

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 100 01
Title:	Intro to Computer Scienc
Instructor:	desJardins,Mari

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	42
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	0	0	2	1	4	14	13	4.03	1167/1589	4.03	4.11	4.32	4.20	4.03
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	8	18	4.18	1024/1589	4.18	4.06	4.29	4.28	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	5	7	17	4.00	1061/1391	4.00	4.18	4.34	4.29	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	3	5	7	16	4.16	943/1552	4.16	4.06	4.25	4.16	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	2	7	11	8	3.53	1290/1495	3.53	3.65	4.14	4.07	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	11	10	9	3.65	1205/1457	3.65	4.02	4.15	3.99	3.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	8	22	4.47	540/1572	4.47	4.15	4.21	4.18	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	28	4.82	677/1589	4.82	4.69	4.66	4.59	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	1	3	14	6	4.04	925/1569	4.04	3.87	4.13	4.08	4.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	4	28	4.79	434/1530	4.79	4.30	4.49	4.45	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	29	4.88	671/1533	4.88	4.65	4.75	4.69	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	9	19	4.39	830/1528	4.39	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	1	3	25	4.42	829/1529	4.42	3.98	4.36	4.31	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	4	2	7	20	4.30	543/1393	4.30	3.99	4.06	3.99	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	1	2	8	4	3.81	984/1337	3.81	3.71	4.17	4.01	3.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	1	1	4	9	4.19	880/1331	4.19	3.94	4.35	4.18	4.19
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	878/1333	4.27	4.09	4.40	4.22	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	1	2	5	3	3	3.36	886/1014	3.36	3.44	4.05	3.91	3.36

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 100 01
Title:	Intro to Computer Scienc
Instructor:	desJardins,Mari

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	42
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														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.03	4.17	4.36	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	3.46	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	3.25	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	2.83	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	2.75	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	2.92	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/40	****	****	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	****	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	2.17	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	1.83	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 100 01
Title:	Intro to Computer Scienc
Instructor:	desJardins,Mari

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	34

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	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	16	Under-grad	34	Non-major	34
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment:	42
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog		Questionnaires:	34
Instructor:	Wilson,Michael			

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	30	4.85	204/1589	4.65	4.11	4.32	4.20	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	23	4.62	455/1589	4.45	4.06	4.29	4.28	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	23	4.59	505/1391	4.53	4.18	4.34	4.29	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	1	7	19	4.57	436/1552	4.38	4.06	4.25	4.16	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	1	7	7	14	3.88	1047/1495	3.54	3.65	4.14	4.07	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	381/1457	4.24	4.02	4.15	3.99	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	6	25	4.62	378/1572	4.38	4.15	4.21	4.18	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	5	28	4.76	806/1589	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.59	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	1	13	13	4.44	453/1569	4.31	3.87	4.13	4.08	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	28	4.82	381/1530	4.71	4.30	4.49	4.45	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	2	30	4.85	757/1533	4.78	4.65	4.75	4.69	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	5	24	4.61	570/1528	4.38	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	2	27	4.67	530/1529	4.49	3.98	4.36	4.31	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	5	4	21	4.45	392/1393	4.40	3.99	4.06	3.99	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	971/1337	4.11	3.71	4.17	4.01	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	1072/1331	4.05	3.94	4.35	4.18	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	702/1333	4.27	4.09	4.40	4.22	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	22	6	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/1014	4.08	3.44	4.05	3.91	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 01
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Wilson,Michael

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	42
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	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/180	****	4.21	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.03	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	4.73	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.49	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	4.28	4.12	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	3.46	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	3.25	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	2.83	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	2.75	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	2.92	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	****	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	****	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	2.17	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	1.83	4.12	3.23	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 01
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Wilson,Michael

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	34

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	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	34	Non-major	30
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	1	Other	3				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 02
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Sheets,David A

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	6	19	4.48	672/1589	4.65	4.11	4.32	4.20	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	6	17	4.34	840/1589	4.45	4.06	4.29	4.28	4.34
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	4	5	18	4.39	742/1391	4.53	4.18	4.34	4.29	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	5	5	16	4.42	636/1552	4.38	4.06	4.25	4.16	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	7	7	5	6	3.22	1411/1495	3.54	3.65	4.14	4.07	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	3	3	3	10	3.90	998/1457	4.24	4.02	4.15	3.99	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	2	22	4.52	484/1572	4.38	4.15	4.21	4.18	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	5	17	7	4.07	1480/1589	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.59	4.07
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	0	4	8	8	4.05	925/1569	4.31	3.87	4.13	4.08	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	6	20	4.61	745/1530	4.71	4.30	4.49	4.45	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	6	21	4.59	1197/1533	4.78	4.65	4.75	4.69	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	5	6	15	4.18	1058/1528	4.38	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	4	20	4.38	883/1529	4.49	3.98	4.36	4.31	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	3	1	0	5	18	4.26	586/1393	4.40	3.99	4.06	3.99	4.26
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	4	0	8	4.33	601/1337	4.11	3.71	4.17	4.01	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	1	4	1	6	4.00	989/1331	4.05	3.94	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	773/1333	4.27	4.09	4.40	4.22	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	641/1014	4.08	3.44	4.05	3.91	3.90

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 02
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Sheets,David A

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	****/180	****	4.21	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	****/194	****	4.03	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	****/178	****	4.73	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	****/181	****	4.49	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	****/165	****	4.28	4.12	4.37	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 3	A 14	Required for Majors 19	Graduate 0 Major 9
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 0	C 5	General 1	Under-grad 29 Non-major 20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 5	D 1		
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 5	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 03
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Park,John

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	46
Questionnaires:	27

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	20	4.63	491/1589	4.65	4.11	4.32	4.20	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	5	16	4.30	901/1589	4.45	4.06	4.29	4.28	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	468/1391	4.53	4.18	4.34	4.29	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	8	6	9	4.04	1052/1552	4.38	4.06	4.25	4.16	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	5	0	5	3	2	2.80	1464/1495	3.54	3.65	4.14	4.07	2.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	886/1457	4.24	4.02	4.15	3.99	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	6	4	13	4.04	1068/1572	4.38	4.15	4.21	4.18	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	624/1589	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.59	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	9	12	4.50	369/1569	4.31	3.87	4.13	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	19	4.69	593/1530	4.71	4.30	4.49	4.45	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	643/1533	4.78	4.65	4.75	4.69	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	11	11	4.27	983/1528	4.38	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	7	15	4.44	806/1529	4.49	3.98	4.36	4.31	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	3	1	4	14	4.32	532/1393	4.40	3.99	4.06	3.99	4.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	639/1337	4.11	3.71	4.17	4.01	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	802/1331	4.05	3.94	4.35	4.18	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	765/1333	4.27	4.09	4.40	4.22	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	20	3	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1014	4.08	3.44	4.05	3.91	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 03
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Park,John

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	46
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	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/180	****	4.21	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	4.03	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	4.73	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/181	****	4.49	4.40	4.54	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	3.46	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/65	****	3.25	4.43	4.13	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	2.75	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	2.92	4.19	3.98	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	2	A	16	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	27	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 04
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Park,John

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	46
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	544/1589	4.65	4.11	4.32	4.20	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	749/1589	4.45	4.06	4.29	4.28	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	600/1391	4.53	4.18	4.34	4.29	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	652/1552	4.38	4.06	4.25	4.16	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1137/1495	3.54	3.65	4.14	4.07	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	354/1457	4.24	4.02	4.15	3.99	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	495/1572	4.38	4.15	4.21	4.18	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	420/1589	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.59	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	894/1569	4.31	3.87	4.13	4.08	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	488/1530	4.71	4.30	4.49	4.45	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	959/1533	4.78	4.65	4.75	4.69	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	804/1528	4.38	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	924/1529	4.49	3.98	4.36	4.31	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	392/1393	4.40	3.99	4.06	3.99	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	823/1337	4.11	3.71	4.17	4.01	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	989/1331	4.05	3.94	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1150/1333	4.27	4.09	4.40	4.22	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	395/1014	4.08	3.44	4.05	3.91	4.25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 04
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Park,John

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	46
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														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/194	****	4.03	4.17	4.36	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	2.75	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	2.92	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	****	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/40	****	****	3.89	3.11	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	2.17	4.00	3.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	1.83	4.12	3.23	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 12 Non-major 12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	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 104 05
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Park,John

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	43
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	19	4.69	393/1589	4.65	4.11	4.32	4.20	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	18	4.58	511/1589	4.45	4.06	4.29	4.28	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	8	17	4.54	564/1391	4.53	4.18	4.34	4.29	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	636/1552	4.38	4.06	4.25	4.16	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	899/1495	3.54	3.65	4.14	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	732/1457	4.24	4.02	4.15	3.99	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	6	15	4.23	871/1572	4.38	4.15	4.21	4.18	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	730/1589	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.59	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	439/1569	4.31	3.87	4.13	4.08	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	5	20	4.69	593/1530	4.71	4.30	4.49	4.45	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	757/1533	4.78	4.65	4.75	4.69	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	5	16	4.42	792/1528	4.38	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	21	4.65	544/1529	4.49	3.98	4.36	4.31	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	1	5	16	4.52	332/1393	4.40	3.99	4.06	3.99	4.52
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/1337	4.11	3.71	4.17	4.01	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	****/1331	4.05	3.94	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1333	4.27	4.09	4.40	4.22	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 104 05	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 43
Title: Prob Sol & Computer Prog		Questionnaires: 26
Instructor: Park,John		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	20	3	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1014	4.08	3.44	4.05	3.91	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	3 A 15	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0 B 8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1 C 1	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	25
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5 F 0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	2				
			? 2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 104Y 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 33
Title: Prob Sol & Computer Prog		Questionnaires: 24
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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	7	5	6	5	1	2.50	1580/1589	2.50	4.11	4.32	4.20	2.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	9	6	5	2	2	2.25	1585/1589	2.25	4.06	4.29	4.28	2.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	3	6	5	3	1	2.61	1384/1391	2.61	4.18	4.34	4.29	2.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	7	5	8	1	3	2.50	1545/1552	2.50	4.06	4.25	4.16	2.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	9	8	4	1	2	2.13	1491/1495	2.13	3.65	4.14	4.07	2.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	10	4	4	1	2	2.10	1455/1457	2.10	4.02	4.15	3.99	2.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	5	4	3	9	3.42	1435/1572	3.42	4.15	4.21	4.18	3.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	420/1589	4.92	4.69	4.66	4.59	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	6	2	6	4	3	2.81	1535/1569	2.81	3.87	4.13	4.08	2.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	3	4	3	4	6	3.30	1493/1530	3.30	4.30	4.49	4.45	3.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	2	3	5	10	4.00	1476/1533	4.00	4.65	4.75	4.69	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	3	5	6	3	3.26	1459/1528	3.26	4.00	4.35	4.31	3.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	11	4	3	2	1	1.95	1525/1529	1.95	3.98	4.36	4.31	1.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	3	3	5	5	3	3.11	1299/1393	3.11	3.99	4.06	3.99	3.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	7	5	4	0	2.38	1323/1337	2.38	3.71	4.17	4.01	2.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	3	3	9	4	3	3.05	1283/1331	3.05	3.94	4.35	4.18	3.05
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	4	8	7	2	3.23	1288/1333	3.23	4.09	4.40	4.22	3.23
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	7	3	3	7	0	2.50	997/1014	2.50	3.44	4.05	3.91	2.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104Y 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment:	33
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog		Questionnaires:	24
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
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	2	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/180	****	4.21	4.20	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	3	1	1	0	0	1.60	****/194	****	4.03	4.17	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/178	****	4.73	4.47	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	****/181	****	4.49	4.40	4.54	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/165	****	4.28	4.12	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	3	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/62	****	3.46	4.46	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/65	****	3.25	4.43	4.13	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	****/63	****	2.83	4.29	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	1	3	0	0	1	2.40	****/61	****	2.75	4.47	4.61	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	****/61	****	2.92	4.19	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	3	0	0	2	0	2.20	****/40	****	****	3.85	3.17	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	2	1	2	0	0	2.00	****/40	****	****	3.89	3.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/32	****	****	4.30	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.57	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	2	1	3	0	0	2.17	35/39	2.17	2.17	4.00	3.52	2.17
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	3	1	2	0	0	1.83	22/22	1.83	1.83	4.12	3.23	1.83
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	1	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104Y 01
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Rheingans,Penny

