```
Course-Section: CMSC 104  1                  University of Maryland                        Page  387
Title        Prob Sol & Computer Pr           Baltimore County                           JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:  Dimitroff,Donal                    Spring 2010                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      43
Questionnaires:  26                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  1  0  1  2  4  3  15  4.16  954/1447  4.37  4.13  4.31  4.18  4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1  0  0  1  5  4  15  4.32  779/1447  4.49  4.09  4.27  4.30  4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1  0  0  1  4  6  14  4.32  726/1241  4.54  4.18  4.33  4.25  4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1  3  0  0  5  5  12  4.32  705/1402  4.47  4.14  4.24  4.15  4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 15 2 0 4 1  3  3.30 1240/1358  4.04  3.85  4.11  4.03  3.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 8 1 1 3 3 9  4.06  785/1316  4.34  4.09  4.14  3.99  4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1  0  1  0  4  4  16  4.36  644/1427  4.51  4.12  4.19  4.24  4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1  0  0  0  1  1  23  4.88  538/1447  4.92  4.61  4.69  4.68  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 1 1 5 6 5  3.72 1110/1434  4.14  3.88  4.10  4.10  3.72


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2  0  0  0  1  5  18  4.71  506/1387  4.74  4.24  4.46  4.46  4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2  0  0  0  1  4  19  4.75  859/1387  4.85  4.58  4.73  4.71  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 1 4 2 17  4.46  677/1386  4.60  4.07  4.32  4.32  4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2  0  1  0  2  4  17  4.50  659/1380  4.65  4.00  4.32  4.31  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 1 0 4 1 15 4.38  388/1193  4.51  3.91  4.02  3.99  4.38


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 2 0 4  4.33 ****/1172  4.21  3.78  4.15  3.95  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 20 0 0 2 1 0 3  3.67 ****/1182  4.21  4.01  4.35  4.18  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 20 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 ****/1170  4.41  4.13  4.38  4.17  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                 20  2  0  0  1  1  2  4.25 ****/ 800  3.94  3.95  4.06  3.95  ****


                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 24  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 189  4.38  4.38  4.34  4.18  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 24 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 192  4.50  4.21  4.34  4.31  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 24 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 186  ****  4.57  4.48  4.46  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          24  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 187  ****  4.34  4.33  4.37  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 24 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 168  ****  4.29  4.20  4.29  ****


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 24 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  66  ****  4.13  4.58  3.95  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 24 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/  62  ****  4.00  4.56  4.08  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 24 1 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  58  ****  4.38  4.41  3.88  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   24  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  65  ****  3.88  4.42  3.78  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               24  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  64  ****  3.75  4.09  3.75  ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 25 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.49  3.83  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 25 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  36  ****  ****  4.25  4.26  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      25  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.52  3.84  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  25  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.30  3.64  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 25 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.43  3.73  ****


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 25 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.72  4.50  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   25  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.57  4.38  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     25  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.64  4.65  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      25  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  20  ****  ****  4.60  4.49  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    25  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  15  ****  ****  4.61  4.31  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	26	Non-major	23
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

```
Title          Prob Sol & Computer Pr           Baltimore County                                   JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Frey,Dennis L                    Spring 2010                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      44
Questionnaires:  30                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                           Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  2 10 18  4.53  551/1447  4.37  4.13  4.31  4.18  4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  9 21  4.70  315/1447  4.49  4.09  4.27  4.30  4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  7 23  4.77  272/1241  4.54  4.18  4.33  4.25  4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   3  0  0  1  4 22  4.78  196/1402  4.47  4.14  4.24  4.15  4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 17  0  0  0  3  9  4.75  173/1358  4.04  3.85  4.11  4.03  4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  9  0  1  1  3 15  4.60  292/1316  4.34  4.09  4.14  3.99  4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  1  2  2 24  4.69  265/1427  4.51  4.12  4.19  4.24  4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  1 28  4.97  194/1447  4.92  4.61  4.69  4.68  4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0  0  0 13 10  4.43  420/1434  4.14  3.88  4.10  4.10  4.43

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  1  2 27  4.87  261/1387  4.74  4.24  4.46  4.46  4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  1 29  4.97  211/1387  4.85  4.58  4.73  4.71  4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  1  2 27  4.87  182/1386  4.60  4.07  4.32  4.32  4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  1  7 22  4.70  420/1380  4.65  4.00  4.32  4.31  4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2 0  0  4  2 22  4.64  199/1193  4.51  3.91  4.02  3.99  4.64

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 0  0  4  1  7  4.25  580/1172  4.21  3.78  4.15  3.95  4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 0  1  2  1  8  4.33  691/1182  4.21  4.01  4.35  4.18  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0  0  3  0  9  4.50  576/1170  4.41  4.13  4.38  4.17  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  18   2  0  0  3  4  3  4.00  423/ 800  3.94  3.95  4.06  3.95  4.00

             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  28   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 189  4.38  4.38  4.34  4.18  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 28 0 0 0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 192  4.50  4.21  4.34  4.31  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 28 0 0 0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 186  ****  4.57  4.48  4.46  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           28   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 187  ****  4.34  4.33  4.37  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 28   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 168  ****  4.29  4.20  4.29  ****

             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 28 1 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  66  ****  4.13  4.58  3.95  ****
```

```
                                 Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades             Reasons                  Type                 Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27       4           0.00-0.99   0     A   17        Required for Majors  19      Graduate     0       Major        7
28-55       4           1.00-1.99   0     B   10
56-83       3           2.00-2.99   2     C    0        General               2      Under-grad  30       Non-major   23
84-150      3           3.00-3.49   6     D    0
Grad.       0           3.50-4.00   4     F    0        Electives             4      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                          I    0        Other                 2
                                          ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 104  3                   University of Maryland                                Page  389
Title         Prob Sol & Computer Pr          Baltimore County                                    JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Frey,Dennis L                   Spring 2010                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      40
Questionnaires:  19                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                      NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  2  0   3  14  4.53  562/1447  4.37  4.13  4.31  4.18  4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  2  1   3  13  4.42  648/1447  4.49  4.09  4.27  4.30  4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  1  0  0   2  16  4.68  357/1241  4.54  4.18  4.33  4.25  4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   1  0  1  1   1  15  4.67  314/1402  4.47  4.14  4.24  4.15  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  11  1  1  0   1   5  4.00  799/1358  4.04  3.85  4.11  4.03  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0   9  0  0  1   1   8  4.70  212/1316  4.34  4.09  4.14  3.99  4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  0   3  16  4.84  126/1427  4.51  4.12  4.19  4.24  4.84
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0   1  18  4.95  291/1447  4.92  4.61  4.69  4.68  4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  7  0  0  0  0  5   7  4.58  290/1434  4.14  3.88  4.10  4.10  4.58

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  1  0   1  16  4.78  398/1387  4.74  4.24  4.46  4.46  4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  1  0   0  17  4.83  707/1387  4.85  4.58  4.73  4.71  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  1   0  0  1  1   0  16  4.72  353/1386  4.60  4.07  4.32  4.32  4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  0  0  1   0  17  4.89  181/1380  4.65  4.00  4.32  4.31  4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  1  0  0  0  2   2  14  4.67  186/1193  4.51  3.91  4.02  3.99  4.67

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  10  0  0  0  1   1   7  4.67  282/1172  4.21  3.78  4.15  3.95  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  10  0  0  0  1   2   6  4.56  521/1182  4.21  4.01  4.35  4.18  4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  10  0  0  0  1   2   6  4.56  549/1170  4.41  4.13  4.38  4.17  4.56
4. Were special techniques successful                 10   1  0  1  3   0   4  3.88  527/ 800  3.94  3.95  4.06  3.95  3.88

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  17  0  0  0  0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 189  4.38  4.38  4.34  4.18  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information  17  0  0  0  0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 192  4.50  4.21  4.34  4.31  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  17  0  0  0  0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 186  ****  4.57  4.48  4.46  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          17   0  0  0  0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 187  ****  4.34  4.33  4.37  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  17   1  0  0  0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 168  ****  4.29  4.20  4.29  ****

              Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  18  0  0  0  0   0   1  5.00 ****/  62  ****  4.00  4.56  4.08  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  18  0  0  0  0   0   1  5.00 ****/  58  ****  4.38  4.41  3.88  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               17   0  0  0  0   0   2  5.00 ****/  64  ****  3.75  4.09  3.75  ****

              Field Work
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  18  0  0  0  0   0   1  5.00 ****/  36  ****  ****  4.25  4.26  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      18   0  0  0  0   0   1  5.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.52  3.84  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  18   0  0  0  0   0   1  5.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.30  3.64  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  18  0  0  0  0   0   1  5.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.43  3.73  ****

              Self  Paced
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      18   0  0  0  0   0   1  5.00 ****/  20  ****  ****  4.60  4.49  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    18   0  0  0  0   0   1  5.00 ****/  15  ****  ****  4.61  4.31  ****
```

Questionnaires: 19   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   3   0.00-0.99   0   A   12   Required for Majors 10   Graduate   0   Major   3
 28-55   5   1.00-1.99   1   B   3
 56-83   1   2.00-2.99   3   C   1   General   1   Under-grad 19   Non-major   16
 84-150   3   3.00-3.49   4   D   0
 Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   6   F   0   Electives   3   #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P   0   responses to be significant
                                            I   0   Other   1
                                            ?   0

