	3.58	3.95	4.00	****
		Laborat	orv															
5. Were r	equiremen		-	early specified	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 555	****	4.41	4.29	4.22	****
		Field W	Jork															
5. Did co	nferences			ield activities	11	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 312	3.50	3.56	3.68	3.60	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
a 11	,	a ana			_			_					_					
Credits E	arnea 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				кеа	asons				Ту	pe 			Majors	} 
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6				_				_		_	_			_
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 3		Gei	nera	Τ				1	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 1		_						_						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### -					jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				<del>-</del> ^							- 1							

Other

11

I

0

0

Course-Section: CMSC 341H 0101
Title DATA STRUCTURES
Instructor: OATES, TIMOTHY

9

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 451 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

		Question	5		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	328/1649	4.75	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.75
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	414/1648	4.63	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.63
3. Did th	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	694/1375	4.38	4.31	4.27	4.22	4.38
		uations reflect			0	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	272/1595	4.71	4.26	4.20	4.21	4.71
				what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1533	****	3.69	4.04	4.05	****
				o what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	0	0		****/1512	****	4.15	4.10	4.11	****
		g system clearly		ined	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	220/1623	4.75	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.75
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	7	1	0		1642/1646	3.13	4.79	4.69	4.67	3.13
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	191/1621	4.71	4.01	4.06	4.02	4.71
		Lectur	е															
		actor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	699/1568	4.63	4.40	4.43	4.39	4.63
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	715/1572	4.86	4.66	4.70	4.64	4.86
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86		4.86	4.24	4.28	4.25	4.86
		es contribute to			1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	. ,	4.86	4.26	4.29	4.23	4.86
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	1	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	303/1352	4.50	4.10	3.98	3.97	4.50
		Discus																
				what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1384	****	3.74	4.08	4.11	****
				d to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1382	****	3.90	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1368	****	3.82	4.30	4.39	****
		Labora	-															
5. Were r	equiremer	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	6	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	522/ 555	2.00	4.41	4.29	4.22	2.00
		Field																
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	6	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	256/ 312	3.00	3.56	3.68	3.60	3.00
		Self																
5. Were t	here enou	ugh proctors for	r all t	he students	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	3.20	3.99	4.05	4.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	utior	1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 0	 А б						iora		0	 Graduat		0	Majo		7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2		rec	1ull.	eu I	or Ma	COLE	•	U	Graduat	E	U	Ma JC	)T	,
28-55 56-83	7	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Cor	nera:	1				0	IIndon ~	rad	8	Non	madom	1
84-150	0	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	1	D 0		Ger	ıera.	т				U	Under-g	Lau	O	MOIJ-	-major	Т
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		ភ្ន	ectiv	7AC				0	#### - 1	Meane +	here =	re not	enous	rh
orau.	U	3.30-4.00	U	P 0		11.7	-C L I	v CD				U	respons				_	11
				I O		Otł	ner					8	T CBPOILE	CD CO L	C DIGI.	cal		
				2 0		OCI						J						
				. 0														

Course-Section: CMSC 345 0101

Title SOFTWARE DESIGN/DEVELO

Instructor: MITCHELL, SUSAN

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 24

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 452 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

Frequencies

Instructor

		Questions	}		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	. — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	w insights, skil	ls from t	his course	0	0	1	1	3	5	14	4.25	965/1649	3.95	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.25
2. Did th	ne instruc	tor make clear	the expec	cted goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	13	4.50	556/1648	4.03	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.50
3. Did th	ne exam qu	estions reflect	the expe	ected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	15	4.42	653/1375	4.41	4.31	4.27	4.22	4.42
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the expec	cted goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	17	4.58	405/1595	4.51	4.26	4.20	4.21	4.58
5. Did as	signed re	adings contribu	ite to wha	at 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 wr	ritten ass	ignments contri	bute to v	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 th	ne grading	system clearly	explaine	ed	0	0	0	0	3	5	16	4.54	459/1623	4.18	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.54
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	lled		0	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	782/1646	4.30	4.79	4.69	4.67	4.83
9. How wo	ould you g	rade the overal	l teachir	ng effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	11	8	4.42	483/1621	4.21	4.01	4.06	4.02	4.42
		Lecture	<u>:</u>															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures	well pre	epared	0	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	480/1568	4.01	4.40	4.43	4.39	4.75
		tor seem intere			0	0	0	0	1	4	19		931/1572	4.30		4.70		4.75
		erial presented		-	0	0	0	0	1				651/1564		4.24			4.50
		s contribute to			0	0	0	0	2				695/1559				4.23	
		techniques enh			0	4	0	0	5	5			515/1352	4.08			3.97	
J. DIG au	alovisuai	ceciniiques em	lance your	diderstanding	U	7	U	U	3	5	10	1.23	313/1332	4.00	1.10	3.90	3.97	4.23
1 5411		Discuss			1.0	0	0	-1	_	0	_	4 10	714/1204	4 10	2 74	4 00	4 11	4 10
		ssions contribu		-	13	0	0	1	2	2			714/1384		3.74		4.11	
		ts actively end			13	0	0	0	1	2			511/1382		3.90			4.64
		tor encourage f		pen discussion	13	0	0	0	1	1			461/1368		3.82		4.39	
4. Were s	special te	chniques succes	sful		13	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	3.58	3.95	4.00	4.50
		Laborat																
5. Were r	requiremen	ts for lab repo	rts clear	rly specified	20	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 555	4.00	4.41	4.29	4.22	****
		Seminar																
5. Were c	riteria f	or 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 W	lork															
5. Did co	nferences	help you carry	out fiel	d activities	20	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 312	3.67	3.56	3.68	3.60	****
		Self P	aced															
5. Were t	here enou	gh proctors for	all the	students	22	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	3.20	3.99	4.05	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Pe:	ason	c			Тур	20			Majors	
00-27	0 0	0.00-0.99	0	A 16 B 6		Red	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduate	3	0	Majo	or	22
28-55		1.00-1.99				Con	00205	1				1	IIndon	- A -	1	Mon	ma i a	2
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0			Ger	nera	Т				1	Under-gr	.au 2	24	non-	-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0 6	D 0 F 0		m 7 -						0	инии .		.b			.la
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	ь	= *		FITE	ecti	ves				U	#### - 1				_	111
				P 0 I 0		O+1	her				^	1	response	es lo E	e sigr	itttcar	IL	
				5 U T O		OCI	ier.				2	1						
				; U														