Term - Fall 2012

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
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 01
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Park,John

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	193
Questionnaires:	76

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	4	14	18	37	4.08	1131/1589	4.18	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	6	23	44	4.44	704/1589	4.43	4.06	4.29	4.30	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	5	5	18	47	4.43	706/1391	4.29	4.18	4.34	4.36	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	3	3	8	15	30	4.12	998/1552	4.11	4.06	4.25	4.26	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	47	3	2	7	7	10	3.66	1221/1495	3.62	3.65	4.14	4.18	3.66
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	37	0	2	8	8	21	4.23	701/1457	4.26	4.02	4.15	4.14	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	3	4	4	18	45	4.32	748/1572	4.34	4.15	4.21	4.19	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	7	68	4.91	467/1589	4.92	4.69	4.66	4.63	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	2	0	6	28	28	4.25	694/1569	4.26	3.87	4.13	4.12	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	3	10	60	4.68	610/1530	4.66	4.30	4.49	4.47	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	6	67	4.87	700/1533	4.83	4.65	4.75	4.78	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	11	14	49	4.47	743/1528	4.41	4.00	4.35	4.35	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	10	17	42	4.24	1012/1529	4.33	3.98	4.36	4.39	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	3	1	12	14	36	4.20	640/1393	4.23	3.99	4.06	4.13	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	3	6	20	28	4.17	730/1337	4.15	3.71	4.17	4.16	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	9	5	12	8	26	3.62	1196/1331	3.81	3.94	4.35	4.32	3.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	5	3	12	13	26	3.88	1080/1333	3.97	4.09	4.40	4.39	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	16	48	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	****/1014	4.13	3.44	4.05	4.03	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment:	193
Title:	Computer Science I		Questionnaires:	76
Instructor:	Park,John			

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	68	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	****/180	****	4.21	4.20	4.50	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	68	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	****/194	****	4.03	4.17	4.12	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	68	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	****/178	****	4.73	4.47	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	68	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	****/181	****	4.49	4.40	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	68	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/165	****	4.28	4.12	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	74	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/62	****	3.46	4.46	4.07	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	74	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	3.25	4.43	4.06	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	74	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	2.83	4.29	3.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	74	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/61	****	2.75	4.47	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	74	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/61	****	2.92	4.19	4.26	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	74	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/40	****	****	3.85	3.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	74	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/40	****	****	3.89	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	74	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	74	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	3.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	74	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	74	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/39	****	2.17	4.00	4.01	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	74	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/22	****	1.83	4.12	3.93	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	74	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 01
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Park,John

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	193
Questionnaires:	76

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	74	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/19	****	****	4.44	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	74	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/16	****	****	4.25	4.56	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	18	0.00-0.99 3	A 42	Required for Majors 69	Graduate 0 Major 37
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 24		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 1	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 76 Non-major 39
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	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 201 09
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Lupoli,Shawn V

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	140
Questionnaires:	72

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	4	2	7	14	43	4.29	929/1589	4.18	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	2	9	16	42	4.42	734/1589	4.43	4.06	4.29	4.30	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	5	12	19	32	4.15	971/1391	4.29	4.18	4.34	4.36	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	14	2	4	9	11	29	4.11	1009/1552	4.11	4.06	4.25	4.26	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	43	5	0	5	4	10	3.58	1262/1495	3.62	3.65	4.14	4.18	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	32	0	2	5	8	19	4.29	639/1457	4.26	4.02	4.15	4.14	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	1	1	1	11	13	40	4.36	697/1572	4.34	4.15	4.21	4.19	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	1	0	0	1	65	4.93	373/1589	4.92	4.69	4.66	4.63	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	3	1	1	6	20	26	4.28	670/1569	4.26	3.87	4.13	4.12	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	1	2	10	53	4.63	694/1530	4.66	4.30	4.49	4.47	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	3	8	56	4.79	889/1533	4.83	4.65	4.75	4.78	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	2	7	15	41	4.36	883/1528	4.41	4.00	4.35	4.35	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	2	9	11	44	4.42	840/1529	4.33	3.98	4.36	4.39	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	2	1	10	17	35	4.26	577/1393	4.23	3.99	4.06	4.13	4.26
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	3	3	9	14	32	4.13	752/1337	4.15	3.71	4.17	4.16	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	3	2	14	15	27	4.00	989/1331	3.81	3.94	4.35	4.32	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	4	3	11	9	32	4.05	992/1333	3.97	4.09	4.40	4.39	4.05
4. Were special techniques successful	12	29	3	0	3	9	16	4.13	491/1014	4.13	3.44	4.05	4.03	4.13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 09
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Lupoli,Shawn V

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	140
Questionnaires:	72

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	58	0	0	2	2	3	7	4.07	****/180	****	4.21	4.20	4.50	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	58	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	****/194	****	4.03	4.17	4.12	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	1	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	****/178	****	4.73	4.47	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	59	1	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	****/181	****	4.49	4.40	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	58	7	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	****/165	****	4.28	4.12	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	67	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/62	****	3.46	4.46	4.07	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	67	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/65	****	3.25	4.43	4.06	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	67	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/63	****	2.83	4.29	3.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	67	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/61	****	2.75	4.47	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	67	1	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/61	****	2.92	4.19	4.26	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	67	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/40	****	****	3.85	3.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	67	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/40	****	****	3.89	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	67	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	67	1	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	3.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	67	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	68	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/39	****	2.17	4.00	4.01	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	68	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/22	****	1.83	4.12	3.93	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	68	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 09
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Lupoli,Shawn V

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	140
Questionnaires:	72

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	68	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/19	****	****	4.44	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	68	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	4.56	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	4	A	29	Required for Majors	61	Graduate	0	Major	35
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	24						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	6	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	72	Non-major	37
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 01
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Morawski,Maksym

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	557/1589	4.25	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	912/1589	4.18	4.06	4.29	4.30	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	780/1391	4.18	4.18	4.34	4.36	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	795/1552	4.01	4.06	4.25	4.26	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	899/1495	3.89	3.65	4.14	4.18	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	732/1457	4.21	4.02	4.15	4.14	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	2	8	4.14	968/1572	4.28	4.15	4.21	4.19	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	901/1589	4.57	4.69	4.66	4.63	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	957/1569	3.84	3.87	4.13	4.12	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	6	0	6	3.85	1406/1530	4.12	4.30	4.49	4.47	3.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	757/1533	4.67	4.65	4.75	4.78	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	2	6	3.92	1238/1528	4.01	4.00	4.35	4.35	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	1089/1529	4.04	3.98	4.36	4.39	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	674/1393	4.08	3.99	4.06	4.13	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	759/1337	3.83	3.71	4.17	4.16	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	736/1331	3.73	3.94	4.35	4.32	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	802/1333	3.93	4.09	4.40	4.39	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	1004/1014	3.13	3.44	4.05	4.03	2.25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 01
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Morawski,Maksym

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	41
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	1	0	1	4.00	****/180	4.27	4.21	4.20	4.50	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/194	4.05	4.03	4.17	4.12	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/178	4.64	4.73	4.47	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/181	4.49	4.49	4.40	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/165	4.28	4.28	4.12	4.42	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 04
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Mitchell,Susan

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	41
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	2	5	9	4	3.75	1391/1589	4.25	4.11	4.32	4.33	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	7	4	4	4	3.15	1542/1589	4.18	4.06	4.29	4.30	3.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	6	6	2	3.15	1349/1391	4.18	4.18	4.34	4.36	3.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	1	2	7	4	3.47	1435/1552	4.01	4.06	4.25	4.26	3.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1495	3.89	3.65	4.14	4.18	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	2	3	1	4	3.70	1172/1457	4.21	4.02	4.15	4.14	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	4	10	4.05	1050/1572	4.28	4.15	4.21	4.19	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	2	0	0	16	2	3.80	1556/1589	4.57	4.69	4.66	4.63	3.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	3	0	7	4	1	3.00	1508/1569	3.84	3.87	4.13	4.12	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	5	5	7	3.89	1388/1530	4.12	4.30	4.49	4.47	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	1467/1533	4.67	4.65	4.75	4.78	4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	3	6	4	4	3.26	1459/1528	4.01	4.00	4.35	4.35	3.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	3	3	5	4	3.11	1483/1529	4.04	3.98	4.36	4.39	3.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	6	0	3	4	3.07	1303/1393	4.08	3.99	4.06	4.13	3.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	778/1337	3.83	3.71	4.17	4.16	4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	2	1	4	2	3.18	1267/1331	3.73	3.94	4.35	4.32	3.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	3	1	1	6	3.91	1069/1333	3.93	4.09	4.40	4.39	3.91
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/1014	3.13	3.44	4.05	4.03	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 04
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Mitchell,Susan

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	41
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	10	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	40/180	4.27	4.21	4.20	4.50	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	59/194	4.05	4.03	4.17	4.12	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	77/178	4.64	4.73	4.47	4.63	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/181	4.49	4.49	4.40	4.55	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	4	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	26/165	4.28	4.28	4.12	4.42	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	8
84-150	1	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				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 07
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Tang,Jason

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	23

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	3	6	13	4.30	910/1589	4.25	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	12	4.35	840/1589	4.18	4.06	4.29	4.30	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	12	4.30	828/1391	4.18	4.18	4.34	4.36	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	900/1552	4.01	4.06	4.25	4.26	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	1019/1495	3.89	3.65	4.14	4.18	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	768/1457	4.21	4.02	4.15	4.14	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	4	14	4.35	723/1572	4.28	4.15	4.21	4.19	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	3	19	4.74	863/1589	4.57	4.69	4.66	4.63	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	1	12	4	4.06	918/1569	3.84	3.87	4.13	4.12	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	858/1530	4.12	4.30	4.49	4.47	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	814/1533	4.67	4.65	4.75	4.78	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	9	12	4.43	780/1528	4.01	4.00	4.35	4.35	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	3	15	4.50	739/1529	4.04	3.98	4.36	4.39	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	2	2	2	13	4.37	478/1393	4.08	3.99	4.06	4.13	4.37
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	5	4	5	3.87	951/1337	3.83	3.71	4.17	4.16	3.87
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	3	3	7	3.93	1054/1331	3.73	3.94	4.35	4.32	3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	4	5	5	3.87	1091/1333	3.93	4.09	4.40	4.39	3.87
4. Were special techniques successful	8	7	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	554/1014	3.13	3.44	4.05	4.03	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 07
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Tang,Jason