```
Course-Section: CMSC 104  4                    University of Maryland                              Page  390
Title         Prob Sol & Computer Pr           Baltimore County                               JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Dimitroff,Donal                  Spring 2010                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    41
Questionnaires: 25                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                     NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1  0  0  1  4  7 12  4.25  869/1447  4.37  4.13  4.31  4.18  4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  1  0  9 14  4.50  532/1447  4.49  4.09  4.27  4.30  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  1  0  2  7 14  4.38  683/1241  4.54  4.18  4.33  4.25  4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  4  1  0  4  6  9  4.10  910/1402  4.47  4.14  4.24  4.15  4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 15  0  1  1  3  4  4.11  736/1358  4.04  3.85  4.11  4.03  4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 7 1  0  4  5  7  4.00  812/1316  4.34  4.09  4.14  3.99  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  1  1  2  9 11  4.17  866/1427  4.51  4.12  4.19  4.24  4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0  3 21  4.88  565/1447  4.92  4.61  4.69  4.68  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 1 4 14 2 3.81 1052/1434 4.14 3.88 4.10 4.10 3.81


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2  0  0  1  0  6 16  4.61  656/1387  4.74  4.24  4.46  4.46  4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  4 20  4.83  707/1387  4.85  4.58  4.73  4.71  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0  0  1  0 12 10  4.35  802/1386  4.60  4.07  4.32  4.32  4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2  0  0  0  2  7 14  4.52  637/1380  4.65  4.00  4.32  4.31  4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 3 0 0 3 7 10 4.35 408/1193 4.51 3.91 4.02 3.99 4.35


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 2 3 2 4 3.73 895/1172 4.21 3.78 4.15 3.95 3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 0 1 1 2 3 4 3.73 1020/1182 4.21 4.01 4.35 4.18 3.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 1 0 2 1 7 4.18 804/1170 4.41 4.13 4.38 4.17 4.18
4. Were special techniques successful                  14  9  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/ 800  3.94  3.95  4.06  3.95  ****


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  17  0  0  0  2  1  5  4.38  106/ 189  4.38  4.38  4.34  4.18  4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 0 0 0 4 4 4.50 89/ 192 4.50 4.21 4.34 4.31 4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 17 2 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 ****/ 186 **** 4.57 4.48 4.46 ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           17  2  0  0  1  0  5  4.67  ****/ 187  ****  4.34  4.33  4.37  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18  2  0  0  1  2  2  4.20  ****/ 168  ****  4.29  4.20  4.29  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19 2 0 0 2 0 2 4.00 ****/ 66 **** 4.13 4.58 3.95 ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 19 2 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 ****/ 62 **** 4.00 4.56 4.08 ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 19 3 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 ****/ 58 **** 4.38 4.41 3.88 ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    19  3  0  0  1  0  2  4.33  ****/  65  ****  3.88  4.42  3.78  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                19  2  0  1  1  0  2  3.75  ****/  64  ****  3.75  4.09  3.75  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 2 1 2 4.00 ****/ 38 **** **** 4.49 3.83 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 20 0 0 0 3 0 2 3.80 ****/ 36 **** **** 4.25 4.26 ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       20  1  0  0  1  0  3  4.50  ****/  28  ****  ****  4.52  3.84  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   20  1  1  0  1  1  1  3.25  ****/  30  ****  ****  4.30  3.64  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 20 2 1 0 1 0 1 3.00 ****/ 27 **** **** 4.43 3.73 ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 1 2 2 4.20 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.72 4.50 ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    19  1  0  1  1  1  2  3.80  ****/  21  ****  ****  4.57  4.38  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      19  1  0  1  1  1  2  3.80  ****/  31  ****  ****  4.64  4.65  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       19  2  0  0  2  0  2  4.00  ****/  20  ****  ****  4.60  4.49  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     19  2  0  1  1  0  2  3.75  ****/  15  ****  ****  4.61  4.31  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: CMSC 201  01                    University of Maryland                                  Page  391
Title        Computer Science I                    Baltimore County                                   JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Evans,Susan A                          Spring 2010                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    108
Questionnaires:  35                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies         Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                       NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank       Mean  Mean  Mean Mean   Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  6 10 19  4.37   752/1447   4.27  4.13  4.31 4.31   4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  8  9 18  4.29   824/1447   4.21  4.09  4.27 4.23   4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   1  0  0  3 12 19  4.47   576/1241   4.50  4.18  4.33 4.35   4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1   5  1  1  4  8 15  4.21   818/1402   4.24  4.14  4.24 4.24   4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  2  11  2  3  7  3  7  3.45  1191/1358   3.26  3.85  4.11 4.12   3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  1  14  0  1  4  6  9  4.15   710/1316   4.12  4.09  4.14 4.08   4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           2   1  0  1  4  7 20  4.44   554/1427   4.37  4.12  4.19 4.14   4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   1  0  1  1  4 27  4.73   885/1447   4.83  4.61  4.69 4.70   4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  5  0  0  0  7 16  7  4.00   849/1434   3.88  3.88  4.10 3.97   4.00

           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  1  4  8 21  4.44   860/1387   4.57  4.24  4.46 4.42   4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  0  8  7 19  4.32  1233/1387   4.47  4.58  4.73 4.71   4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  1  0  0  1  5 10 18  4.32   820/1386   4.24  4.07  4.32 4.24   4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  1  0  7  6 20  4.29   849/1380   4.16  4.00  4.32 4.30   4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  1  7  2  1  5  5 14  4.04   640/1193   4.20  3.91  4.02 4.04   4.04

           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  9  0  0  0  7  6 13  4.23   593/1172   4.31  3.78  4.15 4.12   4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  10  0  2  3  9  3  8  3.48  1083/1182   3.67  4.01  4.35 4.30   3.48
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  11  0  1  2  5  6 10  3.92   933/1170   3.80  4.13  4.38 4.32   3.92
4. Were special techniques successful                 10  12  0  1  5  3  4  3.77   577/ 800   3.73  3.95  4.06 4.01   3.77

           Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  24  0  0  0  2  1  8  4.55    79/ 189   4.68  4.38  4.34 4.47   4.55
2. Were you provided with adequate background information  24  0  0  1  2  4  4  4.00   147/ 192   4.36  4.21  4.34 4.38   4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  24  1  0  0  3  0  7  4.40   130/ 186   4.40  4.57  4.48 4.57   4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          24   0  0  0  1  2  8  4.64    80/ 187   4.67  4.34  4.33 4.46   4.64
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  24  4  0  1  1  1  4  4.14  ****/ 168   ****  4.29  4.20 4.15   ****

           Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  33  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  66   ****  4.13  4.58 4.43   ****

           Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  33  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00  ****/  38   ****  ****  4.49 2.25   ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  33  0  0  0  2  0  0  3.00  ****/  36   ****  ****  4.25 3.25   ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      33   1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  28   ****  ****  4.52 ****   ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  33   1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  30   ****  ****  4.30 ****   ****

           Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  32  0  0  0  1  2  0  3.67  ****/  31   ****  ****  4.72 ****   ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   32   1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/  21   ****  ****  4.57 ****   ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     32   0  0  1  1  0  1  3.33  ****/  31   ****  ****  4.64 ****   ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      32   0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33  ****/  20   ****  ****  4.60 ****   ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    32   0  0  0  2  0  1  3.67  ****/  15   ****  ****  4.61 ****   ****
```

                                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                             Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   6   0.00-0.99   0   A   19   Required for Majors 33   Graduate   0   Major   15
28-55   5   1.00-1.99   1   B   12
56-83   5   2.00-2.99   2   C   2   General   0   Under-grad 35   Non-major 20
84-150   2   3.00-3.49   8   D   0
Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   8   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P   0   responses to be significant
                                           I   0   Other   1
                                           ?   1

```
Course-Section: CMSC 201  08                      University of Maryland                                        Page  392
Title          Computer Science I                 Baltimore County                                             JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Evans,Susan A                      Spring 2010                                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    100
Questionnaires:  40                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                      Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                      NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  3  0  6  9 22  4.18  945/1447   4.27  4.13  4.31 4.31  4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  2  1  6 12 19  4.13  974/1447   4.21  4.09  4.27 4.23  4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  4 11 25  4.53  523/1241   4.50  4.18  4.33 4.35  4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1   5  1  1  4 10 18  4.26  756/1402   4.24  4.14  4.24 4.24  4.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 11  6  5  5  5  7  3.07 1284/1358   3.26  3.85  4.11 4.12  3.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 18 1  2  2  6 11  4.09  763/1316   4.12  4.09  4.14 4.08  4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  1 10  5 24  4.30  716/1427   4.37  4.12  4.19 4.14  4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  3 37  4.93  388/1447   4.83  4.61  4.69 4.70  4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 12 0 0 2 10 9  7  3.75 1088/1434   3.88  3.88  4.10 3.97  3.75


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  0  1 10 28  4.69  521/1387   4.57  4.24  4.46 4.42  4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  1  4  4 31  4.63 1030/1387   4.47  4.58  4.73 4.71  4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  1 11  9 19  4.15  962/1386   4.24  4.07  4.32 4.24  4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  3  5  3  6 23  4.03 1023/1380   4.16  4.00  4.32 4.30  4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 5 1  0  6  5 21  4.36  401/1193   4.20  3.91  4.02 4.04  4.36


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 1  6  3 19  4.38  487/1172   4.31  3.78  4.15 4.12  4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 2 2  7  5 13  3.86  963/1182   3.67  4.01  4.35 4.30  3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 3 2 7  6 11  3.69 1007/1170   3.80  4.13  4.38 4.32  3.69
4. Were special techniques successful                 11  19  2  1  1  0  6  3.70  600/ 800   3.73  3.95  4.06 4.01  3.70