Course-Section: CMSC 345 0201

Title SOFTWARE DESIGN/DEVELO

Instructor: VICK, SHON

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 453 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

		Question	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain new	v insights,ski		m this course	2	0	0	2	6	5	4	3.65	1443/1649	3.95	4.28	4.28	4.27	3.65
		or make clear			1	0	1	1	5	9	2		1464/1648	4.03	4.26	4.23	4.18	3.56
		estions reflec			1	13	0	0	1	1	3		665/1375					4.40
		ations reflect			1	0	0	0	3	4		4.44		4.51		4.20	4.21	4.44
				what you learned	2	12	1	0	1	0	3			3.83	3.69		4.05	3.80
				o what you learned	2	3	0	0	4	2	8	4.29		4.30		4.10		4.29
		system clearl		ined	2	0	1	2	3	4			1228/1623	4.18		4.16		3.82
	_	vas class canc			1	1	1	1	3	8	4			4.30	4.79	4.69		3.76
9. How wor	ıld you gr	rade the overa	II teac	hing effectiveness	4	2	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	914/1621	4.21	4.01	4.06	4.02	4.00
		Lectur	е															
1. Were th	ne instruc	ctor's lecture	s 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	e instruct	or seem inter	ested i	n the subject	5	0	1	0	2	8	3	3.86	1502/1572	4.30	4.66	4.70	4.64	3.86
				xplained clearly	4	0	1	1	3	8	2	3.60	1360/1564	4.05	4.24	4.28	4.25	3.60
		s contribute t			4	0	0	2	5	3	5	3.73	1289/1559	4.12	4.26	4.29	4.23	3.73
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	nance y	our understanding	4	4	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	818/1352	4.08	4.10	3.98	3.97	3.91
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discus			what you learned	16	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1384	4.18	3.74	4.08	4.11	***
				d to participate	16	0	0	1	0	1	1		****/1382	4.64		4.29	4.37	****
				d open discussion	16	0	0	1	0	1	1		****/1368		3.82	4.30	4.39	***
		chniques succe		-	16	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 948	4.50	3.58	3.95	4.00	****
		Labora	t oraz															
5. Were re	equirement			early specified	13	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	388/ 555	4.00	4.41	4.29	4.22	4.00
	- 1					_	_	-	_		_		222, 222					
		Semina																
5. Were ci	riteria fo	or grading mad	e clear		16	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 288	3.67	3.26	3.68	3.58	****
		Field	Work															
5. Did cor	nferences	help you carr	y out f	ield activities	13	0	0	1	0	5	0	3.67	207/ 312	3.67	3.56	3.68	3.60	3.67
		- 16																
5 Were th	nere enouc	Self : gh proctors fo		he students	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 110	****	3 20	3.99	4 05	***
J. Were er	icre cirous	JII PIOCEOID IO	L GII C	iic beddeireb	10	J	J	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	1.00	, 110		3.20	3.33	1.05	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	utior	1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Typ	oe .			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	S	0	Graduate	2	0	Majo	r	15
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 6		_	_					_	1	, .				
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C 0		Ger	nera!	L				1	Under-gr	rad 1	.9	Non-	major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D 0								1			.1			.1-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0 P 1		FIE	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - M				_	Ju
				P 1 I 0		<b>∩</b> +1	ner				1	4	response	s to I	e sign	ıııcan	IL	
				? 1		ULI	161				1	4						
				: т														

Course-Section: CMSC 411 0101

Title COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE

_____

Instructor: SQUII Enrollment: 51 Questionnaires: 27

SQUIRE, JON S

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 454 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fro	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect 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		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		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		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		1322/1559	4.05	4.26	4.29	4.41	
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		****/1384			4.08	4.35	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	1	1	2	0	1		****/1382		3.90	4.29	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	1	0	0	1	3		****/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	****
Freq	uency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00.07														1.0
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 18 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 4		кес	quir	ea i	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	19
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 3 C 1		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad ?	7	Non-	-major	8
84-150 11 3.00-3.49 3 D 0		001	c. a	-				-	onaci g		•	14011		5
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 11 F 0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - 1	Means +	here a	re not	enoug	rh
P 0		111						-	respons					
I O		Oth	her				2	6				001.	-	
? 3		001					_							

Course-Section: CMSC 411 0201 University of Maryland FEB 11, 2009 Title COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE Baltimore County

SOUIRE, JON S

Instructor: Enrollment: 40

Ouestionnaires: 23

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Page 455

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 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 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 4.257. 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 **** 17 0 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 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 00 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 Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed 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	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20	_		_	
				2	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 421 0101

Title PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS

Instructor: KALPAKIS, KONST

Enrollment: 50
Questionnaires: 41

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 456 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

								Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	r	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			Questio	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rar	nk	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			Gener	 al																
1. Did	d you c	ain nev			om this course	0	0	0	1	3	10	27	4.54	603/1	1649	4.46	4.28	4.28	4.50	4.54
2. Dic	d the i	.nstruct	or make clea:	r the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	12	13	16	4.10	1070/1	1648	3.92	4.26	4.23	4.36	4.10
3. Dic	d the e	exam que	estions refle	ct the e	expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	10	22	4.29	771/1	1375	4.03	4.31	4.27	4.48	4.29
					xpected goals	0	5	1	1	7	14	13		1055/1	1595	3.72	4.26	4.20	4.36	4.03
					what you learned	0	5	2	0	7	13	14	4.03	801/1		3.65	3.69	4.04	4.14	4.03
					to what you learned	0	12	1	0	10	9	9		1048/1		3.24	4.15	4.10	4.26	3.86
			system clear		ained	0	1	0	4	5	11	20	4.18	904/1		3.90	4.32	4.16		4.18
			vas class can			0	0	0	0	0	12	29	4.71	,		4.43	4.79		4.71	
9. Hov	w would	l you gi	rade the over	all tead	ching effectiveness	8	0	1	0	4	11	17	4.30	632/1	1621	3.94	4.01	4.06	4.24	4.30
			Lectu:	re																
1. Wer	re the	instruc	ctor's lectur	es well	prepared	0	0	1	0	2	10	28	4.56	779/1	1568	4.32	4.40	4.43	4.54	4.56
2. Dic	d the i	.nstruct	or seem inte	rested i	in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	39	4.97	178/1	1572	4.76	4.66	4.70	4.79	4.97
					explained clearly	0	0	1	2	8	9	21	4.15	1046/1	1564	3.96	4.24	4.28	4.40	4.15
			contribute			0	0	1	2	9	6	23		1023/1		3.97	4.26	4.29	4.41	4.17
5. Dic	d audio	visual	techniques e	nhance y	your understanding	1	5	0	3	7	11	14	4.03	678/1	1352	3.38	4.10	3.98	4.07	4.03
			Discu	agion																
1 Did	d class	discus			what you learned	31	0	0	2	2	1	5	3 90	****/]	1384	3.20	3.74	4.08	4.35	***
					ed to participate	32	0	0	0	1	2	6		****/]		4.60	3.90	4.29	4.56	****
					nd open discussion	32	0	0	0	1	1	7		****/]		4.20	3.82		4.58	****
			chniques succ			32	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/	948	***	3.58	3.95	4.31	****
			T - 1																	
5 Wer	re rea	irement	Labora s for lab re	-	learly specified	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/	555	***	4 41	4 29	4 41	****
3. NCI	10 1040	i I I Cilicii	25 101 1ab 1c,	0100 01	rearry specifica	10	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	-	3.00	,	333		1.11	1.25		
			Semin																	
5. Wer	re crit	eria fo	or grading ma	de clear	£	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	288	3.50	3.26	3.68	3.71	****
			Field	Work																
5. Did	d confe	rences			field activities	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	312	4.00	3.56	3.68	3.95	****
					Frequ	lency	Dist	crib	utio	n										
Credit	ts Earr	ied	Cum. GP.	A	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s				Тур	pe			Majors	
00-27	 7	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Rec	guir	 ed f	or M	 ajor		0	Grad	duate	 e	1	Majo	r or	24
28-55		0	1.00-1.99	0	В 15						J									
56-83	3	1	2.00-2.99	4	C 11		Ger	nera:	1				0	Unde	er-gi	rad 4	0	Non-	major	17
84-15		21	3.00-3.49	8	D 1															
Grad.		1	3.50-4.00	17	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1			Means t			_	h
					P 0							_	_	resp	onse	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
					I 0		Otł	ner				3	8							
					? 3															

Course-Section: CMSC 421 0201

PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS

Title Instructor: CHETTRI, SAMIR

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 15 Baltimore County Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Page 457 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	2	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	803/1649	4.46	4.28	4.28	4.50	4.38
		ctor make clear			3	0	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	1347/1648	3.92	4.26	4.23	4.36	3.75
3. Did th	ie exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	2	0	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	1107/1375	4.03	4.31	4.27	4.48	3.77
		uations reflect			2	1	1	2	3	3	3		1440/1595		4.26	4.20	4.36	3.42
				what you learned	2	2	1	2	3	3	2	3.27	1358/1533	3.65	3.69	4.04	4.14	3.27
				o what you learned	3	4	3	1	1	2	1		1489/1512		4.15	4.10	4.26	2.63
		g system clearl		ined	2	0	1	2	2	4			1342/1623		4.32	4.16	4.27	3.62
	-	was class cand			2	0	0	0	0	11	2		1469/1646	4.43	4.79	4.69	4.71	4.15
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	II teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	8	0	3.58	1310/1621	3.94	4.01	4.06	4.24	3.58
		Lectur	е															
		uctor's lecture			2	0	1	0	3	2	7	4.08	1248/1568	4.32	4.40	4.43	4.54	4.08
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	1212/1572	4.76	4.66	4.70	4.79	4.54
				xplained clearly	2	0	0	2	3	4	4	3.77	1292/1564	3.96	4.24	4.28	4.40	3.77
		es contribute t			2	0	1	1	3	3	5		1270/1559		4.26	4.29	4.41	3.77
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	rour understanding	2	2	3	0	6	1	1	2.73	1281/1352	3.38	4.10	3.98	4.07	2.73
		Discus	sion															
				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 a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d 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 th	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	876/1368	4.20	3.82	4.30	4.58	4.20
		Labora	tory															
5. Were r	equiremer	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 555	****	4.41	4.29	4.41	****
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading mad	e 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 co	nferences	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	9	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.56	3.68	3.95	4.00
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	<b>.</b>
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed fo	or M	ajors	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 4										_				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C 5		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 0								•						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	ıh
				P 0		0.1					_	0	respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner				1	.2						
				? 0														

Course-Section: CMSC 426 0101

Title PRINC COMPUTER SECURIT

Instructor: PHATAK, DHANANJ

Enrollment:

25 Questionnaires: 19

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 458 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	tructor	Cou	ırse	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	S		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank			Mean		Mean	Mean
		 General	 1																
1 Did vo	u gain ne	w insights,ski		m this course	1	0	1	5	3	1	8	3 56	1484/164	9 3	56	4.28	4.28	4.50	3.56
_	_	tor make clear			2	0	1	3	2	5	-		1382/164			4.26		4.36	3.71
		estions reflect			1	0	3	3	5	2			1305/137		17		4.27		3.17
	_	ations reflect		_	1	3	4	1	2	3			1488/159		27	4.26		4.36	
				what you learned	3	4	3	3	1	3			1485/153		83			4.14	
				what you learned by what you learned	3	5	2	2	1	3			1367/151					4.14	
						-	3	2 6	_				, -		27		4.10		
		system clearly		ınea	2	0	-	-	3	2			1577/162		76			4.27	
		was class cance			2	2	0	0	0				465/164		93	4.79	4.69		4.93
9. How wo	ould you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	1	2	6	5	2	3.31	1436/162	21 3.	31	4.01	4.06	4.24	3.31
		Lecture	e																
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture		orepared	2	0	3	2	6	3	3	3.06	1512/156	8 3.	06	4.40	4.43	4.54	3.06
		tor seem inter			2	0	0	1	1	4			1265/157		47				4.47
				xplained clearly	2	0	1	3	5	6			1450/156		29		4.28	4.40	
		s contribute to			2	1	2	2	3	4			1370/155		50	4.26	4.29		3.50
				our understanding	4	0	1	2	6	3			1130/135		33	4.10		4.07	
5. Did au	laiovisuai	techniques em	lance y	our understanding	4	U	1	۷	0	3	3	3.33	1130/133	02 3.	33	4.10	3.90	4.07	3.33
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1011/138	34 3.	67	3.74	4.08	4.35	3.67
2. Were a	ll studen	ts actively end	courage	d to participate	13	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	1057/138	2 3.	83	3.90	4.29	4.56	3.83
		-	_	d open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	796/136	8 4.	33	3.82	4.30	4.58	4.33
		chniques succe		-	13	1	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	844/ 94	8 3.	00	3.58	3.95	4.31	3.00
		- 1																	
1 Did +h	o lah ing	Laborat	_	f the material	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 22	)1 **	**	4.12	4.16	4.73	****
				early specified	15	0	0	0	2	0	2		****/ 55		**	4.12	4.10		****
5. Wele I	equiremen	cs for lab repo	JILS CI	earry specified	13	U	U	U	2	U	4	4.00	/ 55			4.41	4.29	4.41	
		Semina	r																
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading made	e clear		15	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 28	8 **	**	3.26	3.68	3.71	****
		Field V	v71-																
5 Did co	nferences			ield activities	12	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	68 / 31	2 4	0.0	3 56	3 68	3.95	4 00
3. Dia 60	ALCE CHOCK	ncip you carr	y out 1	icia accivicios		Ü	Ü	Ü	J	,	Ü	1.00	00/ 32		00	3.30	3.00	3.73	1.00
		Self 1																	
5. Were t	here enough	gh proctors for	r all t	he students	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 11	.0 **	**	3.20	3.99	4.22	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	ution	ı										
- 11				_	_									_				'	
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	; 				ype				Majors	; 
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	S	1	Gradua	ite		3	Majo	or	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 5													_		
56-83							nera:	1				6	Under-	grad	1	6	Non-	-major	8
84-150														_				-	
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		E14	ectiv	zes				1	#### -	Mear	s t	here a	re not	enoug	rh
22 00.	J	2.20 1.00	-	P 0								_				e sign		_	,
P 0 I 0						O+1	her					6	I CBPOI	LDCD (		c bigii	cai	10	
		ULI	TICI					U											

