

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 100 1
Title:	Intro To Computers/Prog
Instructor:	MacGlashan,Jame

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	44
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	6	5	2	3.38	1439/1528	3.38	4.27	4.31	4.16	3.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	7	5	3	3.56	1387/1527	3.56	4.27	4.28	4.23	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	5	3	3.38	1272/1333	3.38	4.32	4.34	4.26	3.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	5	1	6	3.67	1301/1495	3.67	4.26	4.25	4.11	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	5	4	5	3.80	1020/1439	3.80	3.70	4.11	3.97	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	3	6	2	3.40	1262/1425	3.40	4.17	4.12	3.93	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	8	4	4.00	1050/1508	4.00	4.35	4.18	4.11	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.71	4.66	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	5	5	2	3.50	1269/1490	3.50	3.99	4.11	4.02	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	965/1428	4.40	4.43	4.49	4.43	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	1043/1436	4.67	4.69	4.74	4.70	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	7	2	4	3.53	1294/1427	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.27	3.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	6	4	3.93	1132/1425	3.93	4.20	4.34	4.31	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	4	3	6	3.93	814/1291	3.93	4.08	4.05	3.97	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1271	****	3.96	4.16	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1276	****	4.02	4.33	4.14	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1273	****	4.10	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/922	****	3.86	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 100 1
Title:	Intro To Computers/Prog
Instructor:	MacGlashan,Jame

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	44
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	4.40	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	4.28	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.53	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.56	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.78	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	4.63	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.63	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.25	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.88	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	2.45	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	2.52	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	2.91	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	3.71	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	3.67	4.43	4.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 100 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 44
Title: Intro To Computers/Prog		Questionnaires: 16
Instructor: MacGlashan,Jame		

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

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 100H 2
Title:	Intro to Computers/Prog
Instructor:	MacGlashan,Jame

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	5
Questionnaires:	5

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.27	4.31	4.16	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	453/1527	4.60	4.27	4.28	4.23	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	458/1333	4.60	4.32	4.34	4.26	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	369/1495	4.60	4.26	4.25	4.11	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	499/1439	4.40	3.70	4.11	3.97	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	726/1425	4.20	4.17	4.12	3.93	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	144/1508	4.80	4.35	4.18	4.11	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.71	4.66	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	344/1490	4.50	3.99	4.11	4.02	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	385/1428	4.80	4.43	4.49	4.43	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.69	4.74	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	506/1427	4.60	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	556/1425	4.60	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	539/1291	4.25	4.08	4.05	3.97	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	669/1271	4.20	3.96	4.16	3.98	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	1040/1276	3.80	4.02	4.33	4.14	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	345/1273	4.80	4.10	4.38	4.18	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	316/922	4.33	3.86	4.02	3.87	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 100H 2
Title:	Intro to Computers/Prog
Instructor:	MacGlashan,Jame

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	5
Questionnaires:	5

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/198	****	4.40	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/208	****	4.28	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.53	4.37	4.30	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.78	4.51	4.44	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.25	4.27	4.21	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	2.45	4.00	4.08	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	2.91	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	3.71	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	3.67	4.43	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 100H 2
Title:	Intro to Computers/Prog
Instructor:	MacGlashan,Jame

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	5
Questionnaires:	5

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect									
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean									
Self Paced																							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General			0	Under-grad	5	Non-major			2								
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0																		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives			1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant													
				P	0																		
				I	0	Other			1														
				?	0																		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 1
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Richey,Clark D

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	50
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	3	15	4.48	674/1528	4.30	4.27	4.31	4.16	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	9	4.33	818/1527	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.23	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	458/1333	4.57	4.32	4.34	4.26	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	407/1495	4.43	4.26	4.25	4.11	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	329/1439	4.18	3.70	4.11	3.97	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	329/1425	4.31	4.17	4.12	3.93	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	340/1508	4.62	4.35	4.18	4.11	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	742/1526	4.91	4.71	4.66	4.57	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	7	4	4	3.69	1191/1490	4.00	3.99	4.11	4.02	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	830/1428	4.53	4.43	4.49	4.43	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	1290/1436	4.60	4.69	4.74	4.70	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	4	6	10	4.14	1008/1427	4.34	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	830/1425	4.45	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	304/1291	4.41	4.08	4.05	3.97	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1271	3.54	3.96	4.16	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1276	3.61	4.02	4.33	4.14	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1273	3.89	4.10	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/922	3.63	3.86	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 1
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Richey,Clark D

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	50
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	22/198	4.47	4.40	4.16	3.90	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	68/208	4.25	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	2	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	94/194	4.20	4.60	4.56	4.54	4.70
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	2	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	116/194	4.28	4.53	4.37	4.30	4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	3	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	22/176	4.78	4.56	4.23	4.19	4.78
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	****	4.78	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/74	****	4.63	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	4.63	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	****	4.25	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/73	****	3.88	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/42	3.14	2.45	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/41	3.29	2.52	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/32	3.50	3.50	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/43	3.57	2.91	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/31	3.71	3.71	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/36	3.67	3.67	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 1
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Richey,Clark D

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	50
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1 A 10	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0 B 5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0 C 0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4 F 0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	2				
			? 5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 2
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Li,Wenjia

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	27

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	0	4	7	13	4.12	1067/1528	4.30	4.27	4.31	4.16	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	4	1	9	11	4.08	1057/1527	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.23	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	5	17	4.52	542/1333	4.57	4.32	4.34	4.26	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	0	2	10	11	4.12	982/1495	4.43	4.26	4.25	4.11	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	15	1	2	2	3	2	3.30	1300/1439	4.18	3.70	4.11	3.97	3.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	2	2	5	10	4.21	714/1425	4.31	4.17	4.12	3.93	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	7	18	4.62	340/1508	4.62	4.35	4.18	4.11	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	453/1526	4.91	4.71	4.66	4.57	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	7	8	3	3.78	1136/1490	4.00	3.99	4.11	4.02	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	7	15	4.44	920/1428	4.53	4.43	4.49	4.43	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	4	19	4.64	1066/1436	4.60	4.69	4.74	4.70	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	4	6	12	4.13	1024/1427	4.34	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	8	14	4.46	741/1425	4.45	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	405/1291	4.41	4.08	4.05	3.97	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	2	8	2	4	3.22	1163/1271	3.54	3.96	4.16	3.98	3.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	4	7	3	3	3.17	1216/1276	3.61	4.02	4.33	4.14	3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	5	8	2	3.63	1138/1273	3.89	4.10	4.38	4.18	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	11	8	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	617/922	3.63	3.86	4.02	3.87	3.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 2
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Li,Wenjia

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	27

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	75/198	4.47	4.40	4.16	3.90	4.44
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	123/208	4.25	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	114/194	4.20	4.60	4.56	4.54	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	111/194	4.28	4.53	4.37	4.30	4.43
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/176	4.78	4.56	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/76	****	4.78	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/74	****	4.63	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/66	****	4.63	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/76	****	4.25	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/73	****	3.88	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/42	3.14	2.45	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/41	3.29	2.52	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/32	3.50	3.50	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/43	3.57	2.91	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/31	3.71	3.71	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/36	3.67	3.67	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 2
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Li,Wenjia

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	27

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2 A 10	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0 C 0	General	1	Under-grad	27	Non-major	25
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 responses to be significant			
			0 P 0						
			0 I 0	Other	2				
			? 12						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 3
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Kodeswaran,Pala

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	43
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	4	9	8	3.88	1247/1528	4.30	4.27	4.31	4.16	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	4	7	9	3.91	1213/1527	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.23	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	8	12	4.21	863/1333	4.57	4.32	4.34	4.26	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	932/1495	4.43	4.26	4.25	4.11	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	18	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	744/1439	4.18	3.70	4.11	3.97	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	2	5	1	6	3.79	1069/1425	4.31	4.17	4.12	3.93	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	8	12	4.29	734/1508	4.62	4.35	4.18	4.11	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	618/1526	4.91	4.71	4.66	4.57	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	2	6	10	2	3.48	1282/1490	4.00	3.99	4.11	4.02	3.48
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	2	0	11	9	3.96	1232/1428	4.53	4.43	4.49	4.43	3.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	11	11	4.29	1307/1436	4.60	4.69	4.74	4.70	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	1	1	10	9	3.88	1174/1427	4.34	4.24	4.32	4.27	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	3	6	10	3.91	1148/1425	4.45	4.20	4.34	4.31	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	2	1	2	9	6	3.80	902/1291	4.41	4.08	4.05	3.97	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	1	5	0	4	3.25	1156/1271	3.54	3.96	4.16	3.98	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	3	4	1	3	3.17	1216/1276	3.61	4.02	4.33	4.14	3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	4	2	5	3.83	1046/1273	3.89	4.10	4.38	4.18	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	719/922	3.63	3.86	4.02	3.87	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 3
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Kodeswaran,Pala

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	43
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	108/198	4.47	4.40	4.16	3.90	4.22
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	2	0	3	4	4.00	157/208	4.25	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	2	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	189/194	4.20	4.60	4.56	4.54	3.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	156/194	4.28	4.53	4.37	4.30	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	4	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/176	4.78	4.56	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/76	****	4.78	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/74	****	4.63	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/66	****	4.63	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/76	****	4.25	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/73	****	3.88	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	29/42	3.14	2.45	4.00	4.08	3.14
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	32/41	3.29	2.52	4.06	4.10	3.29
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	29/32	3.50	3.50	4.20	4.09	3.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	2	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	36/43	3.57	2.91	4.43	4.68	3.57
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	28/31	3.71	3.71	4.53	4.51	3.71
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	31/36	3.67	3.67	4.43	4.33	3.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 3
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Kodeswaran,Pala

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	43
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	3	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	3	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	3 A 8	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0 B 9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0 C 6	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1 F 0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	1				
			? 0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 4
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Block,Dawn M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	34

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	2	5	24	4.55	590/1528	4.30	4.27	4.31	4.16	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	26	4.79	227/1527	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.23	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	29	4.85	201/1333	4.57	4.32	4.34	4.26	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	1	3	25	4.73	247/1495	4.43	4.26	4.25	4.11	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	197/1439	4.18	3.70	4.11	3.97	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	2	4	22	4.71	207/1425	4.31	4.17	4.12	3.93	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	29	4.85	124/1508	4.62	4.35	4.18	4.11	4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	227/1526	4.91	4.71	4.66	4.57	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	0	0	12	14	4.41	494/1490	4.00	3.99	4.11	4.02	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	155/1428	4.53	4.43	4.49	4.43	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	28	4.90	516/1436	4.60	4.69	4.74	4.70	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	5	24	4.77	283/1427	4.34	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	2	27	4.80	277/1425	4.45	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	3	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	143/1291	4.41	4.08	4.05	3.97	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	753/1271	3.54	3.96	4.16	3.98	4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	893/1276	3.61	4.02	4.33	4.14	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1016/1273	3.89	4.10	4.38	4.18	3.90
4. Were special techniques successful	23	4	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	****/922	3.63	3.86	4.02	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 4
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Block,Dawn M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	34

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	4.47	4.40	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/208	4.25	4.28	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	4.20	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	4.28	4.53	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	4.78	4.56	4.23	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/42	3.14	2.45	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/41	3.29	2.52	4.06	4.10	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/43	3.57	2.91	4.43	4.68	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	4	A	19	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	34	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 5
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Block,Dawn M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	1	6	19	4.46	687/1528	4.30	4.27	4.31	4.16	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	22	4.71	301/1527	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.23	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	9	19	4.68	383/1333	4.57	4.32	4.34	4.26	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	3	5	17	4.56	419/1495	4.43	4.26	4.25	4.11	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	727/1439	4.18	3.70	4.11	3.97	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	0	3	8	12	4.25	669/1425	4.31	4.17	4.12	3.93	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	7	21	4.75	191/1508	4.62	4.35	4.18	4.11	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	227/1526	4.91	4.71	4.66	4.57	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	9	16	4.64	236/1490	4.00	3.99	4.11	4.02	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	422/1428	4.53	4.43	4.49	4.43	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	677/1436	4.60	4.69	4.74	4.70	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	256/1427	4.34	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	22	4.71	407/1425	4.45	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	8	17	4.56	290/1291	4.41	4.08	4.05	3.97	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	2	3	7	5	3.58	1049/1271	3.54	3.96	4.16	3.98	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	3	3	4	9	4.00	926/1276	3.61	4.02	4.33	4.14	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	5	5	9	4.21	851/1273	3.89	4.10	4.38	4.18	4.21
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	1	0	5	5	3	3.64	669/922	3.63	3.86	4.02	3.87	3.64