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	23

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	14	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	92/180	4.27	4.21	4.20	4.50	4.22
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	141/194	4.05	4.03	4.17	4.12	3.89
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	3	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	99/178	4.64	4.73	4.47	4.63	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	130/181	4.49	4.49	4.40	4.55	4.22
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	3	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	94/165	4.28	4.28	4.12	4.42	4.17
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/62	****	3.46	4.46	4.07	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/65	****	3.25	4.43	4.06	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/63	****	2.83	4.29	3.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/61	****	2.75	4.47	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/61	****	2.92	4.19	4.26	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/40	****	****	3.85	3.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/40	****	****	3.89	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	3.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/39	****	2.17	4.00	4.01	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/22	****	1.83	4.12	3.93	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 07
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Tang,Jason

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	23

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	21	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/19	****	****	4.44	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	4.56	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 20	Graduate 0 Major 7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 23 Non-major 16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	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 202 10
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Morawski,Maksym

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	5	15	4.42	766/1589	4.25	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	9	14	4.54	555/1589	4.18	4.06	4.29	4.30	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	5	17	4.58	505/1391	4.18	4.18	4.34	4.36	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	0	2	7	10	4.25	847/1552	4.01	4.06	4.25	4.26	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	15	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	899/1495	3.89	3.65	4.14	4.18	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	154/1457	4.21	4.02	4.15	4.14	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	540/1572	4.28	4.15	4.21	4.19	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	749/1589	4.57	4.69	4.66	4.63	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	3	6	11	4.14	841/1569	3.84	3.87	4.13	4.12	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	7	8	7	3.83	1409/1530	4.12	4.30	4.49	4.47	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	671/1533	4.67	4.65	4.75	4.78	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	4	8	10	4.04	1147/1528	4.01	4.00	4.35	4.35	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	5	15	4.33	924/1529	4.04	3.98	4.36	4.39	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	221/1393	4.08	3.99	4.06	4.13	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	7	5	4.07	788/1337	3.83	3.71	4.17	4.16	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	3	2	7	3.93	1063/1331	3.73	3.94	4.35	4.32	3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	6	3	5	3.93	1056/1333	3.93	4.09	4.40	4.39	3.93
4. Were special techniques successful	11	10	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1014	3.13	3.44	4.05	4.03	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 202 10		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 26				
Title: Computer Science II										Questionnaires: 25				
Instructor: Morawski,Maksym														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	****/180	4.27	4.21	4.20	4.50	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/194	4.05	4.03	4.17	4.12	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/178	4.64	4.73	4.47	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	1	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/181	4.49	4.49	4.40	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	2	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/165	4.28	4.28	4.12	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	3.46	4.46	4.07	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	3.25	4.43	4.06	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	2.83	4.29	3.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	2.75	4.47	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	2.92	4.19	4.26	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	****	3.85	3.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	****	3.89	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	3.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	2.17	4.00	4.01	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	1.83	4.12	3.93	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 10
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Morawski,Maksym

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	4.56	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 13
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Romano,Ross

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1005/1589	4.25	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	540/1589	4.18	4.06	4.29	4.30	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	600/1391	4.18	4.18	4.34	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1268/1552	4.01	4.06	4.25	4.26	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1215/1495	3.89	3.65	4.14	4.18	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1457	4.21	4.02	4.15	4.14	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	647/1572	4.28	4.15	4.21	4.19	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	730/1589	4.57	4.69	4.66	4.63	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	957/1569	3.84	3.87	4.13	4.12	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	887/1530	4.12	4.30	4.49	4.47	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	1047/1533	4.67	4.65	4.75	4.78	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	817/1528	4.01	4.00	4.35	4.35	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	1129/1529	4.04	3.98	4.36	4.39	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	697/1393	4.08	3.99	4.06	4.13	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	5	1	1	3.00	1271/1337	3.83	3.71	4.17	4.16	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	1261/1331	3.73	3.94	4.35	4.32	3.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1220/1333	3.93	4.09	4.40	4.39	3.56
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1014	3.13	3.44	4.05	4.03	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 13
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Romano,Ross

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	30
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	6	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	113/180	4.27	4.21	4.20	4.50	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	158/194	4.05	4.03	4.17	4.12	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	59/178	4.64	4.73	4.47	4.63	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	126/181	4.49	4.49	4.40	4.55	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	105/165	4.28	4.28	4.12	4.42	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/39	****	2.17	4.00	4.01	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	1.83	4.12	3.93	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	4.56	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors	9	Graduate 0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6					
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General	0	Under-grad 10	Non-major	5
84-150	0	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 1					
			I 0	Other	1			
			? 0					

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 01
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	LaBerge,E F

Term - Fall 2012

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	0	4	10	18	4.44	739/1589	3.82	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	22	4.66	411/1589	3.89	4.06	4.29	4.30	4.66
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	22	4.63	455/1391	4.22	4.18	4.34	4.36	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	0	7	18	4.62	394/1552	3.85	4.06	4.25	4.26	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	0	7	7	9	3.96	959/1495	3.55	3.65	4.14	4.18	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	5	3	9	4.24	701/1457	4.05	4.02	4.15	4.14	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	7	24	4.72	278/1572	4.11	4.15	4.21	4.19	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	25	4.81	730/1589	4.71	4.69	4.66	4.63	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	10	20	4.67	241/1569	3.62	3.87	4.13	4.12	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	26	4.84	346/1530	4.08	4.30	4.49	4.47	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	410/1533	4.45	4.65	4.75	4.78	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	23	4.68	464/1528	3.72	4.00	4.35	4.35	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	23	4.65	558/1529	3.92	3.98	4.36	4.39	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	0	11	15	4.58	290/1393	4.05	3.99	4.06	4.13	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	510/1337	3.61	3.71	4.17	4.16	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	766/1331	3.73	3.94	4.35	4.32	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	749/1333	3.99	4.09	4.40	4.39	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	23	2	1	1	0	4	1	3.43	****/1014	2.90	3.44	4.05	4.03	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 01
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	LaBerge,E F

Term - Fall 2012

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
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/180	****	4.21	4.20	4.50	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.03	4.17	4.12	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/178	****	4.73	4.47	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/181	****	4.49	4.40	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	4.28	4.12	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	3.46	4.46	4.07	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 02
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	LaBerge,E F

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	41
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	1	2	3	8	11	4.04	1153/1589	3.82	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	9	11	4.20	996/1589	3.89	4.06	4.29	4.30	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	6	12	4.16	954/1391	4.22	4.18	4.34	4.36	4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	1	5	6	2	3.64	1362/1552	3.85	4.06	4.25	4.26	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	1	10	3	3	3.33	1381/1495	3.55	3.65	4.14	4.18	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	835/1457	4.05	4.02	4.15	4.14	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	7	15	4.50	495/1572	4.11	4.15	4.21	4.19	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	14	4.58	1032/1589	4.71	4.69	4.66	4.63	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	4	5	13	4.30	634/1569	3.62	3.87	4.13	4.12	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	1	7	14	4.28	1145/1530	4.08	4.30	4.49	4.47	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	757/1533	4.45	4.65	4.75	4.78	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	3	9	11	4.16	1065/1528	3.72	4.00	4.35	4.35	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	7	14	4.28	974/1529	3.92	3.98	4.36	4.39	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	3	7	11	4.23	611/1393	4.05	3.99	4.06	4.13	4.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1337	3.61	3.71	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1331	3.73	3.94	4.35	4.32	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 02
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	LaBerge,E F

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1333	3.99	4.09	4.40	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	C 5	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 4	D 1						
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	1				
			? 2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 03
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Morris,Joel M

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	37
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	1	0	1	5	5	5	4	3.30	1540/1589	3.82	4.11	4.32	4.33	3.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	6	5	6	3	3.19	1537/1589	3.89	4.06	4.29	4.30	3.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	8	5	3.76	1208/1391	4.22	4.18	4.34	4.36	3.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	5	6	3	2	3.13	1505/1552	3.85	4.06	4.25	4.26	3.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	6	3	7	3.68	1203/1495	3.55	3.65	4.14	4.18	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	4	2	3	4	3.36	1332/1457	4.05	4.02	4.15	4.14	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	7	3	8	3.67	1334/1572	4.11	4.15	4.21	4.19	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	11	7	4.25	1349/1589	4.71	4.69	4.66	4.63	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	3	6	3	1	3.00	1508/1569	3.62	3.87	4.13	4.12	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	5	4	6	2	2.95	1515/1530	4.08	4.30	4.49	4.47	2.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	2	6	8	3	3.50	1520/1533	4.45	4.65	4.75	4.78	3.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	6	5	4	1	2.60	1512/1528	3.72	4.00	4.35	4.35	2.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	8	2	2	6	2	2.60	1511/1529	3.92	3.98	4.36	4.39	2.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	3	2	1	5	7	3.61	1083/1393	4.05	3.99	4.06	4.13	3.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	3	2	2	1	2	2.70	1308/1337	3.61	3.71	4.17	4.16	2.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	2	3	1	4	3.70	1161/1331	3.73	3.94	4.35	4.32	3.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1007/1333	3.99	4.09	4.40	4.39	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	2	2	3	1	2	2.90	969/1014	2.90	3.44	4.05	4.03	2.90

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 03	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment:	37
Title:	Discrete Structures		Questionnaires:	21
Instructor:	Morris,Joel M			

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	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/180	****	4.21	4.20	4.50	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/194	****	4.03	4.17	4.12	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/178	****	4.73	4.47	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.49	4.40	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	4.28	4.12	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	3.46	4.46	4.07	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	3.25	4.43	4.06	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	2.83	4.29	3.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	2.75	4.47	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	2.92	4.19	4.26	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/40	****	****	3.85	3.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/40	****	****	3.89	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	3.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/39	****	2.17	4.00	4.01	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/22	****	1.83	4.12	3.93	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 03
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Morris,Joel M

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	37
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	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	4.56	****

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 8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 5	General 1	Under-grad 21 Non-major 13
84-150	1	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 1	
			? 6		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 04
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Yesha,Yaacov

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	40
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	3	4	6	6	6	3.32	1536/1589	3.82	4.11	4.32	4.33	3.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	2	4	7	9	3.68	1410/1589	3.89	4.06	4.29	4.30	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	1	3	18	4.40	733/1391	4.22	4.18	4.34	4.36	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	1	3	5	10	4.10	1009/1552	3.85	4.06	4.25	4.26	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	4	5	5	7	3.28	1396/1495	3.55	3.65	4.14	4.18	3.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	1	1	3	2	9	4.06	848/1457	4.05	4.02	4.15	4.14	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	4	4	14	4.08	1023/1572	4.11	4.15	4.21	4.19	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	373/1589	4.71	4.69	4.66	4.63	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	3	6	6	3	3.37	1428/1569	3.62	3.87	4.13	4.12	3.37
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	3	0	3	5	12	4.00	1319/1530	4.08	4.30	4.49	4.47	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	2	4	17	4.50	1261/1533	4.45	4.65	4.75	4.78	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	4	1	1	6	11	3.83	1299/1528	3.72	4.00	4.35	4.35	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	1	5	13	4.23	1031/1529	3.92	3.98	4.36	4.39	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	2	0	6	4	8	3.80	965/1393	4.05	3.99	4.06	4.13	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	3	0	1	3	3	3.30	1215/1337	3.61	3.71	4.17	4.16	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	0	3	2	3	3.40	1236/1331	3.73	3.94	4.35	4.32	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	2	0	2	0	4	3.50	1231/1333	3.99	4.09	4.40	4.39	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	16	5	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/1014	2.90	3.44	4.05	4.03	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 04
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Yesha,Yaacov

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/180	****	4.21	4.20	4.50	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	4.03	4.17	4.12	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/178	****	4.73	4.47	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.49	4.40	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	4.28	4.12	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	3.46	4.46	4.07	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	3.25	4.43	4.06	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	2.83	4.29	3.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	2.75	4.47	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	2.92	4.19	4.26	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/40	****	****	3.85	3.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/40	****	****	3.89	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	3.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/39	****	2.17	4.00	4.01	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/22	****	1.83	4.12	3.93	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 04
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Yesha,Yaacov