                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 29  0  0  0  1  0 10  4.82   34/ 189   4.68  4.38  4.34 4.47  4.82
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 29 0 0 0 1 1  9  4.73   49/ 192   4.36  4.21  4.34 4.38  4.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 29 2 0 0 1  1  7  4.67 ****/ 186   4.40  4.57  4.48 4.57  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          30  0  0  0  1  1  8  4.70   65/ 187   4.67  4.34  4.33 4.46  4.70
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 30 4 0 0  1  0  5  4.67 ****/ 168   ****  4.29  4.20 4.15  ****


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 39 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/  66   ****  4.13  4.58 4.43  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 39 0 0 0 0 0  1  5.00 ****/  62   ****  4.00  4.56 4.28  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 0 0  1  0  4.00 ****/  58   ****  4.38  4.41 3.79  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   39  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  65   ****  3.88  4.42 4.36  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               39  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  64   ****  3.75  4.09 3.70  ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/  38   ****  ****  4.49 2.25  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 0  1  0  4.00 ****/  36   ****  ****  4.25 3.25  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      39  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  28   ****  ****  4.52 **** ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  39  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  30   ****  ****  4.30 **** ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 39 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/  27   ****  ****  4.43 **** ****


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31   ****  ****  4.72 **** ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   39  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  21   ****  ****  4.57 **** ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     39  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  31   ****  ****  4.64 **** ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      39  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  20   ****  ****  4.60 **** ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    39  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  15   ****  ****  4.61 **** ****
```

Enrollment: 100
Questionnaires: 40   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   9   0.00-0.99   0   A   21   Required for Majors 34   Graduate   0   Major   15
28-55   8   1.00-1.99   0   B   10
56-83   3   2.00-2.99   6   C   4   General   0   Under-grad   40   Non-major 25
84-150   1   3.00-3.49   6   D   0
Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   9   F   0   Electives   2   #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P   0   responses to be significant
                                          I   0   Other   0
                                          ?   2

```
Course-Section: CMSC 202  01                       University of Maryland                                  Page  393
Title          Computer Science II                    Baltimore County                                  JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Bergeron,Ryan J                         Spring 2010                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    44
Questionnaires: 15                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                        Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                        NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   2   3  10  4.53  551/1447  4.34 4.13  4.31 4.31  4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   7   7  4.40  677/1447  4.41 4.09  4.27 4.23  4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   2   5   8  4.40  658/1241  4.30 4.18  4.33 4.35  4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   6   0   0   2   3   4  4.22  797/1402  4.41 4.14  4.24 4.24  4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  7   0   1   0   2   5  4.38  485/1358  3.99 3.85  4.11 4.12  4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4 1   0   0   4   6  4.27  599/1316  4.39 4.09  4.14 4.08  4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   2   6   7  4.33  680/1427  4.44 4.12  4.19 4.14  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0  15  5.00    1/1447  4.81 4.61  4.69 4.70  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 0 0   1  11   1  4.00  849/1434  4.21 3.88  4.10 3.97  4.00

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   8   7  4.47  839/1387  4.65 4.24  4.46 4.42  4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   1   3  11  4.67  982/1387  4.80 4.58  4.73 4.71  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   2   6   7  4.33  811/1386  4.47 4.07  4.32 4.24  4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   2   4   9  4.47  699/1380  4.42 4.00  4.32 4.30  4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0   1   2   7   5  4.07  628/1193  4.17 3.91  4.02 4.04  4.07

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0   0   0   1   3   7  4.55  355/1172  4.14 3.78  4.15 4.12  4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0   0   0   3   3   5  4.18  774/1182  4.13 4.01  4.35 4.30  4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1   2   2   2   4  3.55 1054/1170  3.87 4.13  4.38 4.32  3.55
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   8   1   0   0   0   2  3.67 ****/ 800  **** 3.95  4.06 4.01  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 14   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 189  3.77 4.38  4.34 4.47  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0 0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 192  2.85 4.21  4.34 4.38  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          14   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 187  3.69 4.34  4.33 4.46  ****
```

                          Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 202  04               University of Maryland                                    Page  394
Title       Computer Science II            Baltimore County                                         JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Mitchell,Susan               Spring 2010                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     44
Questionnaires:  22              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions              NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
        General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   1   0   1   5  15  4.50   585/1447  4.34  4.13  4.31  4.31  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   1   2   6  13  4.41   677/1447  4.41  4.09  4.27  4.23  4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   1   1   1   7  12  4.27   766/1241  4.30  4.18  4.33  4.35  4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   2   0   0   1   5  13  4.63   347/1402  4.41  4.14  4.24  4.24  4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  15   0   0   1   2   4  4.43   430/1358  3.99  3.85  4.11  4.12  4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  7   0   1   0   2  12  4.67   239/1316  4.39  4.09  4.14  4.08  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   0   2   4  16  4.64   310/1427  4.44  4.12  4.19  4.14  4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0  11  11  4.50  1079/1447  4.81  4.61  4.69  4.70  4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5  0  0   0   3   8   6  4.18   722/1434  4.21  3.88  4.10  3.97  4.18


        Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   2   6  14  4.55   741/1387  4.65  4.24  4.46  4.42  4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   0   6  16  4.73   904/1387  4.80  4.58  4.73  4.71  4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   1   2   4  15  4.50   607/1386  4.47  4.07  4.32  4.24  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0   1   2   6  13  4.41   759/1380  4.42  4.00  4.32  4.30  4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  2   1   0   4   4  11  4.20   526/1193  4.17  3.91  4.02  4.04  4.20


        Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13  0   1   0   1   4   3  3.89   812/1172  4.14  3.78  4.15  4.12  3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13  0   2   0   0   2   5  3.89   952/1182  4.13  4.01  4.35  4.30  3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13  0  2   0   2   1   4  3.56  1051/1170  3.87  4.13  4.38  4.32  3.56
4. Were special techniques successful                   13  6   0   0   1   1   1  4.00   ****/ 800  ****  3.95  4.06  4.01  ****


        Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   9   0   0   0   4   8   1  3.77   168/ 189  3.77  4.38  4.34  4.47  3.77
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 9  0  2   2   5   4   0  2.85   187/ 192  2.85  4.21  4.34  4.38  2.85
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9  1  0   0   0   3   9  4.75    52/ 186  4.75  4.57  4.48  4.57  4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            9   0   0   3   3   2   5  3.69   161/ 187  3.69  4.34  4.33  4.46  3.69
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  9   6   0   0   1   3   3  4.29    80/ 168  4.29  4.29  4.20  4.15  4.29

                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type               Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      5      0.00-0.99    0      A   10      Required for Majors  18    Graduate     0      Major       13
 28-55      7      1.00-1.99    0      B    8
 56-83      1      2.00-2.99    2      C    2      General               0    Under-grad  22      Non-major    9
 84-150     3      3.00-3.49    2      D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   12      F    0      Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                 0
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 202  07                University of Maryland                            Page  395
Title      Computer Science II              Baltimore County                                 JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Bergeron,Ryan J               Spring 2010                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    40
Questionnaires: 28                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0  1  4  7 16  4.36  771/1447  4.34  4.13  4.31  4.31  4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0  2  1 10 15  4.36  741/1447  4.41  4.09  4.27  4.23  4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   1  0  6  7 14  4.18  838/1241  4.30  4.18  4.33  4.35  4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0  1  2  6 18  4.52  482/1402  4.41  4.14  4.24  4.24  4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  21   1  1  3  1  1  3.00 1291/1358  3.99  3.85  4.11  4.12  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 17   0  1  0  3  7  4.45  444/1316  4.39  4.09  4.14  4.08  4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0  2  2  8 16  4.36  656/1427  4.44  4.12  4.19  4.14  4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0  0  0  1 26  4.96  194/1447  4.81  4.61  4.69  4.70  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  1  1 14  9  4.24  657/1434  4.21  3.88  4.10  3.97  4.24


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0  0  1  3 24  4.82  322/1387  4.65  4.24  4.46  4.42  4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0  0  1  1 26  4.89  553/1387  4.80  4.58  4.73  4.71  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0  2  1  9 16  4.39  757/1386  4.47  4.07  4.32  4.24  4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   1  0  3  7 16  4.37  783/1380  4.42  4.00  4.32  4.30  4.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  5  1  0  4  8 10  4.13  583/1193  4.17  3.91  4.02  4.04  4.13


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0   1  2  2  8 10  4.04  694/1172  4.14  3.78  4.15  4.12  4.04
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0   0  1  2  8 13  4.38  660/1182  4.13  4.01  4.35  4.30  4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0  1  0  3  5 13  4.32  725/1170  3.87  4.13  4.38  4.32  4.32
4. Were special techniques successful                  5  20   0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 800  ****  3.95  4.06  4.01  ****


                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  23  0   0  0  0  1  4  4.80 ****/ 189  3.77  4.38  4.34  4.47  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 23 0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60 ****/ 192  2.85  4.21  4.34  4.38  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 22 3  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 186  4.75  4.57  4.48  4.57  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           22   1   0  0  0  0  5  5.00 ****/ 187  3.69  4.34  4.33  4.46  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 22   3   0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 168  4.29  4.29  4.20  4.15  ****


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 25  1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  66  ****  4.13  4.58  4.43  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 25 1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  62  ****  4.00  4.56  4.28  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 25  1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  58  ****  4.38  4.41  3.79  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    25   1   0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  65  ****  3.88  4.42  4.36  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                25   1   0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  64  ****  3.75  4.09  3.70  ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 26  0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.49  2.25  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 26   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  36  ****  ****  4.25  3.25  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       26   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.52  ****  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   26   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.30  ****  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 26   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.43  ****  ****


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 26  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.72  ****  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    26   0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.57  ****  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      26   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.64  ****  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       26   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  20  ****  ****  4.60  ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     26   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  15  ****  ****  4.61  ****  ****
```