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 5
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Block,Dawn M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/198	4.47	4.40	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/208	4.25	4.28	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/194	4.20	4.60	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/194	4.28	4.53	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/176	4.78	4.56	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	4.78	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	4.63	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.63	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	4.25	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.88	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/42	3.14	2.45	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/41	3.29	2.52	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	3.50	3.50	4.20	4.09	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/43	3.57	2.91	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/31	3.71	3.71	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/36	3.67	3.67	4.43	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 5
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Block,Dawn M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	5	A	16	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 01
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Evans,Susan A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	152
Questionnaires:	85

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	5	17	30	33	4.07	1096/1528	4.44	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	12	20	50	4.40	737/1527	4.57	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	25	53	4.51	564/1333	4.57	4.32	4.34	4.40	4.51
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	4	6	27	40	4.29	796/1495	4.49	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	23	12	9	10	17	13	3.16	1338/1439	3.67	3.70	4.11	4.12	3.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	26	1	2	11	18	26	4.14	796/1425	4.38	4.17	4.12	4.11	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	5	7	22	47	4.25	783/1508	4.57	4.35	4.18	4.19	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	10	73	4.86	654/1526	4.89	4.71	4.66	4.64	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	2	1	1	10	41	16	4.01	904/1490	4.22	3.99	4.11	4.11	4.01
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	3	17	61	4.68	604/1428	4.72	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	17	63	4.73	948/1436	4.80	4.69	4.74	4.76	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	3	27	50	4.56	565/1427	4.67	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	4	9	27	40	4.21	966/1425	4.51	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	4	5	10	21	41	4.11	664/1291	4.48	4.08	4.05	4.14	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	4	9	20	43	4.30	624/1271	4.56	3.96	4.16	4.21	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	4	7	15	21	30	3.86	1017/1276	4.30	4.02	4.33	4.37	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	7	4	23	13	28	3.68	1114/1273	4.27	4.10	4.38	4.43	3.68
4. Were special techniques successful	10	30	2	3	10	9	21	3.98	492/922	4.20	3.86	4.02	4.11	3.98

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 01
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Evans,Susan A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	152
Questionnaires:	85

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	61	0	1	2	2	5	14	4.21	110/198	4.55	4.40	4.16	4.41	4.21
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	63	0	0	1	2	9	10	4.27	119/208	4.55	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.27
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	63	1	0	1	3	4	13	4.38	****/194	4.79	4.60	4.56	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	63	1	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	****/194	4.64	4.53	4.37	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	63	4	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	****/176	4.53	4.56	4.23	4.18	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	71	4	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	****/76	****	4.78	4.51	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	73	3	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	****/74	****	4.63	4.31	3.91	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	73	4	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	****/66	****	4.63	4.27	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	73	2	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	****/76	****	4.25	4.27	4.15	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	73	3	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	****/73	****	3.88	3.94	3.95	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	75	0	2	0	3	2	3	3.40	****/42	****	2.45	4.00	3.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	75	0	0	1	6	0	3	3.50	****/41	****	2.52	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	75	1	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	75	1	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	****/32	****	3.50	4.20	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	75	2	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	72	0	1	1	1	4	6	4.00	****/43	****	2.91	4.43	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	72	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	****/31	****	3.71	4.53	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	72	2	2	1	2	2	4	3.45	****/36	****	3.67	4.43	3.75	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 01
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Evans,Susan A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	152
Questionnaires:	85

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	72	1	0	2	2	2	6	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	3.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	72	2	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	****/20	****	****	4.45	3.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	31	0.00-0.99	3	A	58	Required for Majors	76	Graduate	1	Major	44
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	1	B	18						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	84	Non-major	41
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	22	F	1	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 02
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Evans,Susan A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	230/1528	4.44	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	410/1527	4.57	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	797/1333	4.57	4.32	4.34	4.40	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	445/1495	4.49	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	657/1439	3.67	3.70	4.11	4.12	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	635/1425	4.38	4.17	4.12	4.11	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	318/1508	4.57	4.35	4.18	4.19	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1526	4.89	4.71	4.66	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	251/1490	4.22	3.99	4.11	4.11	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	441/1428	4.72	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1436	4.80	4.69	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1427	4.67	4.24	4.32	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1425	4.51	4.20	4.34	4.37	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	96/1291	4.48	4.08	4.05	4.14	4.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1271	4.56	3.96	4.16	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	268/1276	4.30	4.02	4.33	4.37	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	408/1273	4.27	4.10	4.38	4.43	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/922	4.20	3.86	4.02	4.11	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 02
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Evans,Susan A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	4.55	4.40	4.16	4.41	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	4.55	4.28	4.27	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	4.79	4.60	4.56	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	4.64	4.53	4.37	4.43	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 03
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Evans,Susan A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1528	4.44	4.27	4.31	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1527	4.57	4.27	4.28	4.32	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	564/1333	4.57	4.32	4.34	4.40	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1495	4.49	4.26	4.25	4.28	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1361/1439	3.67	3.70	4.11	4.12	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1425	4.38	4.17	4.12	4.11	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1508	4.57	4.35	4.18	4.19	****
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1061/1526	4.89	4.71	4.66	4.64	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	221/1490	4.22	3.99	4.11	4.11	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1428	4.72	4.43	4.49	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1436	4.80	4.69	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1427	4.67	4.24	4.32	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1425	4.51	4.20	4.34	4.37	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1291	4.48	4.08	4.05	4.14	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1271	4.56	3.96	4.16	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	302/1276	4.30	4.02	4.33	4.37	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1273	4.27	4.10	4.38	4.43	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	158/922	4.20	3.86	4.02	4.11	4.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 03
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Evans,Susan A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	6

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 04
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Evans,Susan A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	835/1528	4.44	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	368/1527	4.57	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	564/1333	4.57	4.32	4.34	4.40	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	657/1495	4.49	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1439	3.67	3.70	4.11	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	396/1425	4.38	4.17	4.12	4.11	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	129/1508	4.57	4.35	4.18	4.19	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1526	4.89	4.71	4.66	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	675/1490	4.22	3.99	4.11	4.11	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1021/1428	4.72	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1043/1436	4.80	4.69	4.74	4.76	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	843/1427	4.67	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	475/1425	4.51	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1291	4.48	4.08	4.05	4.14	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	319/1271	4.56	3.96	4.16	4.21	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	439/1276	4.30	4.02	4.33	4.37	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1273	4.27	4.10	4.38	4.43	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	218/922	4.20	3.86	4.02	4.11	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 04
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Evans,Susan A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	33/198	4.55	4.40	4.16	4.41	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	157/208	4.55	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	4.79	4.60	4.56	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	156/194	4.64	4.53	4.37	4.43	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	158/176	4.53	4.56	4.23	4.18	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 05
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Evans,Susan A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	795/1528	4.44	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	902/1527	4.57	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	769/1333	4.57	4.32	4.34	4.40	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	350/1495	4.49	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1439	3.67	3.70	4.11	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	513/1425	4.38	4.17	4.12	4.11	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1508	4.57	4.35	4.18	4.19	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	618/1526	4.89	4.71	4.66	4.64	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	344/1490	4.22	3.99	4.11	4.11	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1428	4.72	4.43	4.49	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	839/1436	4.80	4.69	4.74	4.76	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	230/1427	4.67	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	277/1425	4.51	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	327/1291	4.48	4.08	4.05	4.14	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	204/1271	4.56	3.96	4.16	4.21	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	506/1276	4.30	4.02	4.33	4.37	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	947/1273	4.27	4.10	4.38	4.43	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	316/922	4.20	3.86	4.02	4.11	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 05
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Evans,Susan A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	87/198	4.55	4.40	4.16	4.41	4.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	90/208	4.55	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	76/194	4.79	4.60	4.56	4.57	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	30/194	4.64	4.53	4.37	4.43	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/176	4.53	4.56	4.23	4.18	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	5
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 06
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Evans,Susan A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	636/1528	4.44	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	501/1527	4.57	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	458/1333	4.57	4.32	4.34	4.40	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	682/1495	4.49	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	851/1439	3.67	3.70	4.11	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	454/1425	4.38	4.17	4.12	4.11	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	708/1508	4.57	4.35	4.18	4.19	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	724/1526	4.89	4.71	4.66	4.64	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	845/1490	4.22	3.99	4.11	4.11	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	385/1428	4.72	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	1162/1436	4.80	4.69	4.74	4.76	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	230/1427	4.67	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	726/1425	4.51	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	366/1291	4.48	4.08	4.05	4.14	4.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	3	10	4.27	639/1271	4.56	3.96	4.16	4.21	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	3	0	4	4	4	3.40	1184/1276	4.30	4.02	4.33	4.37	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	2	2	6	4	3.67	1122/1273	4.27	4.10	4.38	4.43	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	375/922	4.20	3.86	4.02	4.11	4.22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 06
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Evans,Susan A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	33/198	4.55	4.40	4.16	4.41	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	31/208	4.55	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.78
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	35/194	4.79	4.60	4.56	4.57	4.89
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	34/194	4.64	4.53	4.37	4.43	4.78
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	3	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	59/176	4.53	4.56	4.23	4.18	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1 A 10	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0 B 4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0 C 1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 1						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 07
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Evans,Susan A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	919/1528	4.44	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	424/1527	4.57	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	294/1333	4.57	4.32	4.34	4.40	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	369/1495	4.49	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1439	3.67	3.70	4.11	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1032/1425	4.38	4.17	4.12	4.11	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	448/1508	4.57	4.35	4.18	4.19	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	919/1526	4.89	4.71	4.66	4.64	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	0	3.86	1082/1490	4.22	3.99	4.11	4.11	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	854/1428	4.72	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	839/1436	4.80	4.69	4.74	4.76	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	625/1427	4.67	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1076/1425	4.51	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	614/1291	4.48	4.08	4.05	4.14	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	507/1271	4.56	3.96	4.16	4.21	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1053/1276	4.30	4.02	4.33	4.37	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	1083/1273	4.27	4.10	4.38	4.43	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	467/922	4.20	3.86	4.02	4.11	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 07
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Evans,Susan A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	98/198	4.55	4.40	4.16	4.41	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	51/208	4.55	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	49/194	4.79	4.60	4.56	4.57	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/194	4.64	4.53	4.37	4.43	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	87/176	4.53	4.56	4.23	4.18	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.78	4.51	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 08
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Evans,Susan A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	962/1528	4.44	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	489/1527	4.57	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	676/1333	4.57	4.32	4.34	4.40	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	746/1495	4.49	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	7	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1171/1439	3.67	3.70	4.11	4.12	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	7	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	489/1425	4.38	4.17	4.12	4.11	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	558/1508	4.57	4.35	4.18	4.19	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	654/1526	4.89	4.71	4.66	4.64	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	8	2	4.09	851/1490	4.22	3.99	4.11	4.11	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	319/1428	4.72	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	464/1436	4.80	4.69	4.74	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	378/1427	4.67	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	2	8	4.23	944/1425	4.51	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	614/1291	4.48	4.08	4.05	4.14	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	446/1271	4.56	3.96	4.16	4.21	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	774/1276	4.30	4.02	4.33	4.37	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	739/1273	4.27	4.10	4.38	4.43	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	4	9	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/922	4.20	3.86	4.02	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 08
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Evans,Susan A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	38/198	4.55	4.40	4.16	4.41	4.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	100/208	4.55	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.36
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	2	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	68/194	4.79	4.60	4.56	4.57	4.78
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	82/194	4.64	4.53	4.37	4.43	4.55
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	3	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	16/176	4.53	4.56	4.23	4.18	4.88
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	****	4.78	4.51	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	4.63	4.31	3.91	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.63	4.27	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	****	4.25	4.27	4.15	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	3.88	3.94	3.95	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/42	****	2.45	4.00	3.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/41	****	2.52	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	3.50	4.20	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/43	****	2.91	4.43	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/31	****	3.71	4.53	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	3.67	4.43	3.75	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 08
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Evans,Susan A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	3.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	3.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 09
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Ordonez,Patrici

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	99
Questionnaires:	49

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	4	10	32	4.50	636/1528	4.44	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	39	4.78	237/1527	4.57	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	8	38	4.73	328/1333	4.57	4.32	4.34	4.40	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	6	7	29	4.49	528/1495	4.49	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.49
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	4	3	5	6	16	3.79	1028/1439	3.67	3.70	4.11	4.12	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	2	2	5	6	22	4.19	746/1425	4.38	4.17	4.12	4.11	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	7	38	4.67	284/1508	4.57	4.35	4.18	4.19	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	46	4.96	283/1526	4.89	4.71	4.66	4.64	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	3	21	18	4.36	555/1490	4.22	3.99	4.11	4.11	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	15	33	4.65	653/1428	4.72	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	5	41	4.78	886/1436	4.80	4.69	4.74	4.76	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	14	32	4.63	477/1427	4.67	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	9	33	4.54	622/1425	4.51	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	4	12	28	4.41	415/1291	4.48	4.08	4.05	4.14	4.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	2	7	10	20	4.07	759/1271	4.56	3.96	4.16	4.21	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	0	4	2	32	4.55	548/1276	4.30	4.02	4.33	4.37	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	3	7	29	4.58	584/1273	4.27	4.10	4.38	4.43	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	8	9	1	1	2	8	20	4.41	272/922	4.20	3.86	4.02	4.11	4.41