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	40
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	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	4.56	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 20	Graduate 0 Major 8
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 1	B 7		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General 2	Under-grad 26 Non-major 18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 05
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Menyuk,Curtis R

Term - Fall 2012

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	1	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1182/1589	3.82	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1393/1589	3.89	4.06	4.29	4.30	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	971/1391	4.22	4.18	4.34	4.36	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1301/1552	3.85	4.06	4.25	4.26	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1307/1495	3.55	3.65	4.14	4.18	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	400/1457	4.05	4.02	4.15	4.14	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1378/1572	4.11	4.15	4.21	4.19	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1589	4.71	4.69	4.66	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1541/1569	3.62	3.87	4.13	4.12	2.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1095/1530	4.08	4.30	4.49	4.47	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1261/1533	4.45	4.65	4.75	4.78	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1446/1528	3.72	4.00	4.35	4.35	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1294/1529	3.92	3.98	4.36	4.39	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	823/1337	3.61	3.71	4.17	4.16	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	1219/1331	3.73	3.94	4.35	4.32	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1007/1333	3.99	4.09	4.40	4.39	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1014	2.90	3.44	4.05	4.03	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/194	****	4.03	4.17	4.12	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 05
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Menyuk, Curtis R

Term - Fall 2012

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
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	3.46	4.46	4.07	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/40	****	****	3.85	3.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	****	3.89	3.86	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	2.17	4.00	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 0	Required for Majors	6	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5				
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General	0	Under-grad 8	Non-major 7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 1				
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 304 01
Title:	Social/Ethical Iss In IT
Instructor:	Wilson,Richard

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	83
Questionnaires:	46

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	8	6	6	15	11	3.33	1536/1589	3.33	4.11	4.32	4.33	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	3	6	15	17	3.78	1341/1589	3.78	4.06	4.29	4.26	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	35	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	****/1391	****	4.18	4.34	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	3	4	3	16	16	3.90	1186/1552	3.90	4.06	4.25	4.24	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	22	3	0	5	11	5	3.63	1239/1495	3.63	3.65	4.14	4.11	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	1	4	16	19	4.02	873/1457	4.02	4.02	4.15	4.13	4.02
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	6	3	8	10	17	3.66	1339/1572	3.66	4.15	4.21	4.18	3.66
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	13	31	4.70	920/1589	4.70	4.69	4.66	4.67	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	4	4	16	9	7	3.28	1456/1569	3.28	3.87	4.13	4.10	3.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	5	4	7	17	11	3.57	1460/1530	3.57	4.30	4.49	4.49	3.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	13	29	4.61	1167/1533	4.61	4.65	4.75	4.75	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	4	10	15	11	3.57	1395/1528	3.57	4.00	4.35	4.33	3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	10	1	11	9	13	3.32	1448/1529	3.32	3.98	4.36	4.34	3.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	13	3	1	6	12	8	3.70	1036/1393	3.70	3.99	4.06	4.10	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	****/1337	****	3.71	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	39	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	****/1331	****	3.94	4.35	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	39	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/1333	****	4.09	4.40	4.41	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 304 01
Title:	Social/Ethical Iss In IT
Instructor:	Wilson,Richard

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	83
Questionnaires:	46

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	39	2	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	****/1014	****	3.44	4.05	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	42	Required for Majors	41	Graduate	0	Major	31
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	46	Non-major	15
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	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 313 01
Title:	Comp Organ & Assemb Lang
Instructor:	Chang,Richard

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	43
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	435/1589	4.68	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	540/1589	4.55	4.06	4.29	4.26	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	330/1391	4.69	4.18	4.34	4.30	4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	286/1552	4.76	4.06	4.25	4.24	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	899/1495	3.61	3.65	4.14	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	400/1457	4.52	4.02	4.15	4.13	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	152/1572	4.78	4.15	4.21	4.18	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	280/1589	4.97	4.69	4.66	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	646/1569	4.46	3.87	4.13	4.10	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	1	15	4.67	644/1530	4.75	4.30	4.49	4.49	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1533	4.94	4.65	4.75	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	1	13	4.44	768/1528	4.44	4.00	4.35	4.33	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	677/1529	4.42	3.98	4.36	4.34	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	1	14	4.65	236/1393	4.53	3.99	4.06	4.10	4.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1337	****	3.71	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1331	****	3.94	4.35	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1333	****	4.09	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1014	****	3.44	4.05	4.04	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 313 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 43
Title: Comp Organ & Assemb Lang		Questionnaires: 18
Instructor: Chang,Richard		

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	****/194	****	4.03	4.17	4.05	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	2
84-150	4	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				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 313 02
Title:	Comp Organ & Assemb Lang
Instructor:	Chang,Richard

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	43
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	393/1589	4.68	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	17	4.54	569/1589	4.55	4.06	4.29	4.26	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	416/1391	4.69	4.18	4.34	4.30	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	177/1552	4.76	4.06	4.25	4.24	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	2	3	2	4	3	3.21	1413/1495	3.61	3.65	4.14	4.11	3.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	372/1457	4.52	4.02	4.15	4.13	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	255/1572	4.78	4.15	4.21	4.18	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1589	4.97	4.69	4.66	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	272/1569	4.46	3.87	4.13	4.10	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	329/1530	4.75	4.30	4.49	4.49	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	23	4.88	643/1533	4.94	4.65	4.75	4.75	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	8	14	4.44	768/1528	4.44	4.00	4.35	4.33	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	5	2	16	4.28	974/1529	4.42	3.98	4.36	4.34	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	3	5	15	4.42	426/1393	4.53	3.99	4.06	4.10	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1337	****	3.71	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1331	****	3.94	4.35	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1333	****	4.09	4.40	4.41	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 313 02
Title:	Comp Organ & Assemb Lang
Instructor:	Chang,Richard

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	43
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	24	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1014	****	3.44	4.05	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	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				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 331 01
Title:	Prin Of Prog Languages
Instructor:	Lupoli,Shawn V

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	36

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	10	23	4.47	686/1589	4.31	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	7	13	11	3.81	1326/1589	4.07	4.06	4.29	4.26	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	7	10	12	3	3.08	1358/1391	3.78	4.18	4.34	4.30	3.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	2	10	16	3	3.56	1397/1552	3.94	4.06	4.25	4.24	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	20	1	3	6	3	3	3.25	1404/1495	3.32	3.65	4.14	4.11	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	1	2	5	6	8	3.82	1078/1457	3.80	4.02	4.15	4.13	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	4	13	11	5	3.31	1464/1572	3.86	4.15	4.21	4.18	3.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	1	0	2	32	4.86	598/1589	4.89	4.69	4.66	4.67	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	2	8	14	3	3.57	1333/1569	3.97	3.87	4.13	4.10	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	7	11	15	4.11	1273/1530	4.27	4.30	4.49	4.49	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	11	22	4.57	1205/1533	4.74	4.65	4.75	4.75	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	9	16	7	3.71	1350/1528	4.10	4.00	4.35	4.33	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	1	5	12	13	3.83	1300/1529	4.13	3.98	4.36	4.34	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	3	1	6	12	14	3.92	900/1393	4.13	3.99	4.06	4.10	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	2	1	3	2	1	2.89	1285/1337	2.89	3.71	4.17	4.20	2.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1117/1331	3.82	3.94	4.35	4.35	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	1124/1333	3.80	4.09	4.40	4.41	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	25	2	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	499/1014	4.11	3.44	4.05	4.04	4.11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 331 01
Title:	Prin Of Prog Languages
Instructor:	Lupoli,Shawn V

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	36

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	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/180	****	4.21	4.20	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	33
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 22		
56-83	10	2.00-2.99 4	C 1	General	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 13	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 331 03
Title:	Prin Of Prog Languages
Instructor:	Nicholas,Charle

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	48
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	11	10	4.15	1057/1589	4.31	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	10	11	4.33	853/1589	4.07	4.06	4.29	4.26	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	11	13	4.48	626/1391	3.78	4.18	4.34	4.30	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	782/1552	3.94	4.06	4.25	4.24	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	3	2	4	8	4	3.38	1364/1495	3.32	3.65	4.14	4.11	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	2	0	1	7	4	3.79	1104/1457	3.80	4.02	4.15	4.13	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	1	9	13	4.42	631/1572	3.86	4.15	4.21	4.18	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	373/1589	4.89	4.69	4.66	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	1	1	7	10	4.37	559/1569	3.97	3.87	4.13	4.10	4.37
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	7	13	4.43	977/1530	4.27	4.30	4.49	4.49	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	527/1533	4.74	4.65	4.75	4.75	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	1	6	15	4.48	731/1528	4.10	4.00	4.35	4.33	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	8	13	4.43	818/1529	4.13	3.98	4.36	4.34	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	489/1393	4.13	3.99	4.06	4.10	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/1337	2.89	3.71	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1331	3.82	3.94	4.35	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1333	3.80	4.09	4.40	4.41	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 331 03
Title:	Prin Of Prog Languages
Instructor:	Nicholas,Charle

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	48
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	22	1	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1014	4.11	3.44	4.05	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	7
84-150	2	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				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 341 01
Title:	Data Structures
Instructor:	Peng, Yun

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	5	3	6	3.65	1448/1589	4.09	4.11	4.32	4.33	3.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	6	5	2	3.18	1539/1589	3.83	4.06	4.29	4.26	3.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	7	6	3.94	1113/1391	4.11	4.18	4.34	4.30	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	0	2	7	2	3.54	1409/1552	3.93	4.06	4.25	4.24	3.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1420/1495	3.54	3.65	4.14	4.11	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	1129/1457	3.97	4.02	4.15	4.13	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	3	9	4.06	1050/1572	4.12	4.15	4.21	4.18	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1589	4.91	4.69	4.66	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	3	3	6	2	0	2.50	1551/1569	3.48	3.87	4.13	4.10	2.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	7	4	3	3.41	1481/1530	4.01	4.30	4.49	4.49	3.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	4	5	7	4.06	1471/1533	4.37	4.65	4.75	4.75	4.06
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	5	6	2	3	1	2.35	1521/1528	3.46	4.00	4.35	4.33	2.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	5	5	2	2	2.71	1504/1529	3.56	3.98	4.36	4.34	2.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	4	4	3	1	2	2.50	1367/1393	3.52	3.99	4.06	4.10	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1337	2.67	3.71	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/1331	3.33	3.94	4.35	4.35	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 341 01
Title:	Data Structures
Instructor:	Peng, Yun

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1333	3.83	4.09	4.40	4.41	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	6	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	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				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 341 02
Title:	Data Structures
Instructor:	Chen,Jian

Term - Fall 2012

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	0	0	2	3	5	9	7	3.62	1460/1589	4.09	4.11	4.32	4.33	3.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	5	5	8	5	3.27	1525/1589	3.83	4.06	4.29	4.26	3.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	3	12	6	3.69	1235/1391	4.11	4.18	4.34	4.30	3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	4	4	8	4	3.48	1435/1552	3.93	4.06	4.25	4.24	3.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	2	0	3	4	2	3.36	1371/1495	3.54	3.65	4.14	4.11	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	0	4	8	2	3.67	1194/1457	3.97	4.02	4.15	4.13	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	3	6	12	3.85	1233/1572	4.12	4.15	4.21	4.18	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	730/1589	4.91	4.69	4.66	4.67	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	4	9	7	1	3.04	1502/1569	3.48	3.87	4.13	4.10	3.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	5	9	8	4	3.42	1480/1530	4.01	4.30	4.49	4.49	3.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	3	1	8	14	4.27	1421/1533	4.37	4.65	4.75	4.75	4.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	6	7	8	2	3.00	1482/1528	3.46	4.00	4.35	4.33	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	5	8	5	4	3.00	1489/1529	3.56	3.98	4.36	4.34	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	2	6	4	8	3	3.17	1277/1393	3.52	3.99	4.06	4.10	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	4	0	1	0	1	2.00	****/1337	2.67	3.71	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	1	3	1	0	1	2.50	****/1331	3.33	3.94	4.35	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	1	3	2	0	0	2.17	****/1333	3.83	4.09	4.40	4.41	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 341 02
Title:	Data Structures
Instructor:	Chen,Jian