Course-Section: CMSC 435 0101 University of Maryland Title COMPUTER GRAPHICS Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: RHEINGANS, PENN

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 28

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 459 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor 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	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		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		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		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		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		1246/1564		4.24	4.28	4.40	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	8	4	13		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		****/ 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		****/ 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		****/ 52	****	2.00	4.06	4.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	2.00	4.09	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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	****

Course-Section: CMSC 435 0101

Title COMPUTER GRAPHICS

Instructor: RHEINGANS, PENN

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 459 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E						Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	4	Major	28
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	-			
				?	2						

Course-Section: CMSC 441 0101 University of Maryland
Title ALGORITHMS Baltimore County

Title ALGORITHMS Baltimore County Instructor: COLE, FLOYD Fall 2008

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 24

Page 460 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Quest:	ionnaire
---------	--------	------------	--------	----------

							Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u qain new	insights,ski		this course	0	0	1	0	5	3	15	4.29	922/1649	4.42	4.28	4.28	4.50	4.29
		or make clear			0	0	3	1	2	8	10	3.88	1254/1648	3.89	4.26	4.23	4.36	3.88
3. Did th	e exam que	stions reflect	t the exp	pected goals	0	0	3	2	3	6	10	3.75	1112/1375	3.98	4.31	4.27	4.48	3.75
4. Did ot	her evalua	tions reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	6	2	2	0	7	7	3.83	1242/1595	4.07	4.26	4.20	4.36	3.83
5. Did as	signed rea	dings contrib	ute to wl	nat 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 wr	itten assi	.gnments contr	ibute 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
		system clearly			0	0	1	1	4	3	15	4.25	815/1623	4.22	4.32	4.16	4.27	4.25
		as class cance			1	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	731/1646	4.93	4.79	4.69	4.71	4.87
9. How wo	uld you gr	ade the overa	ll teach:	ing effectiveness	2	0	1	1	3	8	9	4.05	892/1621	3.74	4.01	4.06	4.24	4.05
		Lecture	2															
1 Wara t	ho ingtrue	tor's lecture:	_	ropared	1	0	0	1	3	4	15	4.43	943/1568	1 17	4.40	4.43	4.54	4.43
		or seem inter			1	0	0	0	2	2	19		967/1572		4.66	4.70	4.79	4.74
				olained clearly	1	0	1	2	3	8			1173/1564		4.24	4.28		3.96
		contribute to			1	0	1	0	3				790/1559		4.24	4.29		4.43
				ur understanding		13	2	1	2	1			1101/1352			3.98	4.07	
5. Did au	.uiovisuai	techniques em	nance yo	ur understanding		13	۷		4	Т	4	3.40	1101/1352	3.49	4.10	3.90	4.07	3.40
	Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learne																	
					21 21	0	1	0	1	0	1		****/1384			4.08	4.35	****
	. Were all students actively encouraged to participate					0	0	0	2	0	1		****/1382		3.90	4.29	4.56	****
3. Did th	e instruct	or encourage	fair and	open discussion	21	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1368	****	3.82	4.30	4.58	****
		Labora	torv															
5. Were r	equirement			arly specified	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.41	4.29	4.41	****
		Semina	<b>x</b>															
5. Were c	riteria fo	semina. or grading made	=		23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	1.67	3.26	3.68	3.71	****
E 544		Field V		-14	20	0	1	0	0	2	0	2 25	****/ 210		2 56	2 60	2 05	
5. Dia co	nierences	neip you carry	y out II	eld activities	20	0	1	0	0	3	U	3.25	****/ 312	****	3.56	3.68	3.95	****
		Self 1	Paced															
5. Were t	here enoug	h proctors for	r all the	e students	22	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	3.20	3.99	4.22	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ation	ı									
a 11						_					_							
Credits E	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	; 			Туј	pe 			Majors	; 			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	21
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 12														
56-83						Ger	nera.	1				1	Under-g	rad 2	24	Non-	-major	3
84-150																		
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0					Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - I				_	ŗh
	Р 0												response	es to k	e sign	ifican	ıt	
	I 0					Oth	ner				2	2						
	I 0 ? 1																	