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 201 09	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 99
Title: Computer Science I		Questionnaires: 49
Instructor: Ordonez,Patrici		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	15	0.00-0.99 4	A 37 Required for Majors 44	Graduate 0	Major 21
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 4	C 2 General 0	Under-grad 49	Non-major 28
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 3	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 14	F 0 Electives 2 P 0 I 0 Other 2 ? 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 10
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Ordonez,Patrici

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	567/1528	4.44	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	424/1527	4.57	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	521/1333	4.57	4.32	4.34	4.40	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	407/1495	4.49	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	1279/1439	3.67	3.70	4.11	4.12	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	583/1425	4.38	4.17	4.12	4.11	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	0	13	4.63	329/1508	4.57	4.35	4.18	4.19	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	396/1526	4.89	4.71	4.66	4.64	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	0	8	4	4.15	789/1490	4.22	3.99	4.11	4.11	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	155/1428	4.72	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1436	4.80	4.69	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	683/1427	4.67	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	306/1425	4.51	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	464/1291	4.48	4.08	4.05	4.14	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	246/1271	4.56	3.96	4.16	4.21	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	4	3	9	4.31	766/1276	4.30	4.02	4.33	4.37	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	5	3	7	4.00	947/1273	4.27	4.10	4.38	4.43	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	360/922	4.20	3.86	4.02	4.11	4.25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 201 10	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 20
Title: Computer Science I		Questionnaires: 17
Instructor: Ordonez,Patrici		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	4.55	4.40	4.16	4.41	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 9	Graduate	0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	1
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 11
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Ordonez,Patrici

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	765/1528	4.44	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1113/1527	4.57	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	294/1333	4.57	4.32	4.34	4.40	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	903/1495	4.49	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1429/1439	3.67	3.70	4.11	4.12	2.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1285/1425	4.38	4.17	4.12	4.11	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	352/1508	4.57	4.35	4.18	4.19	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1526	4.89	4.71	4.66	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	911/1490	4.22	3.99	4.11	4.11	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1202/1428	4.72	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1183/1436	4.80	4.69	4.74	4.76	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	916/1427	4.67	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	1076/1425	4.51	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	539/1291	4.48	4.08	4.05	4.14	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	246/1271	4.56	3.96	4.16	4.21	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1062/1276	4.30	4.02	4.33	4.37	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1083/1273	4.27	4.10	4.38	4.43	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	857/922	4.20	3.86	4.02	4.11	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 11
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Ordonez,Patrici

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	6

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 12
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Ordonez,Patrici

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	1140/1528	4.44	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	368/1527	4.57	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	489/1333	4.57	4.32	4.34	4.40	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	695/1495	4.49	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	744/1439	3.67	3.70	4.11	4.12	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	121/1425	4.38	4.17	4.12	4.11	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	104/1508	4.57	4.35	4.18	4.19	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1526	4.89	4.71	4.66	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1173/1490	4.22	3.99	4.11	4.11	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1428	4.72	4.43	4.49	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1436	4.80	4.69	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1427	4.67	4.24	4.32	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	611/1425	4.51	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	130/1291	4.48	4.08	4.05	4.14	4.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	507/1271	4.56	3.96	4.16	4.21	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	654/1276	4.30	4.02	4.33	4.37	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	507/1273	4.27	4.10	4.38	4.43	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	719/922	4.20	3.86	4.02	4.11	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 12
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Ordonez,Patrici

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/198	4.55	4.40	4.16	4.41	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/208	4.55	4.28	4.27	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	4.79	4.60	4.56	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	4.64	4.53	4.37	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/176	4.53	4.56	4.23	4.18	****

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 13
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Ordonez,Patrici

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	6
Questionnaires:	3

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	434/1528	4.44	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1527	4.57	4.27	4.28	4.32	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1333	4.57	4.32	4.34	4.40	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	496/1495	4.49	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1439	3.67	3.70	4.11	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1425	4.38	4.17	4.12	4.11	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1508	4.57	4.35	4.18	4.19	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1526	4.89	4.71	4.66	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	4.22	3.99	4.11	4.11	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1428	4.72	4.43	4.49	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1436	4.80	4.69	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1427	4.67	4.24	4.32	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1425	4.51	4.20	4.34	4.37	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1291	4.48	4.08	4.05	4.14	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1271	4.56	3.96	4.16	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1276	4.30	4.02	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1273	4.27	4.10	4.38	4.43	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/922	4.20	3.86	4.02	4.11	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 13
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Ordonez,Patrici

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	6
Questionnaires:	3

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/198	4.55	4.40	4.16	4.41	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/208	4.55	4.28	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/194	4.79	4.60	4.56	4.57	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/194	4.64	4.53	4.37	4.43	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/176	4.53	4.56	4.23	4.18	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 14
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Ordonez,Patrici

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	434/1528	4.44	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	818/1527	4.57	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	521/1333	4.57	4.32	4.34	4.40	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	341/1495	4.49	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1171/1439	3.67	3.70	4.11	4.12	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	703/1425	4.38	4.17	4.12	4.11	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	284/1508	4.57	4.35	4.18	4.19	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1526	4.89	4.71	4.66	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	800/1490	4.22	3.99	4.11	4.11	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	385/1428	4.72	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	806/1436	4.80	4.69	4.74	4.76	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	625/1427	4.67	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	894/1425	4.51	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	480/1291	4.48	4.08	4.05	4.14	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	296/1271	4.56	3.96	4.16	4.21	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	565/1276	4.30	4.02	4.33	4.37	4.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	839/1273	4.27	4.10	4.38	4.43	4.23
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	430/922	4.20	3.86	4.02	4.11	4.13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 14
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Ordonez,Patrici

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/198	4.55	4.40	4.16	4.41	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/208	4.55	4.28	4.27	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/194	4.79	4.60	4.56	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	4.64	4.53	4.37	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/176	4.53	4.56	4.23	4.18	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 15
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Ordonez,Patrici

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	3	1	3	7	4.00	1140/1528	4.44	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	396/1527	4.57	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	0	6	6	4.31	797/1333	4.57	4.32	4.34	4.40	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	942/1495	4.49	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	0	4	2	2	3.44	1248/1439	3.67	3.70	4.11	4.12	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	396/1425	4.38	4.17	4.12	4.11	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	1050/1508	4.57	4.35	4.18	4.19	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	797/1526	4.89	4.71	4.66	4.64	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	911/1490	4.22	3.99	4.11	4.11	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	898/1428	4.72	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	1213/1436	4.80	4.69	4.74	4.76	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	792/1427	4.67	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	930/1425	4.51	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	1	4	6	4.00	728/1291	4.48	4.08	4.05	4.14	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	867/1271	4.56	3.96	4.16	4.21	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	926/1276	4.30	4.02	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	4	2	3	3.60	1146/1273	4.27	4.10	4.38	4.43	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	467/922	4.20	3.86	4.02	4.11	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 15
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Ordonez,Patrici

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/198	4.55	4.40	4.16	4.41	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/208	4.55	4.28	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	4.79	4.60	4.56	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/194	4.64	4.53	4.37	4.43	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/176	4.53	4.56	4.23	4.18	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 16
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Evans,Susan A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	307/1528	4.44	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	771/1527	4.57	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	294/1333	4.57	4.32	4.34	4.40	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	267/1495	4.49	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	851/1439	3.67	3.70	4.11	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	301/1425	4.38	4.17	4.12	4.11	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	946/1508	4.57	4.35	4.18	4.19	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1526	4.89	4.71	4.66	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	911/1490	4.22	3.99	4.11	4.11	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	553/1428	4.72	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	677/1436	4.80	4.69	4.74	4.76	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	184/1427	4.67	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	785/1425	4.51	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	518/1291	4.48	4.08	4.05	4.14	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	528/1271	4.56	3.96	4.16	4.21	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	926/1276	4.30	4.02	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	810/1273	4.27	4.10	4.38	4.43	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	467/922	4.20	3.86	4.02	4.11	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 16
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Evans,Susan A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	138/198	4.55	4.40	4.16	4.41	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	68/208	4.55	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	131/194	4.79	4.60	4.56	4.57	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	156/194	4.64	4.53	4.37	4.43	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	4.78	4.51	4.17	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	4.25	4.27	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/42	****	2.45	4.00	3.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	2.52	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	3.50	4.20	4.32	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	2.91	4.43	3.95	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	3.67	4.43	3.75	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 201 16	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 16
Title: Computer Science I		Questionnaires: 8
Instructor: Evans,Susan A		

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

Self Paced														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives		0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	0									
				I	0	Other		0						
				?	0									

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 03
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Bergeron,Ryan J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	0	2	12	4.44	726/1528	4.46	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	3	9	4.19	970/1527	4.40	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	4	6	3.81	1139/1333	4.30	4.32	4.34	4.40	3.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	4	5	4	3.79	1226/1495	4.26	4.26	4.25	4.28	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	11	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/1439	3.93	3.70	4.11	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	826/1425	4.46	4.17	4.12	4.11	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	626/1508	4.36	4.35	4.18	4.19	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	0	15	4.75	811/1526	4.58	4.71	4.66	4.64	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	2	8	1	3.67	1203/1490	4.00	3.99	4.11	4.11	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	2	3	9	4.13	1163/1428	4.29	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	1	1	11	4.50	1183/1436	4.59	4.69	4.74	4.76	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	2	2	9	4.13	1016/1427	4.19	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	0	3	10	4.27	922/1425	4.14	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	480/1291	4.20	4.08	4.05	4.14	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	421/1271	4.35	3.96	4.16	4.21	4.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	711/1276	4.15	4.02	4.33	4.37	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	0	5	1	4	3.42	1186/1273	4.06	4.10	4.38	4.43	3.42
4. Were special techniques successful	5	9	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/922	****	3.86	4.02	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 03
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Bergeron,Ryan J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	4.09	4.40	4.16	4.41	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/208	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	4.61	4.60	4.56	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	4.51	4.53	4.37	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	4.53	4.56	4.23	4.18	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1 A 7	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0 B 5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2 C 2	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 04
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Bergeron,Ryan J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	9	7	4.17	1015/1528	4.46	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	7	7	4.06	1078/1527	4.40	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	4	8	4.06	977/1333	4.30	4.32	4.34	4.40	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	5	6	3	3.63	1321/1495	4.26	4.26	4.25	4.28	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1020/1439	3.93	3.70	4.11	4.12	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	613/1425	4.46	4.17	4.12	4.11	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	2	4	9	4.18	883/1508	4.36	4.35	4.18	4.19	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1526	4.58	4.71	4.66	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	7	3	3.93	1019/1490	4.00	3.99	4.11	4.11	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	8	6	4.12	1169/1428	4.29	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	1127/1436	4.59	4.69	4.74	4.76	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	3	7	6	4.00	1080/1427	4.19	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	9	4	3.82	1198/1425	4.14	4.20	4.34	4.37	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	604/1291	4.20	4.08	4.05	4.14	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	717/1271	4.35	3.96	4.16	4.21	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	2	2	5	5	3.93	980/1276	4.15	4.02	4.33	4.37	3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	3	2	5	3	3.62	1142/1273	4.06	4.10	4.38	4.43	3.62
4. Were special techniques successful	5	9	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/922	****	3.86	4.02	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 04
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Bergeron,Ryan J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	87/198	4.09	4.40	4.16	4.41	4.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	90/208	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/194	4.61	4.60	4.56	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	67/194	4.51	4.53	4.37	4.43	4.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/176	4.53	4.56	4.23	4.18	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/42	****	2.45	4.00	3.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/41	****	2.52	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	3.50	4.20	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	2.91	4.43	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	3.71	4.53	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	3.67	4.43	3.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	3.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	3.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 04	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment:	19
Title:	Computer Science II		Questionnaires:	18
Instructor:	Bergeron,Ryan J			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3		C	3	General		1	Under-grad	18	Non-major		8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0		D	0								
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1		F	0	Electives		0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant				
					P	0								
					I	0	Other		0					
					?	1								