Term - Fall 2012

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
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	20	5	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1014	****	3.44	4.05	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 25	Graduate 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 2	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 341 03
Title:	Data Structures
Instructor:	Hood, Daniel J

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	40
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	1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	435/1589	4.09	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	378/1589	3.83	4.06	4.29	4.26	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	442/1391	4.11	4.18	4.34	4.30	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	2	12	4.39	693/1552	3.93	4.06	4.25	4.24	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	744/1495	3.54	3.65	4.14	4.11	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	344/1457	3.97	4.02	4.15	4.13	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	4	10	4.21	899/1572	4.12	4.15	4.21	4.18	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	493/1589	4.91	4.69	4.66	4.67	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	241/1569	3.48	3.87	4.13	4.10	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	610/1530	4.01	4.30	4.49	4.49	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	907/1533	4.37	4.65	4.75	4.75	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	377/1528	3.46	4.00	4.35	4.33	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	282/1529	3.56	3.98	4.36	4.34	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	236/1393	3.52	3.99	4.06	4.10	4.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1337	2.67	3.71	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1331	3.33	3.94	4.35	4.35	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 341 03
Title:	Data Structures
Instructor:	Hood, Daniel J

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1333	3.83	4.09	4.40	4.41	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	11
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	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				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 341 04
Title:	Data Structures
Instructor:	Peng, Yun

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	34
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	1	8	8	4.41	766/1589	4.09	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	5	4.18	1024/1589	3.83	4.06	4.29	4.26	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	9	5	4.19	937/1391	4.11	4.18	4.34	4.30	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	10	5	4.33	756/1552	3.93	4.06	4.25	4.24	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	0	3	4	1	3.44	1337/1495	3.54	3.65	4.14	4.11	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	986/1457	3.97	4.02	4.15	4.13	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	710/1572	4.12	4.15	4.21	4.18	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	327/1589	4.91	4.69	4.66	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	3	8	1	3.69	1256/1569	3.48	3.87	4.13	4.10	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	858/1530	4.01	4.30	4.49	4.49	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	1378/1533	4.37	4.65	4.75	4.75	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	2	7	5	3.76	1328/1528	3.46	4.00	4.35	4.33	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	6	5	3.71	1356/1529	3.56	3.98	4.36	4.34	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	1000/1393	3.52	3.99	4.06	4.10	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	3	1	0	2.67	1310/1337	2.67	3.71	4.17	4.20	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1245/1331	3.33	3.94	4.35	4.35	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1107/1333	3.83	4.09	4.40	4.41	3.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 341 04
Title:	Data Structures
Instructor:	Peng, Yun

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	34
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1014	****	3.44	4.05	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 17
84-150	1	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	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 345 01
Title:	Software Design/Develop
Instructor:	Sidhu,Deepinder

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	23
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	1	0	2	0	1	5	10	4.17	1047/1589	3.75	4.11	4.32	4.33	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	3	9	3.94	1220/1589	3.90	4.06	4.29	4.26	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	541/1391	3.91	4.18	4.34	4.30	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	7	9	4.28	826/1552	3.84	4.06	4.25	4.24	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	1	3	1	4	3.60	1251/1495	3.27	3.65	4.14	4.11	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	4	6	6	3.94	953/1457	3.64	4.02	4.15	4.13	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	6	7	3.89	1204/1572	3.63	4.15	4.21	4.18	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	956/1589	3.53	4.69	4.66	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	1125/1569	3.61	3.87	4.13	4.10	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	801/1530	4.40	4.30	4.49	4.49	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	0	5	10	4.44	1323/1533	4.66	4.65	4.75	4.75	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	1050/1528	4.06	4.00	4.35	4.33	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	3	4	6	3.63	1381/1529	3.59	3.98	4.36	4.34	3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	620/1393	3.89	3.99	4.06	4.10	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1337	****	3.71	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1331	****	3.94	4.35	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1333	****	4.09	4.40	4.41	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 345 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 23
Title: Software Design/Develop		Questionnaires: 19
Instructor: Sidhu,Deepinder		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1014	****	3.44	4.05	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	4
84-150	1	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				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 345 03		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 30				
Title: Software Design/Develop										Questionnaires: 24				
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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	5	5	7	4	3.17	1554/1589	3.75	4.11	4.32	4.33	3.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	7	4	8	3.63	1437/1589	3.90	4.06	4.29	4.26	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	3	8	6	0	3.18	1345/1391	3.91	4.18	4.34	4.30	3.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	4	6	8	3	3.36	1477/1552	3.84	4.06	4.25	4.24	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	8	8	2	1	2.55	1482/1495	3.27	3.65	4.14	4.11	2.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	1	8	6	3	3.14	1393/1457	3.64	4.02	4.15	4.13	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	5	8	4	6	3.38	1446/1572	3.63	4.15	4.21	4.18	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	4	4	7	9	0	2.88	1586/1589	3.53	4.69	4.66	4.67	2.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	3	0	2	11	6	0	3.21	1473/1569	3.61	3.87	4.13	4.10	3.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	5	10	8	4.04	1303/1530	4.40	4.30	4.49	4.49	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	3	18	4.63	1154/1533	4.66	4.65	4.75	4.75	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	8	10	4	3.67	1367/1528	4.06	4.00	4.35	4.33	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	9	6	2	3.00	1489/1529	3.59	3.98	4.36	4.34	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	0	12	2	2	3.24	1257/1393	3.89	3.99	4.06	4.10	3.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1337	****	3.71	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1331	****	3.94	4.35	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1333	****	4.09	4.40	4.41	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 345 03
Title:	Software Design/Develop
Instructor:	Mitchell,Susan

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	30
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														
4. Were special techniques successful	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1014	****	3.44	4.05	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 24	Graduate 0 Major 24
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 6	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 24 Non-major 0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 8	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 345 04
Title:	Software Design/Develop
Instructor:	Mitchell,Susan

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	30
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	2	6	6	8	3.91	1294/1589	3.75	4.11	4.32	4.33	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	6	10	4.14	1063/1589	3.90	4.06	4.29	4.26	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	3	7	5	4.00	1061/1391	3.91	4.18	4.34	4.30	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	3	7	8	3.86	1218/1552	3.84	4.06	4.25	4.24	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	8	2	8	3.67	1215/1495	3.27	3.65	4.14	4.11	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	7	4	8	3.86	1042/1457	3.64	4.02	4.15	4.13	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	4	6	7	3.64	1350/1572	3.63	4.15	4.21	4.18	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	5	2	4	7	3	3.05	1582/1589	3.53	4.69	4.66	4.67	3.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	4	0	1	5	7	3	3.75	1209/1569	3.61	3.87	4.13	4.10	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	759/1530	4.40	4.30	4.49	4.49	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	586/1533	4.66	4.65	4.75	4.75	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	909/1528	4.06	4.00	4.35	4.33	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	9	8	4.14	1105/1529	3.59	3.98	4.36	4.34	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	5	4	9	4.22	611/1393	3.89	3.99	4.06	4.10	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1337	****	3.71	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1331	****	3.94	4.35	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1333	****	4.09	4.40	4.41	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 345 04
Title:	Software Design/Develop
Instructor:	Mitchell,Susan

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1014	****	3.44	4.05	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 17	Graduate 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		Major 18
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 22
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Non-major 4
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 411 01
Title:	Computer Architecture
Instructor:	Squire,Jon S

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	48
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	3	0	1	3	4	5	5	3.56	1483/1589	3.99	4.11	4.32	4.46	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	7	7	4.11	1082/1589	4.20	4.06	4.29	4.35	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	780/1391	4.43	4.18	4.34	4.46	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	5	0	2	1	2	8	4.23	868/1552	4.26	4.06	4.25	4.37	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	7	1	3	1	2	4	3.45	1332/1495	3.80	3.65	4.14	4.25	3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	6	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	835/1457	4.12	4.02	4.15	4.30	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	2	1	14	4.56	441/1572	4.51	4.15	4.21	4.28	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1589	4.98	4.69	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	5	4	4	3.79	1185/1569	4.18	3.87	4.13	4.22	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	0	4	12	4.44	964/1530	4.65	4.30	4.49	4.56	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	1221/1533	4.67	4.65	4.75	4.76	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	4	2	8	3.67	1367/1528	4.06	4.00	4.35	4.41	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	2	2	10	3.89	1263/1529	4.17	3.98	4.36	4.44	3.89

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 411 01
Title:	Computer Architecture
Instructor:	Squire,Jon S

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	48
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Lecture														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	2	0	2	4	8	4.00	796/1393	4.29	3.99	4.06	4.18	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 18	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		Major 13
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 21
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Non-major 8
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	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 411 02
Title:	Computer Architecture
Instructor:	Younis,Mohamed

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	4	2	20	4.43	753/1589	3.99	4.11	4.32	4.46	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	5	17	4.29	912/1589	4.20	4.06	4.29	4.35	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	7	18	4.50	600/1391	4.43	4.18	4.34	4.46	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	2	4	3	15	4.29	805/1552	4.26	4.06	4.25	4.37	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	0	3	7	9	4.15	794/1495	3.80	3.65	4.14	4.25	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	7	3	10	4.15	777/1457	4.12	4.02	4.15	4.30	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	6	18	4.46	555/1572	4.51	4.15	4.21	4.28	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	187/1589	4.98	4.69	4.66	4.68	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	312/1569	4.18	3.87	4.13	4.22	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	24	4.85	311/1530	4.65	4.30	4.49	4.56	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	924/1533	4.67	4.65	4.75	4.76	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	1	4	19	4.44	768/1528	4.06	4.00	4.35	4.41	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	2	3	20	4.44	806/1529	4.17	3.98	4.36	4.44	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	1	0	1	3	16	4.57	290/1393	4.29	3.99	4.06	4.18	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1337	****	3.71	4.17	4.36	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1331	****	3.94	4.35	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1333	****	4.09	4.40	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 411 02
Title:	Computer Architecture
Instructor:	Younis,Mohamed

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	26	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1014	****	3.44	4.05	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	15
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	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 421 01
Title:	Princ Of Oper Systems
Instructor:	Banerjee,Nilanj