Title   Computer Science II   Baltimore County   JUN 28, 2010
Instructor: Bergeron,Ryan J   Spring 2010   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 28   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	10	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

```
Course-Section: CMSC 202  10              University of Maryland                                Page  396
Title      Computer Science II                Baltimore County                              JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Park,John                        Spring 2010                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    41
Questionnaires:  21                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                  NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank     Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   1   6   7   7  3.95 1108/1447  4.34 4.13  4.31 4.31  3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   1   6  13  4.48  575/1447  4.41 4.09  4.27 4.23  4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0   1   0   1   7  11  4.35  700/1241  4.30 4.18  4.33 4.35  4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2   0   1   2   7   9  4.26  756/1402  4.41 4.14  4.24 4.24  4.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  15   0   1   0   2   3  4.17  690/1358  3.99 3.85  4.11 4.12  4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 10  0   0   4   1   6  4.18  681/1316  4.39 4.09  4.14 4.08  4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   3   6  12  4.43  568/1427  4.44 4.12  4.19 4.14  4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   1   0   0   1   2  16  4.79  786/1447  4.81 4.61  4.69 4.70  4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0   0   0  12   9  4.43  431/1434  4.21 3.88  4.10 3.97  4.43

           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   5  16  4.76  414/1387  4.65 4.24  4.46 4.42  4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   2  19  4.90  528/1387  4.80 4.58  4.73 4.71  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   1   0   4  16  4.67  431/1386  4.47 4.07  4.32 4.24  4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   1   1   7  12  4.43  739/1380  4.42 4.00  4.32 4.30  4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 4  0   1   2   5   9  4.29  447/1193  4.17 3.91  4.02 4.04  4.29

           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0   1   1   2   4   8  4.06  687/1172  4.14 3.78  4.15 4.12  4.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0   0   0   5   5   6  4.06  841/1182  4.13 4.01  4.35 4.30  4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0   0   0   4   5   5  4.07  854/1170  3.87 4.13  4.38 4.32  4.07
4. Were special techniques successful                  5  12   0   0   2   1   1  3.75 ****/ 800  **** 3.95  4.06 4.01  ****

           Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  19   0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/ 189  3.77 4.38  4.34 4.47  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0  0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 192  2.85 4.21  4.34 4.38  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 19 1  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 186  4.75 4.57  4.48 4.57  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           19   0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/ 187  3.69 4.34  4.33 4.46  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 19   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 168  4.29 4.29  4.20 4.15  ****

                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons                  Type                 Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     4        0.00-0.99    1      A    8       Required for Majors  20    Graduate      0      Major       10
  28-55     5        1.00-1.99    0      B   11
  56-83     1        2.00-2.99    2      C    2       General               0    Under-grad   21      Non-major   11
  84-150    0        3.00-3.49    2      D    0
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00    6      F    0       Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                 0
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 203  1                   University of Maryland                              Page  397
Title        Discrete Structures                  Baltimore County                             JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:  Lomonaco JR,Sam                      Spring 2010                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    50
Questionnaires:  34              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions               NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank       Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   2   2  11  19  4.38   742/1447   3.64  4.13  4.31  4.31  4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   6  12  16  4.29   814/1447   3.65  4.09  4.27  4.23  4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   6  28  4.82   213/1241   4.28  4.18  4.33  4.35  4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  12   1   1   4   6  10  4.05   949/1402   3.90  4.14  4.24  4.24  4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   5   0   1   4  13  11  4.17   681/1358   3.83  3.85  4.11  4.12  4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 8  1   0   3  10  12  4.23   635/1316   3.73  4.09  4.14  4.08  4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   0   4   6  24  4.59   361/1427   4.31  4.12  4.19  4.14  4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0   0   0   1  32  4.97   194/1447   4.47  4.61  4.69  4.70  4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0   0   6  15  11  4.16   744/1434   3.28  3.88  4.10  3.97  4.16


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0   0   0   2  13  18  4.48   818/1387   4.03  4.24  4.46  4.42  4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0   0   0   0   2  31  4.94   369/1387   4.21  4.58  4.73  4.71  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   0   2   5  10  16  4.21   911/1386   3.64  4.07  4.32  4.24  4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   1   0   1   3   7  21  4.50   659/1380   3.73  4.00  4.32  4.30  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 21  0   1   4   4   3  3.75   843/1193   3.47  3.91  4.02  4.04  3.75


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 26  0   1   0   2   2   3  3.75  ****/1172   2.13  3.78  4.15  4.12  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 26  0   1   0   2   1   4  3.88  ****/1182   2.29  4.01  4.35  4.30  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 26 0  1   2   0   2   3  3.50  ****/1170   3.07  4.13  4.38  4.32  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   26  7   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/ 800   ****  3.95  4.06  4.01  ****

                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 33  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  31   ****  ****  4.72  ****  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    12       0.00-0.99    0      A   17       Required for Majors  29    Graduate     0      Major       18
 28-55     8       1.00-1.99    1      B   10
 56-83     1       2.00-2.99    2      C    4       General               0    Under-grad  34      Non-major   16
 84-150    0       3.00-3.49    8      D    0
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   11      F    0       Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I    0       Other                 1
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 203  2                    University of Maryland                              Page 398
Title       Discrete Structures                Baltimore County                                   JUN 28, 2010
Instructor: Yesha,Yaacov                       Spring 2010                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    49
Questionnaires: 34                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0  3  6 11 11  2  3.09 1402/1447  3.64  4.13  4.31 4.31  3.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  4  7 11  8  4  3.03 1398/1447  3.65  4.09  4.27 4.23  3.03
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  3  9 12 10  3.85 1021/1241  4.28  4.18  4.33 4.35  3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   6  0  1 11  9  7  3.79 1148/1402  3.90  4.14  4.24 4.24  3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  2  2 12 12  6  3.53 1161/1358  3.83  3.85  4.11 4.12  3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7  5  0 12  7  3  3.11 1247/1316  3.73  4.09  4.14 4.08  3.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  1  2  8  7 16  4.03  959/1427  4.31  4.12  4.19 4.14  4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   1  0  0  0 26  7  4.21 1275/1447  4.47  4.61  4.69 4.70  4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1  3  7 15  3  0  2.64 1396/1434  3.28  3.88  4.10 3.97  2.64


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  1  4 10 10  9  3.65 1287/1387  4.03  4.24  4.46 4.42  3.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  1  7 10 16  4.21 1280/1387  4.21  4.58  4.73 4.71  4.21
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  5  5 11 10  3  3.03 1327/1386  3.64  4.07  4.32 4.24  3.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  6  6  7  6  9  3.18 1305/1380  3.73  4.00  4.32 4.30  3.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  6  2  4  8  9  5  3.39 1002/1193  3.47  3.91  4.02 4.04  3.39


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 19  0  6  3  4  2  0  2.13 1164/1172  2.13  3.78  4.15 4.12  2.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 20  0  5  2  5  2  0  2.29 1176/1182  2.29  4.01  4.35 4.30  2.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 20 0  3  1  4  4  2  3.07 1134/1170  3.07  4.13  4.38 4.32  3.07
4. Were special techniques successful                   20  9  0  1  2  2  0  3.20 ****/ 800  ****  3.95  4.06 4.01  ****


            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 33 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 192  ****  4.21  4.34 4.38  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31  1  0  1  1  0  0  2.50 ****/  66  ****  4.13  4.58 4.43  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 32 1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  62  ****  4.00  4.56 4.28  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 33  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.72 ****  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     32  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.57 ****  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       33  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.64 ****  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        32  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  20  ****  ****  4.60 ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      32  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  15  ****  ****  4.61 ****  ****

                                     Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type            Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    6       0.00-0.99   0      A   10     Required for Majors  30    Graduate    0     Major      17
  28-55   10       1.00-1.99   0      B   16
  56-83    1       2.00-2.99   3      C    2     General           0       Under-grad  34     Non-major  17
  84-150   1       3.00-3.49   5      D    0
  Grad.    0       3.50-4.00   6      F    0     Electives         0       #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                              responses to be significant
                                      I    0     Other             0
                                      ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 203  3                        University of Maryland                                    Page  399
Title          Discrete Structures                   Baltimore County                                       JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Stephens,Arthur                         Spring 2010                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    46
Questionnaires: 26                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                     Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                    NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5   Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   2   2  10   6   6  3.46 1347/1447  3.64  4.13  4.31 4.31  3.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   4   9   6   7  3.62 1282/1447  3.65  4.09  4.27 4.23  3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   1   0   7   4  14  4.15  850/1241  4.28  4.18  4.33 4.35  4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  12   1   1   2   5   5  3.86 1107/1402  3.90  4.14  4.24 4.24  3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   7   1   2   2   9   5  3.79 1001/1358  3.83  3.85  4.11 4.12  3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 14   1   1   2   3   5  3.83  950/1316  3.73  4.09  4.14 4.08  3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   1   0   4   6  15  4.31  716/1427  4.31  4.12  4.19 4.14  4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   1  18   7  4.23 1263/1447  4.47  4.61  4.69 4.70  4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  1   6  11   7   1  3.04 1346/1434  3.28  3.88  4.10 3.97  3.04


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   1   2   3  10   9  3.96 1196/1387  4.03  4.24  4.46 4.42  3.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   2   3   7   7   6  3.48 1363/1387  4.21  4.58  4.73 4.71  3.48
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   2   4   2   9   8  3.68 1214/1386  3.64  4.07  4.32 4.24  3.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   2   4   5   7   7  3.52 1240/1380  3.73  4.00  4.32 4.30  3.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  6   3   1   7   4   4  3.26 1039/1193  3.47  3.91  4.02 4.04  3.26


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 22  0   2   0   0   1   1  2.75 ****/1172  2.13  3.78  4.15 4.12  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22  0   1   2   0   0   1  2.50 ****/1182  2.29  4.01  4.35 4.30  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0   1   0   0   1   1  3.33 ****/1170  3.07  4.13  4.38 4.32  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  23   2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 800  ****  3.95  4.06 4.01  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                  Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      3        0.00-0.99   0      A    7         Required for Majors   23     Graduate      0       Major        15
 28-55      7        1.00-1.99   0      B   11                                                            
 56-83      3        2.00-2.99   0      C    5         General                0     Under-grad   26       Non-major    11
 84-150     1        3.00-3.49   5      D    1
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   8      F    0         Electives              0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                        I    0         Other                  0
                                        ?    1
```

```
                                                  Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                       NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank       Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   6   4  11   3   3  2.74 1434/1447  2.74 4.13  4.31 4.32  2.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1   0   2   6   6   7   5  3.27 1371/1447  3.27 4.09  4.27 4.23  3.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1   0   5   6   9   1   5  2.81 1228/1241  2.81 4.18  4.33 4.33  2.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1   0   1   2   5  10   8  3.85 1113/1402  3.85 4.14  4.24 4.24  3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  3   0   6   5   3   4   6  2.96 1304/1358  2.96 3.85  4.11 4.10  2.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  5   0   0   3   6   6   7  3.77  985/1316  3.77 4.09  4.14 4.13  3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           4   0   1   4   6   5   7  3.57 1240/1427  3.57 4.12  4.19 4.15  3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                 3   0   0   0   0   2  22  4.92  436/1447  4.92 4.61  4.69 4.65  4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  6   0   0   7   8   4   2  3.05 1345/1434  3.05 3.88  4.10 4.09  3.05


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       4   0   3   4   5   6   5  3.26 1332/1387  3.26 4.24  4.46 4.44  3.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  4   0   1   0   0   3  19  4.70  946/1387  4.70 4.58  4.73 4.71  4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  4   0   2   2   8   5   6  3.48 1265/1386  3.48 4.07  4.32 4.30  3.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    4   0   5   4   4   5   5  3.04 1315/1380  3.04 4.00  4.32 4.32  3.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  5   8   4   3   2   2   3  2.79 1132/1193  2.79 3.91  4.02 4.05  2.79


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  22   0   1   0   1   3   0  3.20 ****/1172  **** 3.78  4.15 4.24  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  22   0   0   1   0   2   2  4.00 ****/1182  **** 4.01  4.35 4.42  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  22   0   0   0   2   1   2  4.00 ****/1170  **** 4.13  4.38 4.49  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                22   3   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/ 800  **** 3.95  4.06 4.12  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                      Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     0      0.00-0.99    0        A   12        Required for Majors  22    Graduate      0       Major       18
28-55     2      1.00-1.99    0        B    8
56-83     3      2.00-2.99    1        C    0        General               0    Under-grad   27       Non-major    9
84-150    2      3.00-3.49    5        D    0
Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    5        F    0        Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0        Other                 0
                                       ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 313  1                    University of Maryland                              Page  401
Title        Comp Organ & Assemb La              Baltimore County                                JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:  Frey,Dennis L                       Spring 2010                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     36
Questionnaires:  26                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  0  0  2  3 21  4.73  331/1447   4.60  4.13  4.31  4.32  4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  2  3 21  4.73  270/1447   4.65  4.09  4.27  4.23  4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  1  0  8 17  4.58  478/1241   4.42  4.18  4.33  4.33  4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  5  0  1  1  2 17  4.67  314/1402   4.58  4.14  4.24  4.24  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2  1  1  6  5 11  4.00  799/1358   4.00  3.85  4.11  4.10  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 4 0 0 1 4 16  4.71  196/1316   4.50  4.09  4.14  4.13  4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1  0  1  0  0  5 19  4.64  301/1427   4.71  4.12  4.19  4.15  4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  0  0  0  0  1 24  4.96  194/1447   4.98  4.61  4.69  4.65  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 0 0 1 5 16  4.68  214/1434   4.66  3.88  4.10  4.09  4.68


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2  0  0  0  1  1 22  4.88  245/1387   4.88  4.24  4.46  4.44  4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2  0  0  1  0  3 20  4.75  859/1387   4.85  4.58  4.73  4.71  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  1  0  2 21  4.79  265/1386   4.71  4.07  4.32  4.30  4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2  0  0  1  0  3 20  4.75  339/1380   4.74  4.00  4.32  4.32  4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 1 0 1 3 3 16  4.48  314/1193   4.21  3.91  4.02  4.05  4.48


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 1 0 3  4.50  ****/1172   ****  3.78  4.15  4.24  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22 0 0 1 0 0 3  4.25  ****/1182   ****  4.01  4.35  4.42  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 0 1 0 0 3  4.25  ****/1170   ****  4.13  4.38  4.49  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   22 2 0 1 0 0 1  3.50  ****/ 800   ****  3.95  4.06  4.12  ****

                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0      A   11      Required for Majors  24     Graduate     0      Major      23
 28-55      2       1.00-1.99    0      B   11
 56-83      7       2.00-2.99    4      C    2      General               0     Under-grad  26      Non-major   3
 84-150     1       3.00-3.49    8      D    0
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    3      F    0      Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                 0
                                       ?    0
```