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 06
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Bergeron,Ryan J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	434/1528	4.46	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	290/1527	4.40	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	393/1333	4.30	4.32	4.34	4.40	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1495	4.26	4.26	4.25	4.28	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1439	3.93	3.70	4.11	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	96/1425	4.46	4.17	4.12	4.11	4.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	239/1508	4.36	4.35	4.18	4.19	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1526	4.58	4.71	4.66	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	10	3	4.00	911/1490	4.00	3.99	4.11	4.11	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	253/1428	4.29	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	580/1436	4.59	4.69	4.74	4.76	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	792/1427	4.19	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	542/1425	4.14	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	464/1291	4.20	4.08	4.05	4.14	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	319/1271	4.35	3.96	4.16	4.21	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	439/1276	4.15	4.02	4.33	4.37	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	0	2	4	4	3.67	1122/1273	4.06	4.10	4.38	4.43	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	10	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/922	****	3.86	4.02	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 06
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Bergeron,Ryan J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	18

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 08
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Mitchell,Susan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	590/1528	4.46	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	656/1527	4.40	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	741/1333	4.30	4.32	4.34	4.40	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	695/1495	4.26	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1439	3.93	3.70	4.11	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	301/1425	4.46	4.17	4.12	4.11	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	517/1508	4.36	4.35	4.18	4.19	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	1	4.09	1395/1526	4.58	4.71	4.66	4.64	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	6	0	3.67	1203/1490	4.00	3.99	4.11	4.11	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1202/1428	4.29	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1155/1436	4.59	4.69	4.74	4.76	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1080/1427	4.19	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	1264/1425	4.14	4.20	4.34	4.37	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	4	2	3	3.60	1024/1291	4.20	4.08	4.05	4.14	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	780/1271	4.35	3.96	4.16	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	926/1276	4.15	4.02	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	947/1273	4.06	4.10	4.38	4.43	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	167/198	4.09	4.40	4.16	4.41	3.57

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 08
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Mitchell,Susan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	196/208	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.30	3.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	2	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	167/194	4.61	4.60	4.56	4.57	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	147/194	4.51	4.53	4.37	4.43	4.14
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/176	4.53	4.56	4.23	4.18	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 09
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Mitchell,Susan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	739/1528	4.46	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1252/1527	4.40	4.27	4.28	4.32	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1116/1333	4.30	4.32	4.34	4.40	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1047/1495	4.26	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	573/1439	3.93	3.70	4.11	4.12	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	396/1425	4.46	4.17	4.12	4.11	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	921/1508	4.36	4.35	4.18	4.19	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	1368/1526	4.58	4.71	4.66	4.64	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1203/1490	4.00	3.99	4.11	4.11	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	1372/1428	4.29	4.43	4.49	4.48	3.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1311/1436	4.59	4.69	4.74	4.76	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	1323/1427	4.19	4.24	4.32	4.33	3.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	1	2	3.29	1345/1425	4.14	4.20	4.34	4.37	3.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	728/1291	4.20	4.08	4.05	4.14	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	598/1271	4.35	3.96	4.16	4.21	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1193/1276	4.15	4.02	4.33	4.37	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	947/1273	4.06	4.10	4.38	4.43	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/922	****	3.86	4.02	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 09
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Mitchell,Susan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	98/198	4.09	4.40	4.16	4.41	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	139/208	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	58/194	4.61	4.60	4.56	4.57	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	53/194	4.51	4.53	4.37	4.43	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	59/176	4.53	4.56	4.23	4.18	4.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/42	****	2.45	4.00	3.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/41	****	2.52	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	3.50	4.20	4.32	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	2.91	4.43	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	3.71	4.53	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	3.67	4.43	3.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	3.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	3.77	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 09	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment:	19
Title:	Computer Science II		Questionnaires:	7
Instructor:	Mitchell,Susan			

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

84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1									
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives			0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant				
				P	0									
				I	0	Other			0					
				?	1									

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 12
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Mitchell,Susan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	521/1528	4.46	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	312/1527	4.40	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	704/1333	4.30	4.32	4.34	4.40	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	432/1495	4.26	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1126/1439	3.93	3.70	4.11	4.12	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	891/1425	4.46	4.17	4.12	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	0	7	4.40	586/1508	4.36	4.35	4.18	4.19	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	1393/1526	4.58	4.71	4.66	4.64	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	778/1490	4.00	3.99	4.11	4.11	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	637/1428	4.29	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1290/1436	4.59	4.69	4.74	4.76	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	713/1427	4.19	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	755/1425	4.14	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	327/1291	4.20	4.08	4.05	4.14	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	446/1271	4.35	3.96	4.16	4.21	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1062/1276	4.15	4.02	4.33	4.37	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	408/1273	4.06	4.10	4.38	4.43	4.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	40/198	4.09	4.40	4.16	4.41	4.63

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 12
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Mitchell,Susan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	59/208	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.63
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	76/194	4.61	4.60	4.56	4.57	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	22/194	4.51	4.53	4.37	4.43	4.88
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	2	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	59/176	4.53	4.56	4.23	4.18	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 13
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Park,John

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	785/1528	4.46	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	170/1527	4.40	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	117/1333	4.30	4.32	4.34	4.40	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	560/1495	4.26	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1439	3.93	3.70	4.11	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	121/1425	4.46	4.17	4.12	4.11	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	808/1508	4.36	4.35	4.18	4.19	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1526	4.58	4.71	4.66	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	82/1490	4.00	3.99	4.11	4.11	4.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	459/1428	4.29	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1436	4.59	4.69	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	110/1427	4.19	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	130/1425	4.14	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	425/1291	4.20	4.08	4.05	4.14	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	644/1271	4.35	3.96	4.16	4.21	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1276	4.15	4.02	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1273	4.06	4.10	4.38	4.43	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	4	0	3	3	3.50	170/198	4.09	4.40	4.16	4.41	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 13
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Park,John

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	115/208	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.30
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	2	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	38/194	4.61	4.60	4.56	4.57	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	3	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	135/194	4.51	4.53	4.37	4.43	4.29
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	5	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	42/176	4.53	4.56	4.23	4.18	4.60
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.78	4.51	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 1
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Artola,Paul C

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	726/1528	4.16	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	688/1527	4.00	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	731/1333	4.08	4.32	4.34	4.40	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	746/1495	3.98	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1064/1439	3.91	3.70	4.11	4.12	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	646/1425	3.92	4.17	4.12	4.11	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	261/1508	4.17	4.35	4.18	4.19	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	900/1526	4.44	4.71	4.66	4.64	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	800/1490	3.66	3.99	4.11	4.11	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	478/1428	4.23	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	1090/1436	4.44	4.69	4.74	4.76	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	506/1427	3.94	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	6	9	4.44	770/1425	3.95	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	2	0	3	1	1	2.86	1231/1291	3.39	4.08	4.05	4.14	2.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	1168/1271	3.23	3.96	4.16	4.21	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1017/1276	3.94	4.02	4.33	4.37	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	706/1273	4.15	4.10	4.38	4.43	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	467/922	4.00	3.86	4.02	4.11	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 1
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Artola,Paul C

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	16

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	9
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 2
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Chang,Richard

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	19	4.61	521/1528	4.16	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	19	4.57	489/1527	4.00	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	21	4.68	383/1333	4.08	4.32	4.34	4.40	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	419/1495	3.98	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	3	9	6	4.00	851/1439	3.91	3.70	4.11	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	1	3	7	9	4.20	726/1425	3.92	4.17	4.12	4.11	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	9	16	4.48	475/1508	4.17	4.35	4.18	4.19	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	227/1526	4.44	4.71	4.66	4.64	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	1	4	7	9	4.14	800/1490	3.66	3.99	4.11	4.11	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	20	4.68	620/1428	4.23	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	548/1436	4.44	4.69	4.74	4.76	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	6	4	18	4.43	742/1427	3.94	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	19	4.56	611/1425	3.95	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	2	2	8	10	4.18	594/1291	3.39	4.08	4.05	4.14	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	887/1271	3.23	3.96	4.16	4.21	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	719/1276	3.94	4.02	4.33	4.37	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	543/1273	4.15	4.10	4.38	4.43	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	20	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/922	4.00	3.86	4.02	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 2
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Chang,Richard

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	2.45	4.00	3.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	2.52	4.06	3.81	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/43	****	2.91	4.43	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/31	****	3.71	4.53	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	3.67	4.43	3.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	3.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	3.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 3
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Nirenburg,Serge

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	44
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	6	2	3.47	1418/1528	4.16	4.27	4.31	4.34	3.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	5	1	3.27	1448/1527	4.00	4.27	4.28	4.32	3.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	3	6	1	3.14	1298/1333	4.08	4.32	4.34	4.40	3.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	0	4	6	1	3.31	1417/1495	3.98	4.26	4.25	4.28	3.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	3	3	5	0	3.18	1333/1439	3.91	3.70	4.11	4.12	3.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	1317/1425	3.92	4.17	4.12	4.11	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	3	2	1	5	3.00	1422/1508	4.17	4.35	4.18	4.19	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	1163/1526	4.44	4.71	4.66	4.64	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	0	6	5	0	3.08	1399/1490	3.66	3.99	4.11	4.11	3.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	2	5	6	3.87	1277/1428	4.23	4.43	4.49	4.48	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	1	2	10	4.33	1290/1436	4.44	4.69	4.74	4.76	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	4	9	0	3.33	1339/1427	3.94	4.24	4.32	4.33	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	7	2	3.47	1313/1425	3.95	4.20	4.34	4.37	3.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	1	1	7	1	3.33	1116/1291	3.39	4.08	4.05	4.14	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1271	3.23	3.96	4.16	4.21	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1276	3.94	4.02	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1273	4.15	4.10	4.38	4.43	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/922	4.00	3.86	4.02	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 3
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Nirenburg, Serge

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	44
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/208	****	4.28	4.27	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/42	****	2.45	4.00	3.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/41	****	2.52	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	3.50	4.20	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	2.91	4.43	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	3.71	4.53	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	3.67	4.43	3.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	3.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	3.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 3	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment:	44									
Title:	Discrete Structures		Questionnaires:	15									
Instructor:	Nirenburg,Serge												
		Frequencies	Instructor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect					
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced													
	I	0	Other					0					
	?	2											

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 4
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Stephens,Arthur

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	45
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	1036/1528	4.16	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	6	3	3.71	1332/1527	4.00	4.27	4.28	4.32	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	3	8	4.14	916/1333	4.08	4.32	4.34	4.40	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	1281/1495	3.98	4.26	4.25	4.28	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	205/1439	3.91	3.70	4.11	4.12	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	891/1425	3.92	4.17	4.12	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	448/1508	4.17	4.35	4.18	4.19	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	3	9	1	3.71	1502/1526	4.44	4.71	4.66	4.64	3.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	2	4	5	0	3.27	1356/1490	3.66	3.99	4.11	4.11	3.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	3	2	1	6	3.62	1343/1428	4.23	4.43	4.49	4.48	3.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	1	1	2	8	3.93	1394/1436	4.44	4.69	4.74	4.76	3.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	1	6	2	3.38	1332/1427	3.94	4.24	4.32	4.33	3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	8	1	3.36	1335/1425	3.95	4.20	4.34	4.37	3.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	0	5	2	2	3.18	1165/1291	3.39	4.08	4.05	4.14	3.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	2	1	0	1	2.60	1240/1271	3.23	3.96	4.16	4.21	2.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1128/1276	3.94	4.02	4.33	4.37	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1188/1273	4.15	4.10	4.38	4.43	3.40
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/208	****	4.28	4.27	4.30	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 4
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Stephens,Arthur

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	45
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	4.78	4.51	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/74	****	4.63	4.31	3.91	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/42	****	2.45	4.00	3.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/41	****	2.52	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	3.50	4.20	4.32	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/43	****	2.91	4.43	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	3.71	4.53	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	3.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	3.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1 A 6	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2 C 1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	1				

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 4		Term - Fall 2010			Enrollment:	45							
Title:	Discrete Structures					Questionnaires:	15							
Instructor:	Stephens,Arthur													
			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														

? 2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 304 1
Title:	Social/Ethical Iss In IT
Instructor:	Wilson,Richard

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	78
Questionnaires:	41

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	4	3	10	11	12	3.60	1377/1528	3.60	4.27	4.31	4.34	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	0	10	9	17	3.95	1180/1527	3.95	4.27	4.28	4.27	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	7	12	17	4.08	967/1333	4.08	4.32	4.34	4.34	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	1	6	13	17	4.24	855/1495	4.24	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	3	4	10	7	9	3.45	1243/1439	3.45	3.70	4.11	4.13	3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	11	10	17	4.10	826/1425	4.10	4.17	4.12	4.17	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	6	10	21	4.20	845/1508	4.20	4.35	4.18	4.17	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	2	36	4.95	340/1526	4.95	4.71	4.66	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	3	10	15	6	3.56	1254/1490	3.56	3.99	4.11	4.11	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	6	6	12	13	3.72	1325/1428	3.72	4.43	4.49	4.48	3.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	3	12	22	4.45	1229/1436	4.45	4.69	4.74	4.74	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	3	5	6	12	12	3.66	1263/1427	3.66	4.24	4.32	4.31	3.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	4	7	13	9	3.45	1318/1425	3.45	4.20	4.34	4.34	3.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	2	3	9	10	7	3.55	1046/1291	3.55	4.08	4.05	4.09	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	****/1271	****	3.96	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	33	0	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	****/1276	****	4.02	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	****/1273	****	4.10	4.38	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	33	4	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/922	****	3.86	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 304 1
Title:	Social/Ethical Iss In IT
Instructor:	Wilson,Richard