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	46
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	0	0	0	1	2	11	20	4.47	686/1589	4.55	4.11	4.32	4.46	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	11	19	4.38	790/1589	4.26	4.06	4.29	4.35	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	9	15	4.03	1049/1391	4.23	4.18	4.34	4.46	4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	5	0	11	12	3.97	1123/1552	4.13	4.06	4.25	4.37	3.97
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	5	4	8	11	3.61	1245/1495	3.97	3.65	4.14	4.25	3.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	2	0	5	6	9	3.91	998/1457	4.10	4.02	4.15	4.30	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	12	20	4.53	473/1572	4.41	4.15	4.21	4.28	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	140/1589	4.97	4.69	4.66	4.68	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	4	10	14	4.20	754/1569	4.23	3.87	4.13	4.22	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	4	29	4.79	416/1530	4.72	4.30	4.49	4.56	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	176/1533	4.97	4.65	4.75	4.76	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	3	7	21	4.39	830/1528	4.40	4.00	4.35	4.41	4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	6	23	4.41	840/1529	4.38	3.98	4.36	4.44	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	5	9	18	4.41	435/1393	4.31	3.99	4.06	4.18	4.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1337	****	3.71	4.17	4.36	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1331	****	3.94	4.35	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1333	****	4.09	4.40	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 421 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 46
Title: Princ Of Oper Systems		Questionnaires: 34
Instructor: Banerjee,Nilanj		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	30	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1014	****	3.44	4.05	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 9 Required for Majors	31 Graduate	0 Major
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 4	C 8 General	0	34 Under-grad
84-150	18	3.00-3.49 9	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0 Electives	0	
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 1		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 421 03
Title:	Princ Of Oper Systems
Instructor:	Joshi,Anupam

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	46
Questionnaires:	36

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	11	24	4.64	477/1589	4.55	4.11	4.32	4.46	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	14	15	4.14	1063/1589	4.26	4.06	4.29	4.35	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	10	21	4.43	706/1391	4.23	4.18	4.34	4.46	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	6	9	15	4.30	795/1552	4.13	4.06	4.25	4.37	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	6	5	14	4.32	620/1495	3.97	3.65	4.14	4.25	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	5	10	13	4.29	649/1457	4.10	4.02	4.15	4.30	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	6	7	20	4.29	801/1572	4.41	4.15	4.21	4.28	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	34	4.97	140/1589	4.97	4.69	4.66	4.68	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	2	2	10	13	4.26	694/1569	4.23	3.87	4.13	4.22	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	6	26	4.65	677/1530	4.72	4.30	4.49	4.56	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	176/1533	4.97	4.65	4.75	4.76	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	10	20	4.41	804/1528	4.40	4.00	4.35	4.41	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	9	20	4.35	904/1529	4.38	3.98	4.36	4.44	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	2	3	7	16	4.21	629/1393	4.31	3.99	4.06	4.18	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1337	****	3.71	4.17	4.36	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	33	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1331	****	3.94	4.35	4.56	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 421 03	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 46
Title: Princ Of Oper Systems		Questionnaires: 36
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														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1333	****	4.09	4.40	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	34	Graduate	0	Major	28
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	36	Non-major	8
84-150	21	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 431 01
Title:	Compiler Design Princ
Instructor:	Oates,James T

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	41
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	0	0	1	5	22	4.75	316/1589	4.75	4.11	4.32	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	109/1589	4.93	4.06	4.29	4.35	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	22	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/1391	****	4.18	4.34	4.46	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	2	3	20	4.72	274/1552	4.72	4.06	4.25	4.37	4.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	6	3	11	4.25	693/1495	4.25	3.65	4.14	4.25	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	278/1457	4.63	4.02	4.15	4.30	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	4	23	4.75	233/1572	4.75	4.15	4.21	4.28	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	598/1589	4.86	4.69	4.66	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	144/1569	4.83	3.87	4.13	4.22	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	179/1530	4.93	4.30	4.49	4.56	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	235/1533	4.96	4.65	4.75	4.76	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	227/1528	4.85	4.00	4.35	4.41	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	257/1529	4.86	3.98	4.36	4.44	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	1	0	1	5	12	4.42	417/1393	4.42	3.99	4.06	4.18	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/1337	****	3.71	4.17	4.36	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1331	****	3.94	4.35	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1333	****	4.09	4.40	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 431 01
Title:	Compiler Design Princ
Instructor:	Oates,James T

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	24	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1014	****	3.44	4.05	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 2	General 2	Under-grad 29
84-150	13	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		Non-major 5
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 15	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 435 01
Title:	Computer Graphics
Instructor:	Olano,Thomas M

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	39
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	1	0	0	0	2	4	21	4.70	379/1589	4.70	4.11	4.32	4.46	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	6	18	4.52	599/1589	4.52	4.06	4.29	4.35	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	7	17	4.48	626/1391	4.48	4.18	4.34	4.46	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	3	4	17	4.58	425/1552	4.58	4.06	4.25	4.37	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	6	7	5	3.84	1076/1495	3.84	3.65	4.14	4.25	3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	248/1457	4.67	4.02	4.15	4.30	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	0	1	23	4.63	368/1572	4.63	4.15	4.21	4.28	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	519/1589	4.89	4.69	4.66	4.68	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	2	12	7	4.14	841/1569	4.14	3.87	4.13	4.22	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	610/1530	4.68	4.30	4.49	4.56	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	24	4.92	469/1533	4.92	4.65	4.75	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	1	8	14	4.32	922/1528	4.32	4.00	4.35	4.41	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	3	18	4.48	761/1529	4.48	3.98	4.36	4.44	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	1	1	0	20	4.77	144/1393	4.77	3.99	4.06	4.18	4.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/1337	****	3.71	4.17	4.36	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/1331	****	3.94	4.35	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1333	****	4.09	4.40	4.63	****
4. Were special techniques successful	22	3	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1014	****	3.44	4.05	4.32	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 435 01
Title:	Computer Graphics
Instructor:	Olano,Thomas M

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	28

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	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/180	****	4.21	4.20	4.31	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.03	4.17	4.27	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	4.73	4.47	4.32	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.49	4.40	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	4.28	4.12	4.09	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	3.46	4.46	4.56	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	3.25	4.43	4.54	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	2.83	4.29	4.31	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	2.75	4.47	4.49	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	2.92	4.19	4.12	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	****	3.85	4.14	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	****	3.89	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.35	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.20	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.31	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 435 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 39
Title: Computer Graphics		Questionnaires: 28
Instructor: Olano,Thomas M		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	1.83	4.12	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	4	Major	26
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	24	Non-major	2
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	8	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 441 01
Title:	Algorithms
Instructor:	Sherman,Alan T

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	23
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	6	8	4.47	699/1589	4.51	4.11	4.32	4.46	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	996/1589	4.34	4.06	4.29	4.35	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	799/1391	4.31	4.18	4.34	4.46	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	7	7	4.33	756/1552	4.20	4.06	4.25	4.37	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	784/1495	4.25	3.65	4.14	4.25	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	569/1457	4.31	4.02	4.15	4.30	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	555/1572	4.10	4.15	4.21	4.28	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.69	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	5	4	3.93	1056/1569	4.21	3.87	4.13	4.22	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	990/1530	4.52	4.30	4.49	4.56	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	1029/1533	4.86	4.65	4.75	4.76	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	1081/1528	4.11	4.00	4.35	4.41	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	974/1529	4.40	3.98	4.36	4.44	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	2	4	2	4	3.67	1057/1393	3.91	3.99	4.06	4.18	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1337	****	3.71	4.17	4.36	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1331	****	3.94	4.35	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1333	****	4.09	4.40	4.63	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1014	****	3.44	4.05	4.32	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 441 01
Title:	Algorithms
Instructor:	Sherman,Alan T

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	23
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	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/180	****	4.21	4.20	4.31	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	4.03	4.17	4.27	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/181	****	4.49	4.40	4.37	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/65	****	3.25	4.43	4.54	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	2.83	4.29	4.31	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	2.75	4.47	4.49	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	2.92	4.19	4.12	****
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.35	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.20	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 3	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 441 02
Title:	Algorithms
Instructor:	Kalpakis,Konsta

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	35
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	1	0	1	0	0	8	18	4.56	582/1589	4.51	4.11	4.32	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	8	16	4.48	644/1589	4.34	4.06	4.29	4.35	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	10	13	4.30	837/1391	4.31	4.18	4.34	4.46	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	1	0	3	6	7	4.06	1045/1552	4.20	4.06	4.25	4.37	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	10	14	4.33	609/1495	4.25	3.65	4.14	4.25	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	3	8	8	4.26	670/1457	4.31	4.02	4.15	4.30	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	4	3	8	10	3.74	1292/1572	4.10	4.15	4.21	4.28	3.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.69	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	1	9	12	4.50	369/1569	4.21	3.87	4.13	4.22	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	728/1530	4.52	4.30	4.49	4.56	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1533	4.86	4.65	4.75	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	5	11	9	4.08	1129/1528	4.11	4.00	4.35	4.41	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	5	17	4.52	714/1529	4.40	3.98	4.36	4.44	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	686/1393	3.91	3.99	4.06	4.18	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/1337	****	3.71	4.17	4.36	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1331	****	3.94	4.35	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1333	****	4.09	4.40	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 441 02
Title:	Algorithms
Instructor:	Kalpakis,Konsta

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	35
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	23	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1014	****	3.44	4.05	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	27
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	1
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	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 444 01
Title:	Information Assurance
Instructor:	Sherman,Alan T

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	18
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	2	5	4	4.18	1026/1589	4.18	4.11	4.32	4.46	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	1151/1589	4.00	4.06	4.29	4.35	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	600/1391	4.50	4.18	4.34	4.46	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	921/1552	4.18	4.06	4.25	4.37	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	744/1495	4.20	3.65	4.14	4.25	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	886/1457	4.00	4.02	4.15	4.30	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	3	3	1	2.91	1532/1572	2.91	4.15	4.21	4.28	2.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	467/1589	4.91	4.69	4.66	4.68	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1143/1569	3.83	3.87	4.13	4.22	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1392/1530	3.89	4.30	4.49	4.56	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	924/1533	4.78	4.65	4.75	4.76	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1367/1528	3.67	4.00	4.35	4.41	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	1397/1529	3.56	3.98	4.36	4.44	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1104/1393	3.57	3.99	4.06	4.18	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	452/1337	4.50	3.71	4.17	4.36	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1331	5.00	3.94	4.35	4.56	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.09	4.40	4.63	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 444 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 18
Title: Information Assurance		Questionnaires: 11
Instructor: Sherman,Alan T		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1014	5.00	3.44	4.05	4.32	5.00

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	2	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 451 01
Title:	Automata Thry& Form Lang
Instructor:	Yesha,Yaacov

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	38
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	2	2	7	5	3	3.26	1544/1589	3.26	4.11	4.32	4.46	3.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	10	4	3.84	1302/1589	3.84	4.06	4.29	4.35	3.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	5	13	4.53	576/1391	4.53	4.18	4.34	4.46	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	3	8	5	4.00	1081/1552	4.00	4.06	4.25	4.37	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	10	4	3.83	1086/1495	3.83	3.65	4.14	4.25	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	2	7	4	3.80	1087/1457	3.80	4.02	4.15	4.30	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	5	8	4.17	949/1572	4.17	4.15	4.21	4.28	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	882/1589	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.68	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	3	5	8	1	3.41	1411/1569	3.41	3.87	4.13	4.22	3.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	7	8	4.17	1237/1530	4.17	4.30	4.49	4.56	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	9	7	4.22	1436/1533	4.22	4.65	4.75	4.76	4.22
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	5	9	2	3.61	1383/1528	3.61	4.00	4.35	4.41	3.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	5	6	3.72	1347/1529	3.72	3.98	4.36	4.44	3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	796/1393	4.00	3.99	4.06	4.18	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/1337	****	3.71	4.17	4.36	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/1331	****	3.94	4.35	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/1333	****	4.09	4.40	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 451 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 38
Title: Automata Thry& Form Lang		Questionnaires: 19
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
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1014	****	3.44	4.05	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	1	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	10	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 461 01
Title:	Database Mangmt Systems
Instructor:	Kargupta,Hillol