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

              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   4   2  13   4.47   626/1447   4.60  4.13  4.31  4.32  4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   0   5  13   4.58   457/1447   4.65  4.09  4.27  4.23  4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   1   0   2   6  10   4.26   774/1241   4.42  4.18  4.33  4.33  4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   3   0   1   1   3  11   4.50   494/1402   4.58  4.14  4.24  4.24  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   5   0   1   4   3   6   4.00   799/1358   4.00  3.85  4.11  4.10  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  11   0   0   2   1   4   4.29   590/1316   4.50  4.09  4.14  4.13  4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   1   2  16   4.79   172/1427   4.71  4.12  4.19  4.15  4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0  19   5.00     1/1447   4.98  4.61  4.69  4.65  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5  0   0   0   0   5   9   4.64   246/1434   4.66  3.88  4.10  4.09  4.64


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   2  17   4.89   215/1387   4.88  4.24  4.46  4.44  4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   1  18   4.95   317/1387   4.85  4.58  4.73  4.71  4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   0   1   5  13   4.63   470/1386   4.71  4.07  4.32  4.30  4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   1   3  15   4.74   366/1380   4.74  4.00  4.32  4.32  4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  1   1   0   5   2   7   3.93   726/1193   4.21  3.91  4.02  4.05  3.93