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	78
Questionnaires:	41

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2 A 32	Required for Majors	37 Graduate 0 Major 33
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0 B 5		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2 C 0	General	0 Under-grad 41 Non-major 8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9 F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 313 2
Title:	Comp Organ & Assemb Lang
Instructor:	Frey,Dennis L

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	334/1528	4.74	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	340/1527	4.68	4.27	4.28	4.27	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	542/1333	4.53	4.32	4.34	4.34	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	350/1495	4.63	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	929/1439	3.94	3.70	4.11	4.13	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	466/1425	4.44	4.17	4.12	4.17	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	172/1508	4.78	4.35	4.18	4.17	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.71	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	555/1490	4.36	3.99	4.11	4.11	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	253/1428	4.88	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	310/1436	4.94	4.69	4.74	4.74	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	529/1427	4.59	4.24	4.32	4.31	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	185/1425	4.88	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	448/1291	4.38	4.08	4.05	4.09	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1271	****	3.96	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1276	****	4.02	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1273	****	4.10	4.38	4.40	****

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 313 2	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment:	39
Title:	Comp Organ & Assemb Lang		Questionnaires:	19
Instructor:	Frey,Dennis L			

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

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 331 1
Title:	Prin Of Prog Languages
Instructor:	Evans,Susan A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	38
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	4	6	5	3.67	1350/1528	3.78	4.27	4.31	4.34	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	6	5	3.61	1369/1527	3.56	4.27	4.28	4.27	3.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	4	7	2	3.22	1291/1333	3.36	4.32	4.34	4.34	3.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	2	3	5	3	3.69	1286/1495	3.77	4.26	4.25	4.28	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	2	6	4	0	2.73	1409/1439	2.81	3.70	4.11	4.13	2.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	3	2	4	3	3.38	1268/1425	3.50	4.17	4.12	4.17	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	7	5	5	3.72	1246/1508	3.81	4.35	4.18	4.17	3.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	1044/1526	4.34	4.71	4.66	4.68	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	3	6	4	2	3.06	1401/1490	3.22	3.99	4.11	4.11	3.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	3	6	5	3.65	1338/1428	3.80	4.43	4.49	4.48	3.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	4	4	7	3.88	1399/1436	4.32	4.69	4.74	4.74	3.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	3	2	6	4	3.41	1326/1427	3.58	4.24	4.32	4.31	3.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	5	2	5	3.29	1344/1425	3.72	4.20	4.34	4.34	3.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	2	1	5	6	3.87	862/1291	3.63	4.08	4.05	4.09	3.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1271	2.80	3.96	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1276	3.20	4.02	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1273	3.40	4.10	4.38	4.40	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	4.40	4.16	4.26	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 331 1
Title:	Prin Of Prog Languages
Instructor:	Evans,Susan A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	38
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	4.28	4.27	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.53	4.37	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.78	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	4.63	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.63	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.25	4.27	3.68	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	2.45	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	2.52	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	3.50	4.20	3.38	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	****	2.91	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	3.71	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	3.67	4.43	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27 1	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0	Major 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 331 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 38
Title: Prin Of Prog Languages		Questionnaires: 18
Instructor: Evans,Susan A		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10									
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General		1	Under-grad	18	Non-major			3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	0									
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives		0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	0									
				I	0	Other		0						
				?	0									

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 331 2
Title:	Prin Of Prog Languages
Instructor:	Finin,Timothy W

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	3	7	7	3.90	1233/1528	3.78	4.27	4.31	4.34	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	7	8	3	3.50	1408/1527	3.56	4.27	4.28	4.27	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	5	7	4	3.50	1243/1333	3.36	4.32	4.34	4.34	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	6	6	3.85	1186/1495	3.77	4.26	4.25	4.28	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	3	7	1	3	2.88	1399/1439	2.81	3.70	4.11	4.13	2.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	5	4	3	3.62	1162/1425	3.50	4.17	4.12	4.17	3.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	7	8	5	3.90	1136/1508	3.81	4.35	4.18	4.17	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	3	4.15	1362/1526	4.34	4.71	4.66	4.68	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	2	8	4	2	3.38	1323/1490	3.22	3.99	4.11	4.11	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	7	7	6	3.95	1232/1428	3.80	4.43	4.49	4.48	3.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	917/1436	4.32	4.69	4.74	4.74	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	7	8	4	3.75	1226/1427	3.58	4.24	4.32	4.31	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	10	7	4.15	1005/1425	3.72	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	2	7	5	3	3.39	1099/1291	3.63	4.08	4.05	4.09	3.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	1227/1271	2.80	3.96	4.16	4.19	2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1212/1276	3.20	4.02	4.33	4.37	3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1188/1273	3.40	4.10	4.38	4.40	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/922	****	3.86	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 331 2
Title:	Prin Of Prog Languages
Instructor:	Finin,Timothy W

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/198	****	4.40	4.16	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/208	****	4.28	4.27	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.53	4.37	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/176	****	4.56	4.23	4.33	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	****	2.91	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	3.71	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	3.67	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 3	Required for Majors	17
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0 B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3 C 4	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2 D 1		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4 F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 2		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 341 1
Title:	Data Structures
Instructor:	Bergeron,Ryan J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	434/1528	4.74	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	453/1527	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.27	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	458/1333	4.70	4.32	4.34	4.34	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	496/1495	4.45	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	4	4	3	3.54	1197/1439	3.62	3.70	4.11	4.13	3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	714/1425	4.24	4.17	4.12	4.17	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	352/1508	4.59	4.35	4.18	4.17	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.71	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	518/1490	4.60	3.99	4.11	4.11	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	1021/1428	4.71	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	645/1436	4.87	4.69	4.74	4.74	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	959/1427	4.59	4.24	4.32	4.31	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	633/1425	4.70	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	574/1291	4.44	4.08	4.05	4.09	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 341 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 26
Title: Data Structures		Questionnaires: 15
Instructor: Bergeron,Ryan J		

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

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant							
				P	0										
				I	0	Other	0								
				?	0										

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 341 2
Title:	Data Structures
Instructor:	Frey,Dennis L

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	206/1528	4.74	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	20	4.77	248/1527	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.27	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	237/1333	4.70	4.32	4.34	4.34	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	419/1495	4.45	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	3	3	5	5	3.59	1165/1439	3.62	3.70	4.11	4.13	3.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	726/1425	4.24	4.17	4.12	4.17	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	295/1508	4.59	4.35	4.18	4.17	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.71	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	82/1490	4.60	3.99	4.11	4.11	4.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	253/1428	4.71	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	207/1436	4.87	4.69	4.74	4.74	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	156/1427	4.59	4.24	4.32	4.31	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	65/1425	4.70	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	181/1291	4.44	4.08	4.05	4.09	4.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/1271	****	3.96	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1276	****	4.02	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1273	****	4.10	4.38	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	21	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/922	****	3.86	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 341 2
Title:	Data Structures
Instructor:	Frey,Dennis L

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	4.40	4.16	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	4.28	4.27	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.53	4.37	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.56	4.23	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.78	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	4.63	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.63	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.25	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.88	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	2.45	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	2.52	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	3.50	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	2.91	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	3.71	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	3.67	4.43	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 341 2
Title:	Data Structures
Instructor:	Frey,Dennis L

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	25
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 341 3
Title:	Data Structures
Instructor:	Frey,Dennis L

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	43
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	20	4.72	348/1528	4.74	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	453/1527	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.27	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	20	4.68	372/1333	4.70	4.32	4.34	4.34	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	2	0	6	13	4.27	820/1495	4.45	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	7	3	0	2	3	7	3.73	1081/1439	3.62	3.70	4.11	4.13	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	10	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	613/1425	4.24	4.17	4.12	4.17	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	8	14	4.52	428/1508	4.59	4.35	4.18	4.17	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.71	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	3	15	4.50	344/1490	4.60	3.99	4.11	4.11	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	199/1428	4.71	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	886/1436	4.87	4.69	4.74	4.74	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	4	18	4.70	378/1427	4.59	4.24	4.32	4.31	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	3	18	4.61	556/1425	4.70	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	0	0	7	11	4.42	405/1291	4.44	4.08	4.05	4.09	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1271	****	3.96	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1276	****	4.02	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1273	****	4.10	4.38	4.40	****

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 341 3	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 43
Title: Data Structures		Questionnaires: 25
Instructor: Frey,Dennis L		

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

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	15
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 341H 1
Title:	Data Structures - Honors
Instructor:	Bergeron,Ryan J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	279/1528	4.78	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	514/1527	4.56	4.27	4.28	4.27	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	648/1333	4.44	4.32	4.34	4.34	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	432/1495	4.56	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1064/1439	3.75	3.70	4.11	4.13	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	396/1425	4.50	4.17	4.12	4.17	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	400/1508	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.17	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1019/1526	4.56	4.71	4.66	4.68	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	289/1490	4.57	3.99	4.11	4.11	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	794/1428	4.56	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	886/1436	4.78	4.69	4.74	4.74	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	713/1427	4.44	4.24	4.32	4.31	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	320/1425	4.78	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	664/1291	4.11	4.08	4.05	4.09	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1271	****	3.96	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1276	****	4.02	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1273	****	4.10	4.38	4.40	****

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 341H 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 10
Title: Data Structures - Honors		Questionnaires: 9
Instructor: Bergeron,Ryan J		

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 345 2
Title:	Software Design/Develop
Instructor:	Miner,Donald

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	33
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	10	12	4.38	795/1528	4.38	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	13	4.42	720/1527	4.42	4.27	4.28	4.27	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	21	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1333	****	4.32	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	247/1495	4.74	4.26	4.25	4.28	4.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	7	5	8	3.70	1112/1439	3.70	3.70	4.11	4.13	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	5	13	4.13	806/1425	4.13	4.17	4.12	4.17	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	4	3	6	9	3.91	1136/1508	3.91	4.35	4.18	4.17	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	23	0	4.00	1421/1526	4.00	4.71	4.66	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	328/1490	4.52	3.99	4.11	4.11	4.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	8	11	4.21	1114/1428	4.21	4.43	4.49	4.48	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	464/1436	4.92	4.69	4.74	4.74	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	10	12	4.42	757/1427	4.42	4.24	4.32	4.31	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	6	14	4.38	838/1425	4.38	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	3	4	3	5	3.67	993/1291	3.67	4.08	4.05	4.09	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1271	****	3.96	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1276	****	4.02	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1273	****	4.10	4.38	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/922	****	3.86	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 345 2
Title:	Software Design/Develop
Instructor:	Miner,Donald

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	33
Questionnaires:	24

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	22	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	6
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 411 1
Title:	Computer Architecture
Instructor:	Squire,Jon S

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	38
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	8	8	4.00	1140/1528	3.98	4.27	4.31	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	11	4.38	760/1527	4.30	4.27	4.28	4.30	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	489/1333	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.37	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	369/1495	4.27	4.26	4.25	4.33	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	3	1	3	2	4	3.23	1320/1439	3.12	3.70	4.11	4.20	3.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	845/1425	4.21	4.17	4.12	4.26	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	144/1508	4.67	4.35	4.18	4.24	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.71	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	4	10	6	4.00	911/1490	3.93	3.99	4.11	4.19	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	553/1428	4.68	4.43	4.49	4.54	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	258/1436	4.93	4.69	4.74	4.75	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	8	10	4.29	891/1427	3.98	4.24	4.32	4.37	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	6	10	4.10	1048/1425	3.82	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	2	3	5	7	3.83	882/1291	3.76	4.08	4.05	4.10	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	4	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1271	1.17	3.96	4.16	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	4	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1276	2.00	4.02	4.33	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/1273	2.50	4.10	4.38	4.55	****

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 411 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 38
Title: Computer Architecture		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor: Squire, Jon S		

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

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	1	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	11
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 411 2
Title:	Computer Architecture
Instructor:	Squire,Jon S