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	40
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	2	7	6	5	5	3.16	1554/1589	3.16	4.11	4.32	4.46	3.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	6	6	4	4	2.84	1566/1589	2.84	4.06	4.29	4.35	2.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	10	6	3.64	1260/1391	3.64	4.18	4.34	4.46	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	5	4	6	5	3	2.87	1533/1552	2.87	4.06	4.25	4.37	2.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	7	4	4	5	4	2.79	1465/1495	2.79	3.65	4.14	4.25	2.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	6	2	8	1	6	2.96	1420/1457	2.96	4.02	4.15	4.30	2.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	4	6	5	6	3.20	1486/1572	3.20	4.15	4.21	4.28	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	10	4.40	1213/1589	4.40	4.69	4.66	4.68	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	7	6	7	4	0	2.33	1558/1569	2.33	3.87	4.13	4.22	2.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	6	6	5	5	3.21	1498/1530	3.21	4.30	4.49	4.56	3.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	2	7	10	4	3.58	1516/1533	3.58	4.65	4.75	4.76	3.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	5	6	8	3	2	2.63	1511/1528	2.63	4.00	4.35	4.41	2.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	9	5	2	3	5	2.58	1512/1529	2.58	3.98	4.36	4.44	2.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	8	4	3	2	4	2.52	1366/1393	2.52	3.99	4.06	4.18	2.52
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/1337	****	3.71	4.17	4.36	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1331	****	3.94	4.35	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1333	****	4.09	4.40	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 461 01
Title:	Database Mangmt Systems
Instructor:	Kargupta,Hillol

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	23	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1014	****	3.44	4.05	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	6
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	9	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 471 01
Title:	Artificial Intelligence
Instructor:	Winner, Kevin A

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	44
Questionnaires:	33

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	10	22	4.64	477/1589	4.64	4.11	4.32	4.46	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	12	18	4.42	734/1589	4.42	4.06	4.29	4.35	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	24	4.73	330/1391	4.73	4.18	4.34	4.46	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	8	21	4.72	274/1552	4.72	4.06	4.25	4.37	4.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	6	10	13	3.91	1019/1495	3.91	3.65	4.14	4.25	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	6	5	19	4.43	476/1457	4.43	4.02	4.15	4.30	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	10	22	4.64	358/1572	4.64	4.15	4.21	4.28	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	187/1589	4.97	4.69	4.66	4.68	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	13	11	4.35	584/1569	4.35	3.87	4.13	4.22	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	14	18	4.52	872/1530	4.52	4.30	4.49	4.56	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	30	4.88	671/1533	4.88	4.65	4.75	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	10	18	4.36	869/1528	4.36	4.00	4.35	4.41	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	24	4.67	530/1529	4.67	3.98	4.36	4.44	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	4	10	19	4.45	392/1393	4.45	3.99	4.06	4.18	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	****/1337	****	3.71	4.17	4.36	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1331	****	3.94	4.35	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1333	****	4.09	4.40	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 471 01
Title:	Artificial Intelligence
Instructor:	Winner, Kevin A

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	44
Questionnaires:	33

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	27	2	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1014	****	3.44	4.05	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	28
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	33	Non-major	5
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	8	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 473 01
Title:	Natural Lang Processing
Instructor:	Nirenburg,Serge

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	19
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	4	4	8	4.25	957/1589	4.25	4.11	4.32	4.46	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	1015/1589	4.19	4.06	4.29	4.35	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	988/1391	4.13	4.18	4.34	4.46	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	362/1552	4.64	4.06	4.25	4.37	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	2	3	7	3.93	995/1495	3.93	3.65	4.14	4.25	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	649/1457	4.29	4.02	4.15	4.30	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	430/1572	4.56	4.15	4.21	4.28	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	545/1589	4.88	4.69	4.66	4.68	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	6	6	2	3.71	1241/1569	3.71	3.87	4.13	4.22	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	938/1530	4.47	4.30	4.49	4.56	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	410/1533	4.93	4.65	4.75	4.76	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	983/1528	4.27	4.00	4.35	4.41	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	6	6	4.07	1147/1529	4.07	3.98	4.36	4.44	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	1	5	5	3.92	888/1393	3.92	3.99	4.06	4.18	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	823/1337	4.00	3.71	4.17	4.36	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	567/1331	4.57	3.94	4.35	4.56	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	313/1333	4.86	4.09	4.40	4.63	4.86

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 473 01
Title:	Natural Lang Processing
Instructor:	Nirenburg,Serge

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	19
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														
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1014	****	3.44	4.05	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 14
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 9	
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 481 01
Title:	Computer Networks
Instructor:	Sidhu,Deepinder

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	44
Questionnaires:	32

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	13	8	7	3.53	1490/1589	3.53	4.11	4.32	4.46	3.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	5	7	11	7	3.58	1451/1589	3.58	4.06	4.29	4.35	3.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	7	12	10	3.91	1149/1391	3.91	4.18	4.34	4.46	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	3	3	5	7	3.89	1202/1552	3.89	4.06	4.25	4.37	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	2	4	6	5	3	3.15	1422/1495	3.15	3.65	4.14	4.25	3.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	4	5	7	4	4	2.96	1420/1457	2.96	4.02	4.15	4.30	2.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	7	7	14	3.94	1161/1572	3.94	4.15	4.21	4.28	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	7	20	5	3.94	1531/1589	3.94	4.69	4.66	4.68	3.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	3	1	4	12	6	1	3.08	1496/1569	3.08	3.87	4.13	4.22	3.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	2	5	15	6	3.61	1454/1530	3.61	4.30	4.49	4.56	3.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	9	9	11	3.90	1500/1533	3.90	4.65	4.75	4.76	3.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	2	9	8	9	3.58	1391/1528	3.58	4.00	4.35	4.41	3.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	8	6	10	3.52	1404/1529	3.52	3.98	4.36	4.44	3.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	1	1	8	5	6	3.67	1057/1393	3.67	3.99	4.06	4.18	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1337	****	3.71	4.17	4.36	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1331	****	3.94	4.35	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1333	****	4.09	4.40	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 481 01
Title:	Computer Networks
Instructor:	Sidhu,Deepinder

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	44
Questionnaires:	32

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	29	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1014	****	3.44	4.05	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 7	C 3	General 1	Under-grad 32
84-150	14	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		Non-major 4
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 14	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 491 01
Title:	Spec Topics In Comp Sci
Instructor:	Nicholas,Charle

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	44
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	2	6	7	21	4.13	1078/1589	4.13	4.11	4.32	4.46	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	8	11	17	4.11	1092/1589	4.11	4.06	4.29	4.35	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	3	5	27	4.61	468/1391	4.61	4.18	4.34	4.46	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	3	8	22	4.50	509/1552	4.50	4.06	4.25	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	0	1	6	25	4.64	282/1495	4.64	3.65	4.14	4.25	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	1	5	7	19	4.38	545/1457	4.38	4.02	4.15	4.30	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	4	5	9	18	4.14	977/1572	4.14	4.15	4.21	4.28	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	33	4.89	493/1589	4.89	4.69	4.66	4.68	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	1	7	11	10	4.03	933/1569	4.03	3.87	4.13	4.22	4.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	6	12	17	4.19	1223/1530	4.19	4.30	4.49	4.56	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	3	32	4.81	843/1533	4.81	4.65	4.75	4.76	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	5	14	16	4.19	1050/1528	4.19	4.00	4.35	4.41	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	7	7	18	3.97	1197/1529	3.97	3.98	4.36	4.44	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	9	10	14	4.15	686/1393	4.15	3.99	4.06	4.18	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	3	4	2	3	3.42	1177/1337	3.42	3.71	4.17	4.36	3.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	964/1331	4.08	3.94	4.35	4.56	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	884/1333	4.25	4.09	4.40	4.63	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	28	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1014	****	3.44	4.05	4.32	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 491 01
Title:	Spec Topics In Comp Sci
Instructor:	Nicholas,Charle

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	44
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/180	****	4.21	4.20	4.31	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	4.03	4.17	4.27	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/178	****	4.73	4.47	4.32	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/181	****	4.49	4.40	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/165	****	4.28	4.12	4.09	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	3.46	4.46	4.56	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	3.25	4.43	4.54	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	2.83	4.29	4.31	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	2.75	4.47	4.49	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	2.92	4.19	4.12	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	****	3.85	4.14	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	****	3.89	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.35	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.20	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.31	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	2.17	4.00	4.43	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	1.83	4.12	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.51	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 491 01
Title:	Spec Topics In Comp Sci
Instructor:	Nicholas,Charle

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	44
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	4.23	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	3.85	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 28	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 30
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		Non-major 4
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 21	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 4		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 611 01
Title:	Adv Computer Architectre
Instructor:	Olano,Thomas M

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	38

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	7	13	14	3.95	1249/1589	3.95	4.11	4.32	4.39	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	13	17	4.21	985/1589	4.21	4.06	4.29	4.33	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	12	19	4.24	893/1391	4.24	4.18	4.34	4.40	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	0	8	9	17	4.08	1023/1552	4.08	4.06	4.25	4.30	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	5	7	12	9	3.60	1251/1495	3.60	3.65	4.14	4.18	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	7	10	17	4.17	768/1457	4.17	4.02	4.15	4.30	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	1	9	24	4.43	601/1572	4.43	4.15	4.21	4.29	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	0	28	7	4.20	1395/1589	4.20	4.69	4.66	4.79	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	3	0	1	2	14	12	4.28	670/1569	4.28	3.87	4.13	4.18	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	2	4	7	19	4.24	1177/1530	4.24	4.30	4.49	4.55	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	4	9	21	4.50	1261/1533	4.50	4.65	4.75	4.82	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	2	2	13	15	4.18	1050/1528	4.18	4.00	4.35	4.38	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	2	1	3	11	16	4.15	1089/1529	4.15	3.98	4.36	4.38	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	2	0	7	13	11	3.94	877/1393	3.94	3.99	4.06	3.91	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	4	2	5	7	11	3.66	1070/1337	3.66	3.71	4.17	4.29	3.66
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	3	9	5	11	3.76	1141/1331	3.76	3.94	4.35	4.51	3.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	0	7	8	12	3.97	1031/1333	3.97	4.09	4.40	4.51	3.97
4. Were special techniques successful	9	10	3	2	4	6	4	3.32	895/1014	3.32	3.44	4.05	4.13	3.32

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 611 01		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 42				
Title: Adv Computer Architectre										Questionnaires: 38				
Instructor: Olano,Thomas M														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/180	****	4.21	4.20	4.40	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/194	****	4.03	4.17	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/178	****	4.73	4.47	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/181	****	4.49	4.40	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/165	****	4.28	4.12	4.43	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/62	****	3.46	4.46	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/65	****	3.25	4.43	4.61	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/63	****	2.83	4.29	4.42	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/61	****	2.75	4.47	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/61	****	2.92	4.19	4.22	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	****/40	****	****	3.85	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/40	****	****	3.89	4.83	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.67	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.17	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/39	****	2.17	4.00	4.10	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/22	****	1.83	4.12	4.54	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 611 01
Title:	Adv Computer Architectre
Instructor:	Olano,Thomas M

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	38

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	34	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/19	****	****	4.44	4.06	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/16	****	****	4.25	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 4	A 18	Required for Majors 29	Graduate 15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		Major 28
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Non-major 10
Grad.	15	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 4		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 621 01
Title:	Adv Operating Systems
Instructor:	Kalpakis,Konsta