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Page 461

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 11 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions					NR	NA	Fre		ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Ranl	ς.	Course Mean	-		Level Mean	
ו הגם		General		.b.;	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4 55	E00/1/	C 4 O	4 40	4 00	4 00	4 50	4 55
		new insights,skil uctor make clear			0	0	1	0 1	0	3 5	4	4.55	590/16 1229/16		3.89	4.28	4.28	4.50 4.36	4.55 3.91
		questions reflect			1	0	0	0	3	2	_	4.20	855/13		3.98	4.31		4.48	4.20
		luations reflect	_	-	0	1	0	0	3	1		4.30			4.07	4.26	4.20		4.30
		readings contribu			0	1	1	0	0	3		4.30				3.69	4.04	4.14	4.30
		ssignments contri		_	1	1	0	0	0	4			345/15		4.37	4.15	4.10	4.26	4.56
7. Was	the gradin	ng system clearly	explaine	ed	0	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	894/16	623	4.22	4.32	4.16	4.27	4.18
8. How	many time:	s was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/16	546	4.93	4.79	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How	would you	grade the overal	l teachir	ng effectiveness	2	0	0	1	4	3	1	3.44	1381/16	521	3.74	4.01	4.06	4.24	3.44
		Lecture	<u> </u>																
		ructor's lectures			1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	852/15	568	4.47		4.43	4.54	4.50
		uctor seem intere			1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/15				4.70	4.79	5.00
		aterial presented	_	_	1	0	0	0	0	7		4.30	,			4.24		4.40	
		res contribute to			2	0	0	0	1	4			901/15				4.29	4.41	
5. Did	audiovisu	al techniques enh	ance your	r understanding	2	2	0	2	2	0	3	3.57	1016/13	352	3.49	4.10	3.98	4.07	3.57
		Discuss	ion																
1. Did	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/13	384	****	3.74	4.08	4.35	****
		ents actively enc			9	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/13		****	3.90	4.29	4.56	****
		uctor encourage f		pen discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/13		****		4.30	4.58	****
4. Were	special	techniques succes	sful		9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	948	****	3.58	3.95	4.31	****
		Laborat	ory																
5. Were	requireme	ents for lab repo	rts clear	rly 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/ 2	288	1.67	3.26	3.68	3.71	1.67
		Field W	lork																
5. Did	conference	es help you carry	out fiel	d activities	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/	312	****	3.56	3.68	3.95	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utior	1										
a 1''	_ 1	Cum. GPA						_						_					
Credits	Expected Grades				Rea	asons					Тур	e 			Majors				
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3						Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	S	0	Gradi	uate	9	0	Majo	or	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 4				_											
	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 2 C 4				Ger	nera:	L				0	Under	r-gr	rad 1	1	Non-	major	1	
	84-150 6 3.00-3.49 2 D 0											0				,			
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0					Ele	ectiv	ves				0			Means t			_	n
	P 0					O+1	ner				1	1	respo	onse	es to b	e sign	ııııcan	1C	
	I 0					OEI	ier.				1	1							
	? 0																		

Course-Section: CMSC 441 0201

Title ALGORITHMS

Instructor: SHERMAN, ALAN Enrollment: 17

Course-Section: CMSC 445 0101 University of Maryland Title SOFTWARE ENGINEERING

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD

8. How many times was class cancelled

Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 17 Ouestionnaires: 15 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 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 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 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

0 0 0 0 7 8 4.53 1166/1646 4.53 4.79 4.69 4.71 4.53

0 1 0 4.00 ****/1384 **** 3.74 4.08 4.35 ****

Page 462 FEB 11, 2009

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

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

Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned

13 0 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 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 ****

0

0

14 0

Laboratory

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

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 Expected Grades Cum. GPA Majors Reasons 00 - 270 Graduate 0 0 0.00-0.99 A 6 Required for Majors 0 Major 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 в б 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 F 0 3.50-4.00 2 0 Grad. Ω Electives #### - Means there are not enough P O responses to be significant I 0 Other

Course-Section: CMSC 451 0101 University of Maryland Title AUTOMATA THRY& FORM LA Baltimore County

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Title AUTOMATA THRY& Instructor: CHANG, RICHARD

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 463 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om 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 th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	300/1648	4.71	4.26	4.23	4.36	4.71
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	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 ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	1	5	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.26	4.20	4.36	5.00
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o 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 th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	210/1623	4.77	4.32	4.16	4.27	4.77
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	75/1621	4.92	4.01	4.06	4.24	4.92
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.40	4.43	4.54	5.00
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1572		4.66	4.70	4.79	5.00
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	434/1564		4.24	4.28	4.40	4.69
		es contribute t			1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	475/1559		4.26	4.29	4.41	4.69
		our understanding	2	4	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	303/1352		4.10	3.98		4.50		
		Discus	gion															
1 Did cl	agg dige			what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/1384	****	3.74	4.08	4.35	****
				ed to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1382		3.90	4.29	4.56	****
				nd open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	_		****/1368		3.82	4.30	4.58	****
		Labora	torv															
5. Were r	equireme		-	early specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.41	4.29	4.41	****
		Semina	r															
1 Were a	ssigned t			announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	Λ	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	3.97	4.54	4.66	****
				lividual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85		3.79	4.47	4.54	****
				Frequ	lency	Dist	tribu	ıtior	1									
Credits E	lawn od	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Dos					П•	m.a			Majors	
		Expected Grades					sons				ту	pe 			Majors	· 		
00-27							quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	13
28-55												0		, .				_
56-83							neral	L				8	Under-g	rad 1	L <b>4</b>	Non-	major	1
	84-150 7 3.00-3.49 0 D 0														,			
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 8 F 0						ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### -				_	ın
P 0						O+1	0.00					4	respons	es to I	be sign	ıııcar	IL	
I 0						OEI	ner					4						

#### Course-Section: CMSC 455 0101 University of Maryland NUMERICAL COMPUTATIONS Baltimore County

Page 464 FEB 11, 2009 Title Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: STEPHENS, ARTHU