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	11	5	3.95	1186/1528	3.98	4.27	4.31	4.39	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	11	4.23	932/1527	4.30	4.27	4.28	4.30	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	741/1333	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.37	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	1	2	7	6	3.94	1114/1495	4.27	4.26	4.25	4.33	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	3	8	3	1	3.00	1361/1439	3.12	3.70	4.11	4.20	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	563/1425	4.21	4.17	4.12	4.26	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	8	13	4.55	409/1508	4.67	4.35	4.18	4.24	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.71	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	5	11	4	3.86	1082/1490	3.93	3.99	4.11	4.19	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	686/1428	4.68	4.43	4.49	4.54	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	516/1436	4.93	4.69	4.74	4.75	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	5	9	5	3.68	1252/1427	3.98	4.24	4.32	4.37	3.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	9	5	5	3.55	1292/1425	3.82	4.20	4.34	4.37	3.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	3	3	6	4	3.69	983/1291	3.76	4.08	4.05	4.10	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	5	1	0	0	0	1.17	1269/1271	1.17	3.96	4.16	4.33	1.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	3	1	1	1	0	2.00	1267/1276	2.00	4.02	4.33	4.49	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	3	0	1	1	1	2.50	1260/1273	2.50	4.10	4.38	4.55	2.50

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 411 2	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 41
Title: Computer Architecture		Questionnaires: 22
Instructor: Squire, Jon S		

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

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type		Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors		20	Graduate	0	Major		17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6								
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	22	Non-major		5
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	10	D	0								
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives		0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant				
				P	0								
				I	0	Other		0					
				?	1								

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 421 1
Title:	Princ Of Oper Systems
Instructor:	Joshi,Anupam

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	45

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	18	21	4.29	886/1528	4.29	4.27	4.31	4.39	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	3	9	16	14	3.91	1225/1527	3.91	4.27	4.28	4.30	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	6	16	19	4.07	972/1333	4.07	4.32	4.34	4.37	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	1	0	5	12	19	4.30	796/1495	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.33	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	2	5	9	4	15	3.71	1099/1439	3.71	3.70	4.11	4.20	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	2	7	9	5	16	3.67	1139/1425	3.67	4.17	4.12	4.26	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	4	10	9	19	3.82	1192/1508	3.82	4.35	4.18	4.24	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	1	41	4.86	636/1526	4.86	4.71	4.66	4.71	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	6	16	14	4.16	778/1490	4.16	3.99	4.11	4.19	4.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	6	10	26	4.42	953/1428	4.42	4.43	4.49	4.54	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	2	39	4.84	742/1436	4.84	4.69	4.74	4.75	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	7	10	22	4.24	925/1427	4.24	4.24	4.32	4.37	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	6	10	24	4.26	930/1425	4.26	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	8	0	3	9	8	13	3.94	803/1291	3.94	4.08	4.05	4.10	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	****/1271	****	3.96	4.16	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	38	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	****/1276	****	4.02	4.33	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	38	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	****/1273	****	4.10	4.38	4.55	****
4. Were special techniques successful	38	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/922	****	3.86	4.02	4.23	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 421 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 70
Title: Princ Of Oper Systems		Questionnaires: 45
Instructor: Joshi,Anupam		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	22	Required for Majors	40	Graduate	1	Major	27
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	44	Non-major	18
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 426 1
Title:	Princ Computer Security
Instructor:	Dollen,John L

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	8	6	4	4	3.00	1485/1528	3.00	4.27	4.31	4.39	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	2	9	2	7	3.25	1451/1527	3.25	4.27	4.28	4.30	3.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	2	6	9	3	3.21	1293/1333	3.21	4.32	4.34	4.37	3.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	4	5	7	2	2.79	1478/1495	2.79	4.26	4.25	4.33	2.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	7	5	4	4	4	2.71	1410/1439	2.71	3.70	4.11	4.20	2.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	7	7	4	4	2	2.46	1404/1425	2.46	4.17	4.12	4.26	2.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	5	7	4	8	3.63	1285/1508	3.63	4.35	4.18	4.24	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	10	11	3	3.71	1503/1526	3.71	4.71	4.66	4.71	3.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	7	5	6	3	0	2.24	1479/1490	2.24	3.99	4.11	4.19	2.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	2	8	6	6	3.50	1364/1428	3.50	4.43	4.49	4.54	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	2	4	8	9	3.92	1396/1436	3.92	4.69	4.74	4.75	3.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	4	9	4	4	3.08	1371/1427	3.08	4.24	4.32	4.37	3.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	3	9	5	3	3.00	1372/1425	3.00	4.20	4.34	4.37	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	4	0	6	6	5	3.38	1099/1291	3.38	4.08	4.05	4.10	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	0	3	4	2	3.36	1127/1271	3.36	3.96	4.16	4.33	3.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	1	0	3	5	3.73	1076/1276	3.73	4.02	4.33	4.49	3.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	3	1	2	3	3.09	1235/1273	3.09	4.10	4.38	4.55	3.09
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	3	0	1	3	0	2.57	895/922	2.57	3.86	4.02	4.23	2.57

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 426 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 26
Title: Princ Computer Security		Questionnaires: 24
Instructor: Dollen,John L		

	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	2.45	4.00	4.73	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27 0	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 14	Major 21
28-55 0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6			
56-83 0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 10	Non-major 3
84-150 2	3.00-3.49 4	D 0			
Grad. 14	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 13	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
		P 0			
		I 0	Other 3		
		? 2			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 435 1
Title:	Computer Graphics
Instructor:	Rheingans,Penny

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	279/1528	4.78	4.27	4.31	4.39	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	672/1527	4.44	4.27	4.28	4.30	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	6	4.00	1003/1333	4.00	4.32	4.34	4.37	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	10	7	4.41	640/1495	4.41	4.26	4.25	4.33	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	6	3	2	3	2.76	1408/1439	2.76	3.70	4.11	4.20	2.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	2	3	9	3.94	942/1425	3.94	4.17	4.12	4.26	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	3	13	4.44	530/1508	4.44	4.35	4.18	4.24	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	340/1526	4.94	4.71	4.66	4.71	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	10	5	4.25	675/1490	4.25	3.99	4.11	4.19	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	794/1428	4.56	4.43	4.49	4.54	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	742/1436	4.83	4.69	4.74	4.75	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	792/1427	4.39	4.24	4.32	4.37	4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	542/1425	4.61	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	415/1291	4.41	4.08	4.05	4.10	4.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1271	****	3.96	4.16	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1276	****	4.02	4.33	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1273	****	4.10	4.38	4.55	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/922	****	3.86	4.02	4.23	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 435 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 27
Title: Computer Graphics		Questionnaires: 18
Instructor: Rheingans,Penny		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	2	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	10	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 441 1
Title:	Algorithms
Instructor:	Lomonaco JR,Sam

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	32

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	6	11	13	4.09	1084/1528	4.44	4.27	4.31	4.39	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	8	18	4.34	806/1527	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.30	4.34
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	4	23	4.61	447/1333	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.37	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	496/1495	4.50	4.26	4.25	4.33	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	7	9	13	4.00	851/1439	4.00	3.70	4.11	4.20	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	2	10	8	4.30	613/1425	4.44	4.17	4.12	4.26	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	4	5	20	4.25	783/1508	4.40	4.35	4.18	4.24	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	19	4.59	986/1526	4.80	4.71	4.66	4.71	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	7	11	10	4.11	845/1490	3.72	3.99	4.11	4.19	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	5	12	13	4.19	1120/1428	4.43	4.43	4.49	4.54	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	6	23	4.68	1031/1436	4.78	4.69	4.74	4.75	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	5	7	16	4.13	1024/1427	4.06	4.24	4.32	4.37	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	3	9	15	4.10	1048/1425	4.16	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	1	3	6	3	6	3.53	1053/1291	3.48	4.08	4.05	4.10	3.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/1271	4.25	3.96	4.16	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/1276	4.50	4.02	4.33	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1273	4.50	4.10	4.38	4.55	****
4. Were special techniques successful	27	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/922	****	3.86	4.02	4.23	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 441 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 40
Title: Algorithms		Questionnaires: 32
Instructor: Lomonaco JR,Sam		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	4.28	4.27	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	26	Graduate	0	Major	26
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	32	Non-major	6
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 441 2
Title:	Algorithms
Instructor:	Sherman,Alan T

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	279/1528	4.44	4.27	4.31	4.39	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	932/1527	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.30	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1003/1333	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.37	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	496/1495	4.50	4.26	4.25	4.33	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	851/1439	4.00	3.70	4.11	4.20	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	329/1425	4.44	4.17	4.12	4.26	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	400/1508	4.40	4.35	4.18	4.24	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1526	4.80	4.71	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	2	0	5	1	3.33	1337/1490	3.72	3.99	4.11	4.19	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	637/1428	4.43	4.43	4.49	4.54	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	580/1436	4.78	4.69	4.74	4.75	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	1	5	4.00	1080/1427	4.06	4.24	4.32	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	951/1425	4.16	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	1086/1291	3.48	4.08	4.05	4.10	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	644/1271	4.25	3.96	4.16	4.33	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	591/1276	4.50	4.02	4.33	4.49	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	637/1273	4.50	4.10	4.38	4.55	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/922	****	3.86	4.02	4.23	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 441 2
Title:	Algorithms
Instructor:	Sherman,Alan T

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	9

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 451 1
Title:	Automata Thry& Form Lang
Instructor:	Cole III,Floyd

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1084/1528	4.09	4.27	4.31	4.39	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	1050/1527	4.09	4.27	4.28	4.30	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	1003/1333	4.00	4.32	4.34	4.37	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1047/1495	4.00	4.26	4.25	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1270/1439	3.40	3.70	4.11	4.20	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	283/1425	4.63	4.17	4.12	4.26	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	870/1508	4.18	4.35	4.18	4.24	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	566/1526	4.91	4.71	4.66	4.71	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1060/1490	3.89	3.99	4.11	4.19	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	686/1428	4.64	4.43	4.49	4.54	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	516/1436	4.91	4.69	4.74	4.75	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1080/1427	4.00	4.24	4.32	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	981/1425	4.18	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	728/1291	4.00	4.08	4.05	4.10	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1271	****	3.96	4.16	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1276	****	4.02	4.33	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1273	****	4.10	4.38	4.55	****

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 451 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 14
Title: Automata Thry& Form Lang		Questionnaires: 11
Instructor: Cole III, Floyd		

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 455 1
Title:	Numerical Computations
Instructor:	Stephens,Arthur

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	4	5	2	0	2.82	1506/1528	2.82	4.27	4.31	4.39	2.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	2	1	2.91	1496/1527	2.91	4.27	4.28	4.30	2.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	1003/1333	4.00	4.32	4.34	4.37	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1381/1495	3.45	4.26	4.25	4.33	3.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	3	0	1	1	1	2.50	1422/1439	2.50	3.70	4.11	4.20	2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	3	2	2	3.44	1241/1425	3.44	4.17	4.12	4.26	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	870/1508	4.18	4.35	4.18	4.24	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	6	1	3.73	1501/1526	3.73	4.71	4.66	4.71	3.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	6	2	1	0	2.30	1477/1490	2.30	3.99	4.11	4.19	2.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	3	2	3	2	3.18	1394/1428	3.18	4.43	4.49	4.54	3.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	1	5	3	3.82	1405/1436	3.82	4.69	4.74	4.75	3.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	6	1	0	3	2.82	1397/1427	2.82	4.24	4.32	4.37	2.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	4	1	1	1	2.18	1414/1425	2.18	4.20	4.34	4.37	2.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	6	1	0	1	0	1.50	1287/1291	1.50	4.08	4.05	4.10	1.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1251/1271	2.33	3.96	4.16	4.33	2.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1265/1276	2.33	4.02	4.33	4.49	2.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	1254/1273	2.67	4.10	4.38	4.55	2.67
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/922	****	3.86	4.02	4.23	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 455 1
Title:	Numerical Computations
Instructor:	Stephens,Arthur

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	11

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 457 1
Title:	Quantum Computation
Instructor:	Lomonaco JR,Sam

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	0	6	3.90	1233/1528	3.90	4.27	4.31	4.39	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	1113/1527	4.00	4.27	4.28	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	704/1333	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.37	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1047/1495	4.00	4.26	4.25	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	1	0	4	3.71	1099/1439	3.71	3.70	4.11	4.20	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	703/1425	4.22	4.17	4.12	4.26	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	1	4	3.60	1293/1508	3.60	4.35	4.18	4.24	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1061/1526	4.50	4.71	4.66	4.71	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	778/1490	4.17	3.99	4.11	4.19	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	854/1428	4.50	4.43	4.49	4.54	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	516/1436	4.90	4.69	4.74	4.75	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	1041/1427	4.10	4.24	4.32	4.37	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	1076/1425	4.00	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	405/1291	4.43	4.08	4.05	4.10	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1007/1271	3.67	3.96	4.16	4.33	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	591/1276	4.50	4.02	4.33	4.49	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	724/1273	4.40	4.10	4.38	4.55	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	467/922	4.00	3.86	4.02	4.23	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 457 1
Title:	Quantum Computation
Instructor:	Lomonaco JR,Sam