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	62
Questionnaires:	47

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	2	5	7	12	18	3.89	1306/1589	3.89	4.11	4.32	4.39	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	3	10	18	11	3.75	1363/1589	3.75	4.06	4.29	4.33	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	5	8	19	10	3.62	1270/1391	3.62	4.18	4.34	4.40	3.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	3	5	9	15	11	3.60	1381/1552	3.60	4.06	4.25	4.30	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	0	4	21	15	4.05	877/1495	4.05	3.65	4.14	4.18	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	5	1	7	17	12	3.71	1163/1457	3.71	4.02	4.15	4.30	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	3	4	3	7	13	14	3.73	1297/1572	3.73	4.15	4.21	4.29	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	1	1	0	6	36	4.70	920/1589	4.70	4.69	4.66	4.79	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	2	2	3	15	17	4.10	879/1569	4.10	3.87	4.13	4.18	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	4	18	20	4.20	1209/1530	4.20	4.30	4.49	4.55	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	1	3	40	4.80	872/1533	4.80	4.65	4.75	4.82	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	3	7	15	17	3.89	1266/1528	3.89	4.00	4.35	4.38	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	1	5	17	17	3.89	1263/1529	3.89	3.98	4.36	4.38	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	4	5	14	10	7	3.28	1244/1393	3.28	3.99	4.06	3.91	3.28
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	5	14	15	4.14	752/1337	4.14	3.71	4.17	4.29	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	0	1	8	25	4.50	623/1331	4.50	3.94	4.35	4.51	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	1	6	26	4.57	641/1333	4.57	4.09	4.40	4.51	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	11	18	2	1	5	5	5	3.56	807/1014	3.56	3.44	4.05	4.13	3.56

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 621 01
Title:	Adv Operating Systems
Instructor:	Kalpakis,Konsta

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	62
Questionnaires:	47

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	40	3	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/180	****	4.21	4.20	4.40	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/194	****	4.03	4.17	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/178	****	4.73	4.47	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/181	****	4.49	4.40	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	2	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/165	****	4.28	4.12	4.43	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	42	2	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/62	****	3.46	4.46	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/65	****	3.25	4.43	4.61	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	2	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/63	****	2.83	4.29	4.42	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	43	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/61	****	2.75	4.47	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/61	****	2.92	4.19	4.22	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/40	****	****	3.85	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/40	****	****	3.89	4.83	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	44	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.67	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	44	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.17	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	44	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/39	****	2.17	4.00	4.10	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/22	****	1.83	4.12	4.54	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 621 01
Title:	Adv Operating Systems
Instructor:	Kalpakis,Konsta

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	62
Questionnaires:	47

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	4.06	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 4	A 17	Required for Majors 36	Graduate 26
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 20		Major 36
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 11
Grad.	26	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 2	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 6		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 668 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment:	36
Title:	Service Oriented Computi		Questionnaires:	21
Instructor:	Halem,Milton			

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	2	5	7	5	3.79	1371/1589	3.79	4.11	4.32	4.39	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	4	6	7	3.89	1272/1589	3.89	4.06	4.29	4.33	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	13	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	799/1391	4.33	4.18	4.34	4.40	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	3	2	6	7	3.94	1144/1552	3.94	4.06	4.25	4.30	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	2	5	2	4	3.27	1401/1495	3.27	3.65	4.14	4.18	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	1042/1457	3.86	4.02	4.15	4.30	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	1	7	9	4.16	959/1572	4.16	4.15	4.21	4.29	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	787/1589	4.78	4.69	4.66	4.79	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	6	6	2	3.71	1241/1569	3.71	3.87	4.13	4.18	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	8	7	4.16	1245/1530	4.16	4.30	4.49	4.55	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	614/1533	4.89	4.65	4.75	4.82	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	6	1	9	3.84	1288/1528	3.84	4.00	4.35	4.38	3.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	2	4	5	5	3.37	1437/1529	3.37	3.98	4.36	4.38	3.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	3	1	5	4	3	3.19	1274/1393	3.19	3.99	4.06	3.91	3.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	5	5	5	3.76	1015/1337	3.76	3.71	4.17	4.29	3.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	2	8	6	4.06	973/1331	4.06	3.94	4.35	4.51	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	5	2	8	3.88	1080/1333	3.88	4.09	4.40	4.51	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	756/1014	3.67	3.44	4.05	4.13	3.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 668 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment:	36
Title:	Service Oriented Computi		Questionnaires:	21
Instructor:	Halem,Milton			

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	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/180	****	4.21	4.20	4.40	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	****	4.03	4.17	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/178	****	4.73	4.47	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/181	****	4.49	4.40	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	4.28	4.12	4.43	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	3.46	4.46	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/65	****	3.25	4.43	4.61	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/63	****	2.83	4.29	4.42	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/61	****	2.75	4.47	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/61	****	2.92	4.19	4.22	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/40	****	****	3.85	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/40	****	****	3.89	4.83	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.67	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.17	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/39	****	2.17	4.00	4.10	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	1.83	4.12	4.54	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 668 01
Title:	Service Oriented Computi
Instructor:	Halem,Milton

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	36
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	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	4.06	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	18	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	10	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	11	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	13	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 671 01
Title:	Prin Artificial Intell
Instructor:	Finin,Timothy W

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	43
Questionnaires:	35

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	2	4	9	17	4.28	929/1589	4.28	4.11	4.32	4.39	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	9	20	4.53	569/1589	4.53	4.06	4.29	4.33	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	10	19	4.50	600/1391	4.50	4.18	4.34	4.40	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	4	11	16	4.39	693/1552	4.39	4.06	4.25	4.30	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	0	4	8	17	4.45	485/1495	4.45	3.65	4.14	4.18	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	2	3	7	18	4.26	680/1457	4.26	4.02	4.15	4.30	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	5	11	13	4.03	1068/1572	4.03	4.15	4.21	4.29	4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	29	4.91	467/1589	4.91	4.69	4.66	4.79	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	5	10	13	4.29	658/1569	4.29	3.87	4.13	4.18	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	10	19	4.55	830/1530	4.55	4.30	4.49	4.55	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	9	22	4.63	1154/1533	4.63	4.65	4.75	4.82	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	3	10	16	4.45	768/1528	4.45	4.00	4.35	4.38	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	11	17	4.34	914/1529	4.34	3.98	4.36	4.38	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	2	5	7	16	4.23	603/1393	4.23	3.99	4.06	3.91	4.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	2	5	6	12	3.89	938/1337	3.89	3.71	4.17	4.29	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	5	9	12	4.19	880/1331	4.19	3.94	4.35	4.51	4.19
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	4	8	14	4.30	860/1333	4.30	4.09	4.40	4.51	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	8	15	2	1	2	3	4	3.50	823/1014	3.50	3.44	4.05	4.13	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 671 01
Title:	Prin Artificial Intell
Instructor:	Finin,Timothy W

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	43
Questionnaires:	35

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	4	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/180	****	4.21	4.20	4.40	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/194	****	4.03	4.17	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/178	****	4.73	4.47	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/181	****	4.49	4.40	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	4.28	4.12	4.43	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/62	****	3.46	4.46	4.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/40	****	****	3.85	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/40	****	****	3.89	4.83	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.67	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 4	A 20	Required for Majors 21	Graduate 16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		Major 23
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Non-major 12
Grad.	16	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 9	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 7		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 673 02
Title:	Intro Nat Lang Process
Instructor:	Nirenburg,Serge

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	4
Questionnaires:	4

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	957/1589	4.25	4.11	4.32	4.39	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1471/1589	3.50	4.06	4.29	4.33	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1298/1391	3.50	4.18	4.34	4.40	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1081/1552	4.00	4.06	4.25	4.30	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1404/1495	3.25	3.65	4.14	4.18	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	886/1457	4.00	4.02	4.15	4.30	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	1095/1572	4.00	4.15	4.21	4.29	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.69	4.66	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1209/1569	3.75	3.87	4.13	4.18	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1169/1530	4.25	4.30	4.49	4.55	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.65	4.75	4.82	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1333/1528	3.75	4.00	4.35	4.38	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1406/1529	3.50	3.98	4.36	4.38	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	796/1393	4.00	3.99	4.06	3.91	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1066/1337	3.67	3.71	4.17	4.29	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1331	5.00	3.94	4.35	4.51	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	547/1333	4.67	4.09	4.40	4.51	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1013/1014	1.00	3.44	4.05	4.13	1.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 673 02
Title:	Intro Nat Lang Process
Instructor:	Nirenburg,Serge

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	4
Questionnaires:	4

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	113/180	4.00	4.21	4.20	4.40	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	121/194	4.00	4.03	4.17	4.15	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/178	5.00	4.73	4.47	4.63	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 2	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 3	Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 1	Non-major 2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0			
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 1	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 681 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 32
Title: Advanced Comp Networks		Questionnaires: 28
Instructor: Sidhu,Deepinder		

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	3	3	8	6	7	3.41	1522/1589	3.41	4.11	4.32	4.39	3.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	5	10	5	5	3.22	1532/1589	3.22	4.06	4.29	4.33	3.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	4	8	7	6	3.41	1313/1391	3.41	4.18	4.34	4.40	3.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	4	6	7	6	3.26	1494/1552	3.26	4.06	4.25	4.30	3.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	3	4	11	6	3.72	1175/1495	3.72	3.65	4.14	4.18	3.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	2	0	7	8	6	3.70	1177/1457	3.70	4.02	4.15	4.30	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	3	2	3	10	7	3.64	1344/1572	3.64	4.15	4.21	4.29	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	4	19	2	3.92	1536/1589	3.92	4.69	4.66	4.79	3.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	5	9	2	2	3.06	1501/1569	3.06	3.87	4.13	4.18	3.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	13	9	4.19	1216/1530	4.19	4.30	4.49	4.55	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	13	12	4.42	1332/1533	4.42	4.65	4.75	4.82	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	0	8	10	6	3.69	1358/1528	3.69	4.00	4.35	4.38	3.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	8	9	7	3.77	1330/1529	3.77	3.98	4.36	4.38	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	4	3	4	5	5	3.19	1271/1393	3.19	3.99	4.06	3.91	3.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	6	2	9	4	3	2.83	1292/1337	2.83	3.71	4.17	4.29	2.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	4	5	6	6	3.33	1245/1331	3.33	3.94	4.35	4.51	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	4	5	6	6	3.33	1271/1333	3.33	4.09	4.40	4.51	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	4	13	2	0	2	4	3	3.55	810/1014	3.55	3.44	4.05	4.13	3.55

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 681 01		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 32				
Title: Advanced Comp Networks										Questionnaires: 28				
Instructor: Sidhu,Deepinder														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/180	****	4.21	4.20	4.40	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	****/194	****	4.03	4.17	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/178	****	4.73	4.47	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/181	****	4.49	4.40	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/165	****	4.28	4.12	4.43	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	2	0	2	8	1	3.46	55/62	3.46	3.46	4.46	4.44	3.46
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	2	2	1	5	2	3.25	61/65	3.25	3.25	4.43	4.61	3.25
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	5	0	1	4	2	2.83	60/63	2.83	2.83	4.29	4.42	2.83
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	3	2	3	3	1	2.75	61/61	2.75	2.75	4.47	4.33	2.75
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	3	1	4	2	2	2.92	59/61	2.92	2.92	4.19	4.22	2.92
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/40	****	****	3.85	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/40	****	****	3.89	4.83	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.67	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	2	0	2	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.17	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	2	0	2	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/39	****	2.17	4.00	4.10	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	2	0	2	0	3.00	****/22	****	1.83	4.12	4.54	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 681 01
Title:	Advanced Comp Networks
Instructor:	Sidhu,Deepinder

Term - Fall 2012

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	****/19	****	****	4.44	4.06	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	****/16	****	****	4.25	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	16	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	17	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	17	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	10	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	5						