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17  0   0   0   1   0   1   4.00   ****/1172   ****  3.78  4.15  4.24  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17  0   0   0   0   0   2   5.00   ****/1182   ****  4.01  4.35  4.42  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17  0   0   0   0   0   2   5.00   ****/1170   ****  4.13  4.38  4.49  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  17   1   0   0   0   0   1   5.00   ****/ 800   ****  3.95  4.06  4.12  ****
```

                                          Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                  Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0        A   10      Required for Majors  17     Graduate      0      Major       18
28-55      2      1.00-1.99    0        B    4                                  Under-grad   19      Non-major    1
56-83      6      2.00-2.99    1        C    2      General               0
84-150     3      3.00-3.49    7        D    1                                  #### - Means there are not enough
Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    4        F    0      Electives             0            responses to be significant
                                        P    0
                                        I    0      Other                 0
                                        ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 331  1                    University of Maryland                              Page  403
Title       Prin Of Prog Languages              Baltimore County                              JUN 28, 2010
Instructor: Vick,Shon                             Spring 2010                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   27
Questionnaires:  19               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  1  5  4  7  2  3.21 1387/1447  3.55 4.13  4.31 4.32  3.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  1  3  6  8  1  3.26 1371/1447  3.45 4.09  4.27 4.23  3.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   6  0  3  4  4  1  3.25 1188/1241  3.61 4.18  4.33 4.33  3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   3  0  3  6  4  2  3.33 1307/1402  3.71 4.14  4.24 4.24  3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   1  3  3  2  5  4  3.24 1255/1358  3.35 3.85  4.11 4.10  3.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 9  0  1  3  3  2  3.67 1050/1316  3.63 4.09  4.14 4.13  3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  2  2  7  5  3  3.26 1329/1427  3.29 4.12  4.19 4.15  3.26
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  2  1  3  4  9  3.89 1405/1447  4.43 4.61  4.69 4.65  3.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  3  9  4  0  3.06 1343/1434  3.42 3.88  4.10 4.09  3.06


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  3  3  6  3  3  3.00 1350/1387  3.57 4.24  4.46 4.44  3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  1  0  4  6  7  4.00 1320/1387  4.15 4.58  4.73 4.71  4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  3  6  4  3  2  2.72 1351/1386  3.34 4.07  4.32 4.30  2.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  4  4  4  2  4  2.89 1329/1380  3.26 4.00  4.32 4.32  2.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5  2  0  3  1  3  5  3.83  796/1193  3.78 3.91  4.02 4.05  3.83


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13  0  0  1  3  1  1  3.33 1042/1172  3.81 3.78  4.15 4.24  3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13  0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1182  4.07 4.01  4.35 4.42  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  480/1170  4.48 4.13  4.38 4.49  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                   13  5  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 800  **** 3.95  4.06 4.12  ****


                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                      Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    2        0.00-0.99    2         A   6          Required for Majors  16     Graduate     0        Major        15
  28-55    1        1.00-1.99    1         B  10
  56-83    1        2.00-2.99    2         C   1          General               0     Under-grad  19        Non-major     4
  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
                                          P   0                                       responses to be significant
                                          I   0          Other                 0
                                          ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 331  2                    University of Maryland                                    Page  404
Title      Prin Of Prog Languages              Baltimore County                                        JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Finin,Timothy W                  Spring 2010                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   43
Questionnaires:  28                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies       Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                  NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   1   1   7  10   9  3.89 1166/1447  3.55  4.13  4.31  4.32  3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0   5   7   8   7  3.63 1278/1447  3.45  4.09  4.27  4.23  3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   3   7   6  12  3.96  949/1241  3.61  4.18  4.33  4.33  3.96
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   2   1   1   3  10  10  4.08  923/1402  3.71  4.14  4.24  4.24  4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  4   1   3   8   8   4  3.46 1191/1358  3.35  3.85  4.11  4.10  3.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6  1   3   5   8   5  3.59 1092/1316  3.63  4.09  4.14  4.13  3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   4   4   5   9   6  3.32 1315/1427  3.29  4.12  4.19  4.15  3.32
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   1  27  4.96  194/1447  4.43  4.61  4.69  4.65  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0  0   0   8  12   3  3.78 1066/1434  3.42  3.88  4.10  4.09  3.78


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   1   6   8  12  4.15 1118/1387  3.57  4.24  4.46  4.44  4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   1   5   5  15  4.31 1241/1387  4.15  4.58  4.73  4.71  4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   2   5  12   8  3.96 1079/1386  3.34  4.07  4.32  4.30  3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   2   3   5  10   7  3.63 1211/1380  3.26  4.00  4.32  4.32  3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  1  1   2   9   4   9  3.72  861/1193  3.78  3.91  4.02  4.05  3.72


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21 0  0   0   1   3   3  4.29  559/1172  3.81  3.78  4.15  4.24  4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21 0  1   2   1   1   2  3.14 1131/1182  4.07  4.01  4.35  4.42  3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 21 0 0   0   2   1   4  4.29  745/1170  4.48  4.13  4.38  4.49  4.29


            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 26 0 0  0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 192  ****  4.21  4.34  4.20  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 27  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.49  4.73  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 27  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  36  ****  ****  4.25  3.81  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   27  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.30  4.42  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 27 0  0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.72  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    27  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.57  5.00  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0      A   10        Required for Majors  26    Graduate     0       Major       23
28-55      2       1.00-1.99    0      B   12
56-83      7       2.00-2.99    2      C    4        General               0    Under-grad  28       Non-major    5
84-150     5       3.00-3.49    4      D    0
Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   10      F    0        Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0        Other                 1
                                       ?    1
```

```
                                                      Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5   Mean     Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  1  1  2  9  4.46  640/1447  4.32  4.13  4.31  4.32  4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  2  0  2  2  7  3.92 1123/1447  3.98  4.09  4.27  4.23  3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  2  1  4  6  4.08  891/1241  4.02  4.18  4.33  4.33  4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   1  0  0  4  3  5  4.08  923/1402  3.88  4.14  4.24  4.24  4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 3  1  3  2  1  3  3.20 1262/1358  3.31  3.85  4.11  4.10  3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 8 1 0 0 1  3  4.00  812/1316  4.14  4.09  4.14  4.13  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  1  0  2  7  3  3.85 1117/1427  4.12  4.12  4.19  4.15  3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  0 13  5.00    1/1447  4.99  4.61  4.69  4.65  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 4 3 2 3.78 1073/1434  3.86  3.88  4.10  4.09  3.78


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  1  0  2  2  8  4.23 1055/1387  4.27  4.24  4.46  4.44  4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  1  2 10  4.69  946/1387  4.62  4.58  4.73  4.71  4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 5 2 5  3.85 1155/1386  4.01  4.07  4.32  4.30  3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   1  0  2  3  2  5  3.83 1138/1380  3.96  4.00  4.32  4.32  3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 4 0 0 2 2 4  4.25  478/1193  4.11  3.91  4.02  4.05  4.25


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 2 1 0 0 1  2.25 1161/1172  3.00  3.78  4.15  4.24  2.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 3 0 0 0 1  2.00 1178/1182  3.13  4.01  4.35  4.42  2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 2 0 0 0 2 3.00 1137/1170  3.81  4.13  4.38  4.49  3.00
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	1			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

```
Course-Section: CMSC 341  2                     University of Maryland                              Page  406
Title          Data Structures                     Baltimore County                             JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Kargupta,Hillol                       Spring 2010                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    25
Questionnaires: 11                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                      Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                   NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5   Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   1   1   5   4  4.09 1012/1447  4.32  4.13  4.31 4.32  4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   3   4   3  3.82 1203/1447  3.98  4.09  4.27 4.23  3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   1   3   4   3  3.82 1047/1241  4.02  4.18  4.33 4.33  3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2   0   1   4   3   1  3.44 1277/1402  3.88  4.14  4.24 4.24  3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   4   1   0   1   3   1  3.50 1170/1358  3.31  3.85  4.11 4.10  3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  5   0   0   1   2   3  4.33  549/1316  4.14  4.09  4.14 4.13  4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   2   4   5  4.27  751/1427  4.12  4.12  4.19 4.15  4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1   0   0   0   0  10  5.00    1/1447  4.99  4.61  4.69 4.65  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  0  0   1   2   7   1  3.73 1110/1434  3.86  3.88  4.10 4.09  3.73


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   3   2   6  4.27 1023/1387  4.27  4.24  4.46 4.44  4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   1   4   6  4.45 1173/1387  4.62  4.58  4.73 4.71  4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   1   2   4   4  4.00 1047/1386  4.01  4.07  4.32 4.30  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   4   4   3  3.91 1104/1380  3.96  4.00  4.32 4.32  3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  1   0   0   4   2   4  4.00  652/1193  4.11  3.91  4.02 4.05  4.00


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0   0   1   0   1   0  3.00 ****/1172  3.00  3.78  4.15 4.24  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/1182  3.13  4.01  4.35 4.42  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9  0   0   1   0   1   0  3.00 ****/1170  3.81  4.13  4.38 4.49  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

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

              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   4  10  16  4.40   723/1447  4.32  4.13  4.31  4.32  4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   7  10  13  4.20   911/1447  3.98  4.09  4.27  4.23  4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   1   0   6   9  14  4.17   844/1241  4.02  4.18  4.33  4.33  4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   4   0   2   6   5  13  4.12   900/1402  3.88  4.14  4.24  4.24  4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  8   5   3   3   4   7  3.23  1257/1358  3.31  3.85  4.11  4.10  3.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 17  0   2   1   4   6  4.08   774/1316  4.14  4.09  4.14  4.13  4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   2   5   7  16  4.23   799/1427  4.12  4.12  4.19  4.15  4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   1  29  4.97   194/1447  4.99  4.61  4.69  4.65  4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0   0   6  11   8  4.08   807/1434  3.86  3.88  4.10  4.09  4.08


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   1   4   9  15  4.31   990/1387  4.27  4.24  4.46  4.44  4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   0   0   8  20  4.71   919/1387  4.62  4.58  4.73  4.71  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   2   3  12  12  4.17   945/1386  4.01  4.07  4.32  4.30  4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0   0   8   9  12  4.14   978/1380  3.96  4.00  4.32  4.32  4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3 1   2   4   6  13  4.08   624/1193  4.11  3.91  4.02  4.05  4.08


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 22 0  1   1   0   3   3  3.75   881/1172  3.00  3.78  4.15  4.24  3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22 0  1   0   1   0   6  4.25   737/1182  3.13  4.01  4.35  4.42  4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 0   0   1   1   6  4.63   508/1170  3.81  4.13  4.38  4.49  4.63
4. Were special techniques successful                  22   4   0   0   0   1   3  4.75  ****/  800  ****  3.95  4.06  4.12  ****