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/198	****	4.40	4.16	4.37	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	4.28	4.27	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.53	4.37	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.56	4.23	3.87	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	4.63	4.31	4.42	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.63	4.27	4.26	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	4.25	4.27	4.42	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.88	3.94	4.23	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	2.45	4.00	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	2.52	4.06	4.33	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.57	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	3.50	4.20	4.24	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.11	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	4	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 457 1
Title:	Quantum Computation
Instructor:	Lomonaco JR,Sam

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	10

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

84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0									
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives			7	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant				
				P	0									
				I	0	Other			0					
				?	2									

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 461 1
Title:	Database Mangmt Systems
Instructor:	Grasso,Clare T

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	835/1528	4.33	4.27	4.31	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	7	6	4.06	1078/1527	4.06	4.27	4.28	4.30	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	7	4.17	898/1333	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.37	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	844/1495	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.33	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	1	1	4	6	3.60	1153/1439	3.60	3.70	4.11	4.20	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	613/1425	4.31	4.17	4.12	4.26	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	613/1508	4.39	4.35	4.18	4.24	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	797/1526	4.76	4.71	4.66	4.71	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	6	7	3	3.71	1180/1490	3.71	3.99	4.11	4.19	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	1065/1428	4.28	4.43	4.49	4.54	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	1183/1436	4.50	4.69	4.74	4.75	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	3	6	7	3.94	1128/1427	3.94	4.24	4.32	4.37	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	7	4	3.61	1270/1425	3.61	4.20	4.34	4.37	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	1	3	3	4	3.67	993/1291	3.67	4.08	4.05	4.10	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/1271	****	3.96	4.16	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1276	****	4.02	4.33	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1273	****	4.10	4.38	4.55	****

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 461 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 25
Title: Database Mangmt Systems		Questionnaires: 18
Instructor: Grasso,Clare T		

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

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	6
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	8	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 471 1
Title:	Artificial Intelligence
Instructor:	Oates,James T

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	44
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	23	4.68	419/1528	4.68	4.27	4.31	4.39	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	22	4.65	396/1527	4.65	4.27	4.28	4.30	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	26	4.81	237/1333	4.81	4.32	4.34	4.37	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	2	7	18	4.59	381/1495	4.59	4.26	4.25	4.33	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	4	11	13	4.13	770/1439	4.13	3.70	4.11	4.20	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	2	1	8	14	4.36	553/1425	4.36	4.17	4.12	4.26	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	8	21	4.61	340/1508	4.61	4.35	4.18	4.24	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	24	6	4.20	1332/1526	4.20	4.71	4.66	4.71	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	4	24	4.72	177/1490	4.72	3.99	4.11	4.19	4.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	26	4.83	335/1428	4.83	4.43	4.49	4.54	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	207/1436	4.97	4.69	4.74	4.75	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	24	4.77	283/1427	4.77	4.24	4.32	4.37	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	5	24	4.73	378/1425	4.73	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	4	5	16	4.48	346/1291	4.48	4.08	4.05	4.10	4.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1271	****	3.96	4.16	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/1276	****	4.02	4.33	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1273	****	4.10	4.38	4.55	****
4. Were special techniques successful	26	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/922	****	3.86	4.02	4.23	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 471 1
Title:	Artificial Intelligence
Instructor:	Oates,James T

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	44
Questionnaires:	31

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	27
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	31	Non-major	4
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	9	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 473 1
Title:	Natural Lang Processing
Instructor:	Nirenburg,Serge

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1408/1528	3.50	4.27	4.31	4.39	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	2	1	3.25	1451/1527	3.25	4.27	4.28	4.30	3.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1166/1333	3.75	4.32	4.34	4.37	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	1321/1495	3.63	4.26	4.25	4.33	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	5	0	3.67	1126/1439	3.67	3.70	4.11	4.20	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	1285/1425	3.33	4.17	4.12	4.26	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1422/1508	3.00	4.35	4.18	4.24	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.71	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	1406/1490	3.00	3.99	4.11	4.19	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	4	1	0	3.00	1401/1428	3.00	4.43	4.49	4.54	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1290/1436	4.33	4.69	4.74	4.75	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1360/1427	3.17	4.24	4.32	4.37	3.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	1388/1425	2.83	4.20	4.34	4.37	2.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	1273/1291	2.25	4.08	4.05	4.10	2.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1195/1271	3.00	3.96	4.16	4.33	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1230/1276	3.00	4.02	4.33	4.49	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1201/1273	3.33	4.10	4.38	4.55	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/922	****	3.86	4.02	4.23	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 473 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 15
Title: Natural Lang Processing		Questionnaires: 9
Instructor: Nirenburg,Serge		

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 481 1
Title:	Computer Networks
Instructor:	Sidhu,Deepinder

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	27

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	3	4	8	3	7	3.28	1455/1528	3.28	4.27	4.31	4.39	3.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	9	4	4	5	3.04	1479/1527	3.04	4.27	4.28	4.30	3.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	5	5	7	6	3.40	1268/1333	3.40	4.32	4.34	4.37	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	7	1	3	4	3	6	3.59	1338/1495	3.59	4.26	4.25	4.33	3.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	3	6	1	4	7	3.29	1305/1439	3.29	3.70	4.11	4.20	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	3	1	2	3	4	3.31	1296/1425	3.31	4.17	4.12	4.26	3.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	4	5	4	6	6	3.20	1397/1508	3.20	4.35	4.18	4.24	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	12	10	4.45	1112/1526	4.45	4.71	4.66	4.71	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	3	3	9	4	1	2.85	1438/1490	2.85	3.99	4.11	4.19	2.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	5	10	8	3.92	1250/1428	3.92	4.43	4.49	4.54	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	4	5	16	4.48	1198/1436	4.48	4.69	4.74	4.75	4.48
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	3	7	6	6	3.36	1335/1427	3.36	4.24	4.32	4.37	3.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	6	3	4	9	3.40	1327/1425	3.40	4.20	4.34	4.37	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	0	6	1	5	6	3.61	1018/1291	3.61	4.08	4.05	4.10	3.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	3	0	3	3	3.18	1172/1271	3.18	3.96	4.16	4.33	3.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	3	0	4	0	4	3.18	1214/1276	3.18	4.02	4.33	4.49	3.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	2	2	3	1	3	3.09	1235/1273	3.09	4.10	4.38	4.55	3.09
4. Were special techniques successful	16	7	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/922	****	3.86	4.02	4.23	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 481 1
Title:	Computer Networks
Instructor:	Sidhu,Deepinder

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	27

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	9	Major	21
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	9	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 491 02
Title:	Spec Topics In Comp Sci
Instructor:	Yesha,Yaacov

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	3	2	3.50	1408/1528	4.12	4.27	4.31	4.39	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	2	2	3.30	1438/1527	4.20	4.27	4.28	4.30	3.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1333	4.42	4.32	4.34	4.37	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1401/1495	3.94	4.26	4.25	4.33	3.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1361/1439	3.95	3.70	4.11	4.20	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	891/1425	4.00	4.17	4.12	4.26	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	1221/1508	4.39	4.35	4.18	4.24	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	811/1526	4.42	4.71	4.66	4.71	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1096/1490	4.19	3.99	4.11	4.19	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	1202/1428	4.42	4.43	4.49	4.54	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	1114/1436	4.76	4.69	4.74	4.75	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	0	4	4	4.00	1080/1427	4.38	4.24	4.32	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	2	3	3.30	1343/1425	4.10	4.20	4.34	4.37	3.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1170/1291	4.18	4.08	4.05	4.10	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1108/1271	3.67	3.96	4.16	4.33	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	926/1276	4.14	4.02	4.33	4.49	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	888/1273	4.33	4.10	4.38	4.55	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	691/922	2.63	3.86	4.02	4.23	3.60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 491 02
Title:	Spec Topics In Comp Sci
Instructor:	Yesha,Yaacov

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/198	****	4.40	4.16	4.37	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	4.28	4.27	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	4.53	4.37	4.45	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	4.78	4.51	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	4.63	4.31	4.42	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	4.63	4.27	4.26	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.25	4.27	4.42	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.88	3.94	4.23	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	2.45	4.00	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	2.52	4.06	4.33	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.57	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	3.50	4.20	4.24	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	2.91	4.43	4.63	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	3.71	4.53	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	3.67	4.43	4.38	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 491 02	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 18
Title: Spec Topics In Comp Sci		Questionnaires: 10
Instructor: Yesha,Yaacov		

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

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 491 06
Title:	Spec Topics In Comp Sci
Instructor:	Hood, Daniel J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	36
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	175/1528	4.12	4.27	4.31	4.39	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1527	4.20	4.27	4.28	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	210/1333	4.42	4.32	4.34	4.37	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	247/1495	3.94	4.26	4.25	4.33	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	573/1439	3.95	3.70	4.11	4.20	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	1	0	9	4.55	358/1425	4.00	4.17	4.12	4.26	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	239/1508	4.39	4.35	4.18	4.24	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1526	4.42	4.71	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	320/1490	4.19	3.99	4.11	4.19	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1428	4.42	4.43	4.49	4.54	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1436	4.76	4.69	4.74	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	83/1427	4.38	4.24	4.32	4.37	4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	98/1425	4.10	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	105/1291	4.18	4.08	4.05	4.10	4.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1271	3.67	3.96	4.16	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1276	4.14	4.02	4.33	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1273	4.33	4.10	4.38	4.55	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/922	2.63	3.86	4.02	4.23	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 491 06
Title:	Spec Topics In Comp Sci
Instructor:	Hood, Daniel J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	36
Questionnaires:	17

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	3
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	11	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 491 07
Title:	Spec Topics In Comp Sci
Instructor:	Caban,Jesus J.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	1090/1528	4.12	4.27	4.31	4.39	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	818/1527	4.20	4.27	4.28	4.30	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	769/1333	4.42	4.32	4.34	4.37	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	9	4.42	640/1495	3.94	4.26	4.25	4.33	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	636/1439	3.95	3.70	4.11	4.20	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	454/1425	4.00	4.17	4.12	4.26	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	139/1508	4.39	4.35	4.18	4.24	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	689/1526	4.42	4.71	4.66	4.71	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	494/1490	4.19	3.99	4.11	4.19	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	637/1428	4.42	4.43	4.49	4.54	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1436	4.76	4.69	4.74	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	625/1427	4.38	4.24	4.32	4.37	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	2	7	4.17	997/1425	4.10	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	161/1291	4.18	4.08	4.05	4.10	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	0	3	2	3.71	982/1271	3.67	3.96	4.16	4.33	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	868/1276	4.14	4.02	4.33	4.49	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	584/1273	4.33	4.10	4.38	4.55	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/922	2.63	3.86	4.02	4.23	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 491 07
Title:	Spec Topics In Comp Sci
Instructor:	Caban,Jesus J.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.78	4.51	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	4.63	4.31	4.42	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.63	4.27	4.26	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.25	4.27	4.42	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.88	3.94	4.23	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 491 08
Title:	Spec Topics In Comp Sci
Instructor:	Parker,James B

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	1140/1528	4.12	4.27	4.31	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	970/1527	4.20	4.27	4.28	4.30	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	957/1333	4.42	4.32	4.34	4.37	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	1427/1495	3.94	4.26	4.25	4.33	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	6	4	4.18	727/1439	3.95	3.70	4.11	4.20	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1345/1425	4.00	4.17	4.12	4.26	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	758/1508	4.39	4.35	4.18	4.24	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	8	2	0	3.09	1518/1526	4.42	4.71	4.66	4.71	3.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	911/1490	4.19	3.99	4.11	4.19	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1202/1428	4.42	4.43	4.49	4.54	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	1221/1436	4.76	4.69	4.74	4.75	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	1044/1427	4.38	4.24	4.32	4.37	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	1076/1425	4.10	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	728/1291	4.18	4.08	4.05	4.10	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	900/1271	3.67	3.96	4.16	4.33	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	786/1276	4.14	4.02	4.33	4.49	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	810/1273	4.33	4.10	4.38	4.55	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	918/922	2.63	3.86	4.02	4.23	1.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 491 08
Title:	Spec Topics In Comp Sci
Instructor:	Parker,James B

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/42	****	2.45	4.00	4.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	****	2.91	4.43	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 611 1
Title:	Adv Computer Architectre
Instructor:	Olano,Thomas M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	52
Questionnaires:	45