Enrollment:	6	
Ougationnaimag:	2	

Enrollment:	ь
Ouestionnaires:	3

Ctudont	('011760	Evaluation	()1100+101	nnaire

	Questions				NR	NA	Fr 1	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5		tructor Rank	Course Mean	-	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		~																
1 Did wo	u gain ne	Genera w insights,ski		m this sourse	0	0	0	0	2	1	Λ	2 22	1540/1649	3.33	1 20	4.28	4.50	3.33
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	1			1546/1648			4.23	4.36	3.33
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	1	1		950/1375			4.27	4.48	4.00
		ations reflect			0	1	0	0	0	1	1		497/1595		4.26	4.20	4.36	4.50
				what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	_		1441/1533		3.69	4.04	4.14	3.00
	_	_		o what you learned	0	1	-	0	1	1			1266/1512		4.15	4.10	4.26	3.50
		g system clearl			0	0	0	0	1	1			1029/1623			4.16	4.27	4.00
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	1			1037/1646		4.79			4.67
	-			hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	0			1504/1621				4.24	
				3														
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	s 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 th	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n 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 le	cture mat	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1336/1564	3.67	4.24	4.28	4.40	3.67		
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o 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 au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1301/1352	2.50	4.10	3.98	4.07	2.50
		Discus																
				what you learned	2		1	0	0	0			1380/1384		3.74			1.00
				d to participate	2	0	1	0	0	0			1378/1382		3.90		4.56	1.00
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1286/1368	3.00	3.82	4.30	4.58	3.00
				<b>7</b>		- D.J			_									
				Frequ	iency	DIS	CLID	ution	1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	A 1		Red	auir	ed fo	or Ma	iors		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	2			
28-55							-1011	- A I	10	. , 0 . 0		-	Gradat	_	•	1100	-	-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad	3	Non-	-major	1
84-150	4-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0														-		5 2	_
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0						Ele	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ıh
P 0													respons				_	•
				I 0		Ot1	her					2	-		5			
				? 0	001101													

Course-Section: CMSC 461 0101

Title DATABASE MANGMT SYSTEM

Instructor: GRASSO, MICHAEL

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 15

GRASSO, MICHAEL

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 465 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1														
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	-			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		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		4.60
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		****/ 948	****	3.58	3.95	4.31	****
- 1														
Laboratory 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 212	****	4.75	4.40	1 57	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	3	0		3.50	470/555	3.50	4.75	4.40	4.41	
J. Here requirements for tab reports creating specifical		J	Ü	Ü	3	Ü	-	3.30	1707 333	3.30	1.11	1.25	1.11	3.30
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	1.4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	**** / 110		2 00	2 00	4 00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	U	4.00	****/ 110	***	3.20	3.99	4.22	****
Freq	uency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	\$			Туј	oe			Majors	<b>;</b>
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 8		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	14
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6		~		,				0	1		_			4
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 3 C 0		Ger	nera	L				8	Under-g	raa 1	.5	Non-	major	1
84-150		. רקו	ecti					0	инии -	Moona +	howo -	20 20±	0001-	.h
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0		₽T6	=CL1	ves				U	#### - I					111
I O		O+1	her					6	T C P P O I I S	ע טי פי	c arall	call		
? 0		001						-						

Course-Section: CMSC 471 0101

Title ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENC

Instructor: MINER, DONALD P

Enrollment:

39 Questionnaires: 35

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 466 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
1														
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		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	4.13	4.16	4.27	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1646		4.79	4.69		5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	17		4.38	535/1621			4.06		4.38
9. how would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	U	U	U	۷	1/	13	4.30	333/1021	4.30	4.01	4.00	4.24	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	7	10	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		4.66	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		****/ 243	****	4.40	4.12	4.61	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 212	****	4.75	4.40	4.57	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 209	****	4.77	4.35	4.63	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	2	1	5		****/ 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		****/ 85	****	3.79	4.47	4.54	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 81	****	3.58	4.43	4.57	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.00	4.35	4.44	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	5	1		****/ 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		****/ 52	****	2.00	4.06	4.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	2.00	4.09	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.52	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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	***

Course-Section: CMSC 471 0101

Title ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENC

Instructor: MINI

MINER, DONALD P

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 466 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	16	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	31
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	-			
				?	2						

Course-Section: CMSC 473 0101

Title NATURAL LANG PROCESSIN

Instructor: NIRENBURG, SERG

Enrollment: 14 Fall 2008

Page 467 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			General	 L															
1. [	oid you	gain ne	w insights,skil	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	871/1649	4.33	4.28	4.28	4.50	4.33
2. I	oid the	instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	1070/1648	4.09	4.26	4.23	4.36	4.09
3. I	oid the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the e	kpected goals	0	6	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	1259/1375	3.33	4.31	4.27	4.48	3.33
4. I	oid oth	er evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	1	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	566/1595	4.45	4.26	4.20	4.36	4.45
5. I	oid ass	signed re	eadings contribu	ite 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
					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. V	Was the	grading	system clearly	expla:	ined	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	915/1623	4.17	4.32	4.16	4.27	4.17
8. F	How mar	y times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. F	ow wor	ıld you g	grade the overal	ll teac	ning effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	754/1621	4.20	4.01	4.06	4.24	4.20
			Lecture																
			ctor's lectures			0	0	0	1	1	4			1121/1568	4.25	4.40	4.43	4.54	4.25
			ctor seem intere			0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	931/1572	4.75	4.66	4.70	4.79	4.75
					xplained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	3		4.00	1127/1564	4.00	4.24	4.28	4.40	4.00
			es contribute to			0	0	0	0	3	4			1031/1559	4.17	4.26	4.29		4.17
5. I	oid aud	liovisual	techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	0	0	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	1011/1352	3.58	4.10	3.98	4.07	3.58
			Discuss																
					what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	795/1384		3.74	4.08	4.35	4.00
					d to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	616/1382	4.50	3.90	4.29	4.56	4.50
			_		d open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1		4.25	844/1368	4.25	3.82	4.30	4.58	4.25
4. V	Vere sp	ecial te	echniques succes	ssful		8	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 948	****	3.58	3.95	4.31	***
5. W	Were re	quiremen	Laborat nts for lab repo	-	early specified	7	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	487/ 555	3.20	4.41	4.29	4.41	3.20
			Semina	2															
5. W	Were cr	riteria f	for grading made	e clear		9	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	250/ 288	2.67	3.26	3.68	3.71	2.67
			Field V	Jork															
5. I	oid cor	ferences	help you carry	out f	ield activities	10	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	3.56	3.68	3.95	****
			Self I		_														
5. V	Were th	ere enou	igh proctors foi	r all th	ne students	8	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	3.20	3.99	4.22	4.00
					Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	utio	n									
Cred	dits Ea	irned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	\$
00-	-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 7		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	 s	0	Graduat	======= =	4	Majo	r r	11
28-	-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3														
56-		0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	nera:	1				8	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	1
84-	-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Gra	ad.	4	3.50-4.00	3	F 0 P 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - I				_	jh
					I 0		Otł	ner.					4	T Capolla	-6 LO L	c argi	ııııcaı		
					? 1		OCI	101					-						

University of Maryland Course-Section: CMSC 481 0101 Title COMPUTER NETWORKS

Baltimore County Fall 2008

GREEN, FRANK E. Instructor: Enrollment: 30

Lecture

Page 468 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	22 Student Co	urse	Eval	uati	on Q	uest	ionn	aire	2						
				Fre	eque:	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	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 instr	ructor 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 eva	aluations 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

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

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

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

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	U	U	U	1	Τ.	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	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	3	General	8	Under-grad 2	22	Non-major	9
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means t	there	are not enough	n
				P	0	Electives		responses to h	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	_			
				?	2						

Course-Section: CMSC 491G 0101

Title COMP GRAPHICS FOR GAME

Instructor: BAKER, DAN

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 9

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 469 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies Ins				tructor	Course	e Dept	TIMBC	Levrel	Se				
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Me
General														
. 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.
. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	168/1648		4.26	4.23	4.36	4.
. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1375		4.31	4.27	4.48	5.
. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	144/1595		4.26	4.20	4.36	4.
Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	272/1533		3.69	4.04		4
Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	142/1512		4.15	4.10	4.26	4
Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1623		4.32	4.16	4.27	5
How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.78	881/1646		4.79	4.69	4.71	
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
Lecture														
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
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
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
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	Ę
Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1352		4.10	3.98	4.07	
Discussion														
Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1384	****	3.74	4.08	4.35	,
Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1382	****	3.90	4.29	4.56	
Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1368	****	3.82	4.30	4.58	,
Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 948	****	3.58	3.95	4.31	,
were special techniques successivi	,	U	U	U	U	U	2	3.00	/ 540		3.30	3.93	4.51	
Laboratory														
Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 221	****	4.12	4.16	4.73	
Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.40	4.12	4.61	•
Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.75	4.40	4.57	
Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.77	4.35	4.63	•
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														
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														
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	,
Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	1.50	4.16	4.24	,
Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	2.00	4.43	4.84	5
Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	2.00	4.42	4.85	4
Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	***	3.20	3.99	4.22	*
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5					or Ma			0	 Graduat		2	 Majo		
J-2/ U U.UU-U.99 U A 5		Red	dart	eu I	OT Mg	JOE	٥	U	Gradual	_	4	ria JC	) <u>T</u>	

Credits E	Credits Earned			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	7	Non-major	2
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 sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-	_		
				?	3						

Course-Section: CMSC 491Q 0101 University of Maryl Title QUANTUM COMPUTATION Baltimore County Instructor: LOMONACO JR, SA Fall 2008

University of Maryland Page 470
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	12	
Questionnaires:	2	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions			NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	§ 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		Genera	_															
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.28	4.28	4.50	4.50
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	1		556/1648	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.36	4.50
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	1	1		546/1375	4.50	4.31	4.27	4.48	4.50
		ations reflect			0	0 1	0	0	0	1	1		497/1595	4.50	4.26	4.20	4.36	4.50
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	-	1		1/1533		3.69	4.04	4.14	5.00
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		883/1512		4.15	4.10	4.26	4.00
		g system clearly was class cance		inea	1	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1623 1/1646		4.32	4.16	4.27	5.00
	-			hing offostivonoss	0	0	0	0	0	1	1		374/1621		4.79	4.69	4.71 4.24	5.00 4.50
9. HOW WO	uia you g	grade the overa	II teac	hing effectiveness	U	U	U	U	U	1	1	4.50	3/4/1021	4.50	4.01	4.06	4.24	4.50
		Lecture																
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture	s well j	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.40	4.43	4.54	4.50
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1241/1572	4.50	4.66	4.70	4.79	4.50
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearl					0	0	0	0	1	1		651/1564		4.24	4.28	4.40	4.50
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	1	1		695/1559	4.50	4.26	4.29	4.41	4.50
5. Did au	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1352	4.50	4.10	3.98	4.07	4.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute 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 a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d 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	e instruc	ctor encourage :	fair and	d 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 s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	_	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	3.58	3.95	4.31	5.00
		Labora	torv															
5. Were re	equiremer		_	early specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.41	4.29	4.41	5.00
				P		- <b>D</b> .												
				Frequ	iency	DIS	tribi	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	ре			Majors	3		
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1						 quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	 3	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1		_				J								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									J				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	nt	
				I 0	Other					1	_		_					
				? 0														

Course-Section: CMSC 491S 0101

Title SRVC ORIENTED COMPUTIN

Instructor: HALEM, MILTON

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 11

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 471 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	-01161	ncie	S		Tns	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	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			3.69	4.04	4.14	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	3	1	2		1309/1512		4.15	4.10	4.26	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	1	5		1332/1623		4.32	4.16	4.27	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10		664/1646		4.79	4.69	4.71	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	4			1261/1621			4.06	4.24	
J. How would you grade one overdir bedoming erroserveness	_	Ū	_	ŭ	_	-	_	5.07	1201, 1021	3.07	1.01	1.00		3.07
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		4.24	4.28	4.40	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	3	5		1241/1559		4.26	4.29	4.41	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	0	1	6		534/1352		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		****/ 88	****	3.97	4.54	4.66	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 85	****	3.79	4.47	4.54	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 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		****/ 52	***	2.00	4.06	4.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	, -	****	2.00	4.09	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.52	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 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	****
0.15 7 1														
Self Paced	1.0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ <b>-</b> >	****	0 50	4 20	1 (1	
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 53		2.50	4.30	4.64	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 30	****	1.50	4.16	4.24	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 41	****	2.00	4.43	4.84	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 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	****

Course-Section: CMSC 491S 0101

Title SRVC ORIENTED COMPUTIN

Instructor: HALEM, MILTON

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 471 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5 5	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0	1.					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	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	Electives		responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

#### Course-Section: CMSC 491V 0101 University of Maryland Page 472 Title ELECTRONIC VOTING SYS Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Fall 2008 Instructor: SHERMAN, ALAN