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	7	13	23	4.32	855/1528	4.32	4.27	4.31	4.45	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	17	24	4.49	607/1527	4.49	4.27	4.28	4.36	4.49
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	9	30	4.57	500/1333	4.57	4.32	4.34	4.39	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	1	7	14	18	4.23	879/1495	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.33	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	2	1	10	12	14	3.90	968/1439	3.90	3.70	4.11	4.24	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	4	19	16	4.17	756/1425	4.17	4.17	4.12	4.28	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	2	8	31	4.71	239/1508	4.71	4.35	4.18	4.25	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	40	4.95	283/1526	4.95	4.71	4.66	4.81	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	0	1	3	17	14	4.26	675/1490	4.26	3.99	4.11	4.16	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	12	31	4.68	604/1428	4.68	4.43	4.49	4.56	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	1	10	30	4.56	1148/1436	4.56	4.69	4.74	4.83	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	15	26	4.52	601/1427	4.52	4.24	4.32	4.36	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	15	24	4.39	830/1425	4.39	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	2	4	17	15	4.10	674/1291	4.10	4.08	4.05	3.99	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	1	6	8	10	3.96	814/1271	3.96	3.96	4.16	4.27	3.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	2	1	7	7	9	3.77	1058/1276	3.77	4.02	4.33	4.43	3.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	0	4	11	11	4.15	888/1273	4.15	4.10	4.38	4.52	4.15
4. Were special techniques successful	19	15	0	1	5	2	3	3.64	****/922	****	3.86	4.02	4.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 611 1
Title:	Adv Computer Architectre
Instructor:	Olano,Thomas M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	52
Questionnaires:	45

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	4.40	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	4.28	4.27	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.53	4.37	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.56	4.23	4.66	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.78	4.51	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	4.63	4.31	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.63	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.25	4.27	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.88	3.94	3.81	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	2.45	4.00	3.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	2.52	4.06	4.01	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.95	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	3.50	4.20	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.36	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	2.91	4.43	4.43	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	3.71	4.53	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	3.67	4.43	4.54	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 611 1
Title:	Adv Computer Architectre
Instructor:	Olano,Thomas M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	52
Questionnaires:	45

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.68	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.64	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	A	31	Required for Majors	39	Graduate	17	Major	41
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	28	Non-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	17	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 621 1
Title:	Adv Operating Systems
Instructor:	Kalpakis,Konsta

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	33

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	0	7	23	4.59	532/1528	4.59	4.27	4.31	4.45	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	7	20	4.48	607/1527	4.48	4.27	4.28	4.36	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	1	7	20	4.31	787/1333	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.39	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	2	2	10	14	4.17	932/1495	4.17	4.26	4.25	4.33	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	13	17	4.47	419/1439	4.47	3.70	4.11	4.24	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	1	3	4	8	11	3.93	959/1425	3.93	4.17	4.12	4.28	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	8	20	4.44	544/1508	4.44	4.35	4.18	4.25	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.71	4.66	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	1	10	14	4.52	328/1490	4.52	3.99	4.11	4.16	4.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	8	23	4.69	604/1428	4.69	4.43	4.49	4.56	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.69	4.74	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	0	14	15	4.28	891/1427	4.28	4.24	4.32	4.36	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	7	21	4.52	655/1425	4.52	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	1	5	10	11	4.04	711/1291	4.04	4.08	4.05	3.99	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	1	2	8	12	4.08	756/1271	4.08	3.96	4.16	4.27	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	3	6	15	4.36	727/1276	4.36	4.02	4.33	4.43	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	2	21	4.68	489/1273	4.68	4.10	4.38	4.52	4.68
4. Were special techniques successful	9	16	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	****/922	****	3.86	4.02	4.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 621 1
Title:	Adv Operating Systems
Instructor:	Kalpakis,Konsta

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	33

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/198	****	4.40	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/208	****	4.28	4.27	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.58	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.56	4.23	4.66	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	4.78	4.51	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	4.63	4.31	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.63	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.25	4.27	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	3.88	3.94	3.81	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/42	****	2.45	4.00	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.95	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	3.50	4.20	4.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/43	****	2.91	4.43	4.43	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.64	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A	20
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6
			Required for Majors	27	Graduate
				17	Major
					30

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 621 1
Title:	Adv Operating Systems
Instructor:	Kalpakis,Konsta

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	33

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General			0	Under-grad	16	Non-major		3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0									
Grad.	17	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives			1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant				
				P	0									
				I	0	Other			1					
				?	5									

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 651 1
Title:	Automata Thry/Forml Lang
Instructor:	Chang,Richard

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	199/1528	4.86	4.27	4.31	4.45	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	161/1527	4.86	4.27	4.28	4.36	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.32	4.34	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	177/1495	4.80	4.26	4.25	4.33	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	762/1439	4.14	3.70	4.11	4.24	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.17	4.12	4.28	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	746/1508	4.29	4.35	4.18	4.25	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	1421/1526	4.00	4.71	4.66	4.81	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	221/1490	4.67	3.99	4.11	4.16	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1428	5.00	4.43	4.49	4.56	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.69	4.74	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1008/1427	4.14	4.24	4.32	4.36	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	785/1425	4.43	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1291	5.00	4.08	4.05	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1271	5.00	3.96	4.16	4.27	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1276	5.00	4.02	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1273	5.00	4.10	4.38	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/922	5.00	3.86	4.02	4.00	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 651 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 8
Title: Automata Thry/Forml Lang		Questionnaires: 7
Instructor: Chang,Richard		

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 671 02
Title:	Prin Artificial Intell
Instructor:	Zavala-Gutierre

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	8	1	3.47	1418/1528	4.04	4.27	4.31	4.45	3.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	8	7	0	3.47	1414/1527	3.93	4.27	4.28	4.36	3.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	5	4	3.87	1110/1333	4.21	4.32	4.34	4.39	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	8	2	3.79	1226/1495	4.09	4.26	4.25	4.33	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	10	3	2	3.47	1237/1439	3.59	3.70	4.11	4.24	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	9	2	4.00	891/1425	4.19	4.17	4.12	4.28	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	5	6	4.00	1050/1508	4.31	4.35	4.18	4.25	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	867/1526	4.86	4.71	4.66	4.81	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	1	2	4	0	1	2.75	1450/1490	3.56	3.99	4.11	4.16	2.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	6	5	1	3.27	1388/1428	3.99	4.43	4.49	4.56	3.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	1340/1436	4.54	4.69	4.74	4.83	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	7	4	1	3.21	1353/1427	3.86	4.24	4.32	4.36	3.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	1	7	2	3.27	1348/1425	3.91	4.20	4.34	4.34	3.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	2	6	3	1	3.08	1188/1291	3.79	4.08	4.05	3.99	3.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	4	5	2	1	3.00	1195/1271	3.23	3.96	4.16	4.27	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	3	5	2	3.50	1152/1276	3.94	4.02	4.33	4.43	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	5	5	3	3.85	1041/1273	4.04	4.10	4.38	4.52	3.85
4. Were special techniques successful	2	8	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	895/922	3.18	3.86	4.02	4.00	2.60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 671 02
Title:	Prin Artificial Intell
Instructor:	Zavala-Gutierre

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/198	****	4.40	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	206/208	2.50	4.28	4.27	4.40	2.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/194	****	4.53	4.37	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/176	****	4.56	4.23	4.66	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/76	****	4.78	4.51	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/74	****	4.63	4.31	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/66	****	4.63	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/76	****	4.25	4.27	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/73	****	3.88	3.94	3.81	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	3	0	0	1	0	1.75	42/42	1.75	2.45	4.00	3.86	1.75
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	3	0	0	1	0	1.75	41/41	1.75	2.52	4.06	4.01	1.75
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.95	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/32	****	3.50	4.20	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.36	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	43/43	2.25	2.91	4.43	4.43	2.25
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/31	****	3.71	4.53	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/36	****	3.67	4.43	4.54	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 671 02
Title:	Prin Artificial Intell
Instructor:	Zavala-Gutierre

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.68	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.64	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	9	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 671 1
Title:	Prin Artificial Intell
Instructor:	desJardins,Mari

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	22
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	506/1528	4.04	4.27	4.31	4.45	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	760/1527	3.93	4.27	4.28	4.36	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	4	13	4.56	511/1333	4.21	4.32	4.34	4.39	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	7	10	4.39	682/1495	4.09	4.26	4.25	4.33	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	1	7	6	3.72	1090/1439	3.59	3.70	4.11	4.24	3.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	533/1425	4.19	4.17	4.12	4.28	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	1	15	4.61	340/1508	4.31	4.35	4.18	4.25	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1526	4.86	4.71	4.66	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	6	9	4.38	530/1490	3.56	3.99	4.11	4.16	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	534/1428	3.99	4.43	4.49	4.56	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	580/1436	4.54	4.69	4.74	4.83	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	3	13	4.50	625/1427	3.86	4.24	4.32	4.36	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	13	4.56	611/1425	3.91	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	3	13	4.50	327/1291	3.79	4.08	4.05	3.99	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	2	8	1	3.46	1092/1271	3.23	3.96	4.16	4.27	3.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	711/1276	3.94	4.02	4.33	4.43	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	0	6	6	4.23	839/1273	4.04	4.10	4.38	4.52	4.23
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	2	1	3	5	3.75	617/922	3.18	3.86	4.02	4.00	3.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 671 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 22
Title: Prin Artificial Intell		Questionnaires: 18
Instructor: desJardins,Mari		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 2	A 13 Required for Majors	9 Graduate	8 Major
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0 General	2	10 Non-major
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00 5	F 0 Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	3	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 676 01
Title:	Information Retrieval
Instructor:	McNamee,Paul

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	835/1528	4.33	4.27	4.31	4.45	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	892/1527	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.36	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	5	4.13	925/1333	4.13	4.32	4.34	4.39	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	369/1495	4.60	4.26	4.25	4.33	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	2	3	5	3.47	1237/1439	3.47	3.70	4.11	4.24	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	2	7	3.93	950/1425	3.93	4.17	4.12	4.28	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	503/1508	4.47	4.35	4.18	4.25	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	839/1526	4.73	4.71	4.66	4.81	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	675/1490	4.25	3.99	4.11	4.16	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	286/1428	4.87	4.43	4.49	4.56	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.69	4.74	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	772/1427	4.40	4.24	4.32	4.36	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	726/1425	4.47	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	5	4	6	4.07	695/1291	4.07	4.08	4.05	3.99	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	6	3	3.53	1065/1271	3.53	3.96	4.16	4.27	3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	439/1276	4.67	4.02	4.33	4.43	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	507/1273	4.67	4.10	4.38	4.52	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	9	2	1	2	0	0	2.00	912/922	2.00	3.86	4.02	4.00	2.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 676 01
Title:	Information Retrieval
Instructor:	McNamee,Paul

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	15

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 7 Required for Majors	9	Graduate 9 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0 General	0	Under-grad 6 Non-major 15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00 2	F 0 Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	4	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 691 08
Title:	Spec Topics In Comp Sci
Instructor:	Yesha,Yelena

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	805/1528	4.36	4.27	4.31	4.45	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	0	4	5	4.09	1050/1527	4.09	4.27	4.28	4.36	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1003/1333	4.00	4.32	4.34	4.39	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	746/1495	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.33	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	0	1	2	4	3.40	1270/1439	3.40	3.70	4.11	4.24	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	1000/1425	3.88	4.17	4.12	4.28	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	1	2	1	4	3.40	1358/1508	3.40	4.35	4.18	4.25	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.71	4.66	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	911/1490	4.00	3.99	4.11	4.16	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	1	2	4	3.89	1270/1428	3.89	4.43	4.49	4.56	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1148/1436	4.56	4.69	4.74	4.83	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	942/1427	4.22	4.24	4.32	4.36	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	0	2	5	4.11	1037/1425	4.11	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	96/1291	4.86	4.08	4.05	3.99	4.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	272/1271	4.73	3.96	4.16	4.27	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	472/1276	4.64	4.02	4.33	4.43	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	235/1273	4.91	4.10	4.38	4.52	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	261/922	4.43	3.86	4.02	4.00	4.43

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 691 08
Title:	Spec Topics In Comp Sci
Instructor:	Yesha,Yelena

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/198	****	4.40	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/208	****	4.28	4.27	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.56	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/194	****	4.53	4.37	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/176	****	4.56	4.23	4.66	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	29/76	4.78	4.78	4.51	4.51	4.78
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	31/74	4.63	4.63	4.31	4.32	4.63
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	23/66	4.63	4.63	4.27	4.44	4.63
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	50/76	4.25	4.25	4.27	4.33	4.25
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	50/73	3.88	3.88	3.94	3.81	3.88
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/42	****	2.45	4.00	3.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/41	****	2.52	4.06	4.01	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.95	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	3.50	4.20	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.36	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/43	****	2.91	4.43	4.43	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	3.71	4.53	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/36	****	3.67	4.43	4.54	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 691 08
Title:	Spec Topics In Comp Sci
Instructor:	Yesha,Yelena

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.68	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.64	****

Frequency Distribution

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