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 3

						Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	w insights,skil	=	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	433/1649	4.67	4.28	4.28	4.50	4.67
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.26	4.23	4.36	4.00
3. Did th	ne exam qu	estions reflect	the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.31	4.27	4.48	4.50
		ations reflect			1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.26	4.20	4.36	4.50
5. Did as	signed re	adings contribu	ıte to i	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 wr	ritten ass	signments contri	ibute 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 th	ne grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1533/1623	3.00	4.32	4.16	4.27	3.00
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.79	4.69	4.71	4.50
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overal	ll teac	ning effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.01	4.06	4.24	4.00
		Lecture	<b>a</b>															
1 Were t	he instri	ctor's lectures		repared	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.40	4.43	4.54	4.50
					2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.66	4.70	4.79	5.00
	<ol> <li>Did the instructor seem interested in the subject</li> <li>Was lecture material presented and explained clearly</li> </ol>						0	0	0	1			651/1564	4.50	4.24	4.28	4.40	4.50
		es contribute to			1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.26	4.29	4.41	5.00
				our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1352	5.00	4.10	3.98		
		1	2															
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contribu	ate 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 a	all studer	its actively end	courage	d 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 th	ne instruc	tor encourage f	fair and	d 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 s	special te	chniques succes	ssful		2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	3.58	3.95	4.31	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ıtioı	า									
				1														
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	\$			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	or	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1			_									3 -		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				1	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	-major	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									_				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	nt	
				I 0		Other					1							
				? 1														

Course-Section: CMSC 611 0101

ADV COMPUTER ARCHITECT

Title Instructor: OLANO, MARC

Enrollment: 56

Questionnaires: 42

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 473 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	_	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	7	12	20		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		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		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		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		****/ 30	****	1.50	4.16	4.49	****
Were your contacts with the instructor helpful		1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 41	****	2.00	4.43	4.43	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39 39	1	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 24	****	2.00	4.42	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 110	****	3.20	3.99	3.92	****
· ···· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			-	-		-	-		, ,					
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	itio	n									

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	6	 А	19	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	22	Major	28
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	39	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 621 0101

ADV OPERATING SYSTEMS

Title SIDHU, DEEPINDE

Instructor: Enrollment:

41 Questionnaires: 34 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 474 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

				Fre	eaue	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		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
	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
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	3	5	11	14		1450/1572	4.09	4.66	4.70	4.83	4.09
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	4	5	13	- 8		1368/1564	3.58	4.24	4.28	4.41	3.58
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	3	7	9			1359/1559	3.55		4.29	4.41	3.55
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	4	1	6	9			1101/1352			3.98	4.10	
	1 1 1 3									,					
	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														
	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	10	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 221	****		4.16	4.27	****
	Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	1	1	1	2	1		****/ 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	****
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 85	****	3.79	4.47	4.50	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 81	****	3.58	4.43	4.43	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.00	4.35	4.42	****
	Were criteria for grading made clear	30	1	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 288	****	3.26	3.68	3.87	****
٥.	were criteria for grading made crear	30		U	U			_	1.00	/ 200		3.20	3.00	3.07	
	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	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 48	****	2.00	4.09	4.47	****
	Was the instructor available for consultation	32	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.58	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	1	0	1	0	0	0			****	1.50	4.38	4.44	****
	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	1	0	1	0	0	•		****/ 312	****	3.56	3.68	3.83	****
٥.	Did conferences help you carry out freid activities	31		U		U	U	_	3.30	/ 312		3.30	3.00	3.03	
	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	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 30	****	1.50	4.16	4.49	****
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	1	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	,	****	2.00	4.43	4.43	****
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50		****	2.00	4.42	4.67	****
	Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	1	0	2	0	0	0		****/ 110	****		3.99	3.92	****
	* *************************************	-		-		-	-	-		, .=-					

Course-Section: CMSC 621 0101

Title ADV OPERATING SYSTEMS

Instructor: SIDHU, DEEPINDE

Enrollment: 41
Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 474 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	5	А	14	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	19	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	24	_			
				?	4						

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2008

Course-Section: CMSC 636 0101

11

DATA VISUALIZATION

4. Were special techniques successful

Field Work

RHEINGANS, PENN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Page 475 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

6 4 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 948 **** 3.58 3.95 4.03 ****

				Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	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

# Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	I O Other		1				
				?	2						

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

Course-Section: CMSC 643 0101

Title Quantum Computation

Instructor: Lomonaco Jr., S.

Enrollment: 0
Questionnaires: 8

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 10 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	n Questionnaire	2
---------	--------	------------	-----------------	---

			Fre	equei	ncies	S	Instructor		ructor	Course Dept		t UMBC Leve		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
G1														
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			1139/1533	****	4.01		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		4.63		****	4.34	4.29		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	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	1	1	2 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	4.08	4.03	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1362	****	4.43	4.29	4.03	
5. Did the instructor encourage rair and open discussion	1	O	O	O	O	O	_	3.00	1/1300		1.15	1.50	1.01	3.00
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		****/ 48	****	4.50	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	4.40	4.47		****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 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	****			3.51	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	****
Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned     Did study questions make clear the expected goal			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful			0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful			U	3	J	5	_	5.00	, 11			1.15	1.2/	
Errom		Dia	+ m i h	.+	_									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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 sig	nificant	

I 0 Other 3 ? 0

Course-Section: CMSC 671 0101

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title PRIN ARTIFICIAL INTELL

Instructor: PENG, YUN Enrollment:

14 Questionnaires: 10

Fall 2008

Page 476 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
a1														
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		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		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			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		1232/1384		3.74	4.08	4.30	3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	3	1	2		1229/1382	3.43	3.90	4.29	4.52	3.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3 3	0 3	0	0	2 1	3 2	2	4.00	948/1368	4.00	3.82	4.30	4.56	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	U	U	1	2	Τ	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		****/ 221	****	4.12	4.16	4.27	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 243	****	4.40	4.12	4.61	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 212	****	4.75	4.40	4.73	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 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	•	0	•	0	0	0	1	F 00	****	de de de de	2 05	4 = 4	4 62	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 88	****	3.97	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1 1		****/ 85 ****/ 81	****	3.79	4.47	4.50	****
<ol> <li>Did research projects contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Did presentations contribute to what you learned</li> </ol>	9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 81 ****/ 92	****	3.58 4.00	4.43	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 288	****	3.26	3.68	3.87	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	9	U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	200		3.20	3.00	3.07	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 52	****	2.00	4.06	4.51	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 48	****	2.00	4.09	4.47	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 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	****

Course-Section: CMSC 671 0101

Title PRIN ARTIFICIAL INTELL

Instructor: PENG, YUN

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 476 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	5	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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 sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 681 0101

Title ADVANCED COMP NETWORKS

Instructor: SIDHU, DEEPINDE

Enrollment: 20

Questionnaires: 13

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 477 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				-	ncies	5	_		tructor	Course	-		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		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		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	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		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 12	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 53	****	2.50	4.30	4.37	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful		0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 41	****	2.00	4.43	4.43	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful			0	0	1	0	0		****/ 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	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	3	 А	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	5	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						