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  29   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  189  ****  4.38  4.34  4.26  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 29 0 0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  192  ****  4.21  4.34  4.20  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 29 0 0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  186  ****  4.57  4.48  4.36  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           29   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00  ****/  187  ****  4.34  4.33  4.11  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 29   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  168  ****  4.29  4.20  4.02  ****
```

                              Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     0      0.00-0.99    0      A   12      Required for Majors  28    Graduate      0      Major        17
28-55     2      1.00-1.99    0      B    9                                 Under-grad    30     Non-major    13
56-83    10      2.00-2.99    4      C    6      General              0
84-150    4      3.00-3.49    6      D    0
Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    7      F    0      Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                     P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                     I    0      Other                0
                                     ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 345  1                University of Maryland                              Page  408
Title      Software Design/Develo           Baltimore County                              JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:  Edelman,Mitch                     Spring 2010                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   30
Questionnaires:  28                Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  4  7  7  5  5  3.00 1411/1447  3.43 4.13  4.31 4.32  3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  4  7  8  5  4  2.93 1409/1447  3.43 4.09  4.27 4.23  2.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   1  3  3  8  8  5  3.33 1175/1241  4.00 4.18  4.33 4.33  3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  3  4 11  4  5  3.15 1349/1402  3.61 4.14  4.24 4.24  3.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  10  4  6  1  5  2  2.72 1333/1358  3.44 3.85  4.11 4.10  2.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  6  5  2 10  5  3.11 1249/1316  3.25 4.09  4.14 4.13  3.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   1  9  7  4  4  3  2.44 1401/1427  2.92 4.12  4.19 4.15  2.44
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  1 27  4.96  194/1447  4.38 4.61  4.69 4.65  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7  0  4  4  5  5  3  2.95 1365/1434  3.32 3.88  4.10 4.09  2.95


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  3  8  6  5  4  2.96 1353/1387  3.38 4.24  4.46 4.44  2.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  2  6 10  8  3.92 1336/1387  3.99 4.58  4.73 4.71  3.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  2 11  5  5  4  2.93 1340/1386  3.36 4.07  4.32 4.30  2.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  8  3  4  6  5  2.88 1329/1380  3.24 4.00  4.32 4.32  2.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  5  1  2  9  5  5  3.50  960/1193  3.63 3.91  4.02 4.05  3.50


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 25  0  0  1  1  1  0  3.00 ****/1172  **** 3.78  4.15 4.24  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 25  0  0  0  2  1  0  3.33 ****/1182  **** 4.01  4.35 4.42  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 25  0  0  0  3  0  0  3.00 ****/1170  **** 4.13  4.38 4.49  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  25   0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 ****/ 800  **** 3.95  4.06 4.12  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades           Reasons                   Type                  Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0      A  14      Required for Majors  22     Graduate     1        Major       24
  28-55      1      1.00-1.99    0      B  12
  56-83      3      2.00-2.99    3      C   0      General               0     Under-grad  27        Non-major    4
  84-150    12      3.00-3.49    8      D   0
  Grad.      1      3.50-4.00    8      F   0      Electives             2     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I   0      Other                 0
                                       ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 345  2                    University of Maryland                              Page  409
Title      Software Design/Develo              Baltimore County                               JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Vick,Shon                          Spring 2010                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    24
Questionnaires: 15                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
              ------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course     0  0  0  1  4  6  4  3.87 1190/1447  3.43  4.13  4.31  4.32  3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      0  0  1  1  3  3  7  3.93 1114/1447  3.43  4.09  4.27  4.23  3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     1  8  0  0  1  0  5  4.67  380/1241  4.00  4.18  4.33  4.33  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      0  0  1  1  0  7  6  4.07  936/1402  3.61  4.14  4.24  4.24  4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  9  0  0  1  3  2  4.17  690/1358  3.44  3.85  4.11  4.10  4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  4  1  0  4  4  1  3.40 1172/1316  3.25  4.09  4.14  4.13  3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              0  0  3  0  4  4  4  3.40 1291/1427  2.92  4.12  4.19  4.15  3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled                    0  0  0  0  6  6  3  3.80 1414/1447  4.38  4.61  4.69  4.65  3.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  1  1  0  3  7  2  3.69 1131/1434  3.32  3.88  4.10  4.09  3.69


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          0  0  1  0  4  6  4  3.80 1253/1387  3.38  4.24  4.46  4.44  3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     0  0  0  1  4  3  7  4.07 1309/1387  3.99  4.58  4.73  4.71  4.07
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0  0  1  1  3  5  5  3.80 1174/1386  3.36  4.07  4.32  4.30  3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       0  0  2  1  3  4  5  3.60 1218/1380  3.24  4.00  4.32  4.32  3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  2  1  0  4  3  4  3.75  843/1193  3.63  3.91  4.02  4.05  3.75


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1172  ****  3.78  4.15  4.24  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1182  ****  4.01  4.35  4.42  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1170  ****  4.13  4.38  4.49  ****

                                       Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                  Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0      A   10      Required for Majors  11      Graduate      0       Major        12
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0      B    1
  56-83      1        2.00-2.99    0      C    0      General               1      Under-grad   15       Non-major     3
  84-150     4        3.00-3.49    3      D    0
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    4      F    0      Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other                 0
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 411  1                     University of Maryland                           Page  410
Title       Computer Architecture               Baltimore County                                JUN 28, 2010
Instructor: Squire,Jon S                        Spring 2010                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    39
Questionnaires: 18                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  1  1  6 10  4.39   742/1447  4.47  4.13  4.31  4.43  4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  2  3 13  4.61   413/1447  4.58  4.09  4.27  4.31  4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  0  2  4 11  4.53   523/1241  4.51  4.18  4.33  4.41  4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  3  0  0  1  5  8  4.50   494/1402  4.38  4.14  4.24  4.34  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  5  2  0  2  4  4  3.67  1084/1358  3.56  3.85  4.11  4.15  3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  5  0  1  0  4  7  4.42   486/1316  4.21  4.09  4.14  4.27  4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  0  2  2 13  4.65   301/1427  4.47  4.12  4.19  4.20  4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0  0 17  5.00     1/1447  5.00  4.61  4.69  4.72  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  0  0  1  1  6  7  4.27   623/1434  4.26  3.88  4.10  4.17  4.27


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2  0  0  0  2  1 13  4.69   536/1387  4.74  4.24  4.46  4.48  4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2  0  0  0  0  1 15  4.94   369/1387  4.97  4.58  4.73  4.76  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  1  0  6  9  4.44   705/1386  4.49  4.07  4.32  4.34  4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2  0  0  1  2  5  8  4.25   887/1380  4.36  4.00  4.32  4.34  4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  2  0  1  2  5  6  4.14   574/1193  4.11  3.91  4.02  4.00  4.14


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/1172  3.00  3.78  4.15  4.25  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/1182  4.33  4.01  4.35  4.49  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1170  4.00  4.13  4.38  4.51  ****


                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/ 189  ****  4.38  4.34  4.74  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 192  ****  4.21  4.34  4.61  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 186  ****  4.57  4.48  4.72  ****


                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  38  ****  ****  4.49  4.68  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  36  ****  ****  4.25  4.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  28  ****  ****  4.52  4.72  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  30  ****  ****  4.30  4.38  ****


                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  31  ****  ****  4.72  4.80  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  21  ****  ****  4.57  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  31  ****  ****  4.64  4.60  ****


                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades            Reasons                   Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0         0.00-0.99    0      A   10        Required for Majors  15      Graduate     0        Major      14
  28-55     0         1.00-1.99    0      B    5                                                           
  56-83     2         2.00-2.99    0      C    0        General               0      Under-grad  18        Non-major   4
  84-150    8         3.00-3.49    5      D    0                                                           
  Grad.     0         3.50-4.00    6      F    0        Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                 1
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 411  2                     University of Maryland                              Page  411
Title        Computer Architecture                  Baltimore County                              JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:  Younis,Mohamed                         Spring 2010                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     31
Questionnaires:  20                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                 Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                  NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   0   1   7  12  4.55   529/1447  4.47  4.13  4.31  4.43  4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   0   9  11  4.55   479/1447  4.58  4.09  4.27  4.31  4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   2   6  12  4.50   541/1241  4.51  4.18  4.33  4.41  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   4   0   0   2   8   6  4.25   766/1402  4.38  4.14  4.24  4.34  4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   6   1   3   0   7   2  3.46  1186/1358  3.56  3.85  4.11  4.15  3.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5   0   1   3   6   5  4.00   812/1316  4.21  4.09  4.14  4.27  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   0   2  10   8  4.30   716/1427  4.47  4.12  4.19  4.20  4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   0  20  5.00     1/1447  5.00  4.61  4.69  4.72  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0   0   0   2  11   7  4.25   634/1434  4.26  3.88  4.10  4.17  4.25


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   0   4  16  4.80   353/1387  4.74  4.24  4.46  4.48  4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   0   0  20  5.00     1/1387  4.97  4.58  4.73  4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   0   2   5  13  4.55   558/1386  4.49  4.07  4.32  4.34  4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   1   0   1   1   5  12  4.47   689/1380  4.36  4.00  4.32  4.34  4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  6   0   1   1   7   4  4.08   624/1193  4.11  3.91  4.02  4.00  4.08


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14  0   1   1   2   1   1  3.00  1090/1172  3.00  3.78  4.15  4.25  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14  0   0   0   1   2   3  4.33   691/1182  4.33  4.01  4.35  4.49  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0   0   0   2   2   2  4.00   864/1170  4.00  4.13  4.38  4.51  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   14  5   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 800  ****  3.95  4.06  4.19  ****


                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                   Type                Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0        A   3       Required for Majors  17     Graduate     0       Major        13
 28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0        B   7                                                                     
 56-83      1       2.00-2.99    1        C   4       General               0     Under-grad  20       Non-major     7
 84-150     7       3.00-3.49    2        D   0                                                                     
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    7        F   1       Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I   0       Other                 0
                                         ?   2
```

Title   Princ Of Oper Systems   Baltimore County   JUN 28, 2010
Instructor: Kalpakis,Konsta   Spring 2010   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 51
Questionnaires: 32   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                                 Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   1   1   5  25  4.69  386/1447  4.69 4.13  4.31 4.43  4.69
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   4   8  19  4.41  677/1447  4.41 4.09  4.27 4.31  4.41
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   2   3  11  16  4.28  758/1241  4.28 4.18  4.33 4.41  4.28
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   3   1   1   4   9  14  4.17  845/1402  4.17 4.14  4.24 4.34  4.17
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  7   0   2   4  11   8  4.00  799/1358  4.00 3.85  4.11 4.15  4.00
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6  0   3   3   9  11  4.08  774/1316  4.08 4.09  4.14 4.27  4.08
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   1   0   6  11  14  4.16  874/1427  4.16 4.12  4.19 4.20  4.16
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1   0   0   1   0  30  4.94  339/1447  4.94 4.61  4.69 4.72  4.94
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0   0   4   7  18  4.48  363/1434  4.48 3.88  4.10 4.17  4.48


              Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   8  24  4.75  429/1387  4.75 4.24  4.46 4.48  4.75
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   3  29  4.91  528/1387  4.91 4.58  4.73 4.76  4.91
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   1   3   9  19  4.44  705/1386  4.44 4.07  4.32 4.34  4.44
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   1   2   2  27  4.72  392/1380  4.72 4.00  4.32 4.34  4.72
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 6  1   1   4   6  13  4.16  555/1193  4.16 3.91  4.02 4.00  4.16


              Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 28 0  0   0   1   1   2  4.25 ****/1172  **** 3.78  4.15 4.25  ****
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 28 0  0   0   0   0   4  5.00 ****/1182  **** 4.01  4.35 4.49  ****
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 28 0 0   0   0   0   4  5.00 ****/1170  **** 4.13  4.38 4.51  ****
```

                                      Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                 Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1      0.00-0.99    0      A    9      Required for Majors  30    Graduate      0      Major        25
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0      B   16
 56-83      0      2.00-2.99    1      C    5      General               0    Under-grad   32      Non-major     7
 84-150    11      3.00-3.49    8      D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   10      F    0      Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                 0
                                       ?    1
```

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

                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0  0  0  0  2  14  4.88  179/1447   4.88  4.13  4.31  4.43  4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  1  1  14  4.81  187/1447   4.81  4.09  4.27  4.31  4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  12  0  0  0  0   4  5.00  ****/1241   ****  4.18  4.33  4.41  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  5  11  4.69  292/1402   4.69  4.14  4.24  4.34  4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  1  0  1  3  11  4.44  419/1358   4.44  3.85  4.11  4.15  4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2  0  0  2  5   7  4.36  534/1316   4.36  4.09  4.14  4.27  4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   1  0  1  4  2   8  4.13  890/1427   4.13  4.12  4.19  4.20  4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  1  1  14  4.81  727/1447   4.81  4.61  4.69  4.72  4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  0  5  10  4.67  230/1434   4.67  3.88  4.10  4.17  4.67


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  3  13  4.81  337/1387   4.81  4.24  4.46  4.48  4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  0  16  5.00    1/1387   5.00  4.58  4.73  4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  6  10  4.63  483/1386   4.63  4.07  4.32  4.34  4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  1  2  13  4.75  339/1380   4.75  4.00  4.32  4.34  4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 1  0  0  0  3  11  4.79  112/1193   4.79  3.91  4.02  4.00  4.79


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  0  0  3   6  4.67  282/1172   4.67  3.78  4.15  4.25  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0  0  0  0  0   9  5.00    1/1182   5.00  4.01  4.35  4.49  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0  0  0  1  0   8  4.78  364/1170   4.78  4.13  4.38  4.51  4.78
4. Were special techniques successful                  8   0  0  0  0  2   7  4.78   98/ 800   4.78  3.95  4.06  4.19  4.78


                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  14  0  0  0  0  2   1  4.33  ****/ 189   ****  4.38  4.34  4.74  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15 0 0 0  0  1   1  4.50  ****/ 192   ****  4.21  4.34  4.61  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 15 0 0 0  0  1   1  4.50  ****/ 186   ****  4.57  4.48  4.72  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           15  0  0  0  0  0   2  5.00  ****/ 187   ****  4.34  4.33  4.59  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 15  1  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/ 168   ****  4.29  4.20  4.53  ****


                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16 0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  66   ****  4.13  4.58  4.87  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  62   ****  4.00  4.56  4.80  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  58   ****  4.38  4.41  4.59  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    16  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  65   ****  3.88  4.42  4.55  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                16  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  64   ****  3.75  4.09  4.43  ****


                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  38   ****  ****  4.49  4.68  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  36   ****  ****  4.25  4.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       16  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  28   ****  ****  4.52  4.72  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   16  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  30   ****  ****  4.30  4.38  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  27   ****  ****  4.43  4.62  ****


                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  31   ****  ****  4.72  4.80  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    16  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  21   ****  ****  4.57  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      16  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  31   ****  ****  4.64  4.60  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       16  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  20   ****  ****  4.60  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     16  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  15   ****  ****  4.61  5.00  ****
```

                                             Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	1	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	4
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	11	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: CMSC 433  1                    University of Maryland                           Page  414
Title      Scripting Languages                    Baltimore County                              JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:  Hood,Daniel J                         Spring 2010                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    61
Questionnaires:  40                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  2   0   0   1   0   4  33  4.82  243/1447  4.82 4.13  4.31 4.43  4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   2   0   0   0   0   5  33  4.87  145/1447  4.87 4.09  4.27 4.31  4.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  2   1   0   0   1   8  28  4.73  313/1241  4.73 4.18  4.33 4.41  4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   2   5   0   0   0   5  28  4.85  136/1402  4.85 4.14  4.24 4.34  4.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  15   1   2   0   3  17  4.43  419/1358  4.43 3.85  4.11 4.15  4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 13   0   0   2   3  20  4.72  196/1316  4.72 4.09  4.14 4.27  4.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           2   0   0   1   0  10  27  4.66  292/1427  4.66 4.12  4.19 4.20  4.66
8. How many times was class cancelled                 3   1   0   0   0   0  36  5.00    1/1447  5.00 4.61  4.69 4.72  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8  2   0   0   0   8  22  4.73  174/1434  4.73 3.88  4.10 4.17  4.73


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       5   0   0   0   0   3  32  4.91  180/1387  4.91 4.24  4.46 4.48  4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  5   0   0   0   0   3  32  4.91  475/1387  4.91 4.58  4.73 4.76  4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5  0   0   0   0   2  33  4.94   82/1386  4.94 4.07  4.32 4.34  4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    5   0   0   0   2   0  33  4.89  181/1380  4.89 4.00  4.32 4.34  4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8  5   0   0   2   4  21  4.70  162/1193  4.70 3.91  4.02 4.00  4.70


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 34  0   1   0   0   1   4  4.17 ****/1172  **** 3.78  4.15 4.25  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 34  0   0   0   2   0   4  4.33 ****/1182  **** 4.01  4.35 4.49  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 34 0   0   0   1   1   4  4.50 ****/1170  **** 4.13  4.38 4.51  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                 34   3   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/ 800  **** 3.95  4.06 4.19  ****


                                   Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                   Type                   Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0      A   23        Required for Majors  6      Graduate      0        Major        33
  28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0      B    7                                                           
  56-83      1       2.00-2.99    1      C    2        General              2      Under-grad   40        Non-major     7
  84-150    22       3.00-3.49    6      D    1
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   19      F    0        Electives           25      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    1                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                2
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 435  1                   University of Maryland                          Page  415
Title      Computer Graphics                     Baltimore County                            JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Kundu,Kishalay                        Spring 2010                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   23
Questionnaires: 18                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                   Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean      Rank       Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  2  2  4  3  7  3.61 1306/1447  3.61  4.13  4.31  4.43  3.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  3  2  5  7  1  3.06 1395/1447  3.06  4.09  4.27  4.31  3.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  1  3  6  6  2  3.28 1184/1241  3.28  4.18  4.33  4.41  3.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  4  1  0  4  4  5  3.86 1107/1402  3.86  4.14  4.24  4.34  3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  5  2  2  2  3  3  3.25 1251/1358  3.25  3.85  4.11  4.15  3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 7  1  0  1  3  5  4.10  758/1316  4.10  4.09  4.14  4.27  4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  1  0  6  6  5  3.78 1156/1427  3.78  4.12  4.19  4.20  3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  7  9  1  1  0  1.78 1446/1447  1.78  4.61  4.69  4.72  1.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  5  4  7  1  0  2.24 1417/1434  2.24  3.88  4.10  4.17  2.24


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  4  5  6  3  0  2.44 1378/1387  2.44  4.24  4.46  4.48  2.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  1  3  4  6  4  3.50 1362/1387  3.50  4.58  4.73  4.76  3.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  4  6  5  3  0  2.39 1373/1386  2.39  4.07  4.32  4.34  2.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  6  5  5  1  1  2.22 1368/1380  2.22  4.00  4.32  4.34  2.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 6  5  1  5  1  0  2.17 1174/1193  2.17  3.91  4.02  4.00  2.17


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15 0  2  0  0  1  0  2.00 ****/1172  ****  3.78  4.15  4.25  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15 0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/1182  ****  4.01  4.35  4.49  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 0  0  1  2  0  3.67 ****/1170  ****  4.13  4.38  4.51  ****


                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0      A   7      Required for Majors  10   Graduate     0     Major       13
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0      B   6
 56-83      2      2.00-2.99   2      C   0      General              0    Under-grad   18    Non-major    5
 84-150     7      3.00-3.49   4      D   0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   6      F   0      Electives            7    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P   0                               responses to be significant
                                      I   0      Other                0
                                      ?   4
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 441  1                     University of Maryland                              Page  416
Title       Algorithms                          Baltimore County                                   JUN 28, 2010
Instructor: Yesha,Yaacov                        Spring 2010                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    42
Questionnaires:  22                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                             Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0   1   1   9   7   3  3.48 1345/1447  3.57  4.13  4.31  4.43  3.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0   1   4   8   4   4  3.29 1369/1447  3.39  4.09  4.27  4.31  3.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0   0   3   5   7   6  3.76 1065/1241  3.63  4.18  4.33  4.41  3.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   3   0   0  11   1   6  3.72 1178/1402  3.53  4.14  4.24  4.34  3.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   1   1   0   6   6   7  3.90  917/1358  4.20  3.85  4.11  4.15  3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 3   0   6   8   4  3.89  921/1316  3.74  4.09  4.14  4.27  3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0   1   3   4   7   6  3.67 1201/1427  3.58  4.12  4.19  4.20  3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0   0   0   2  19  4.90  485/1447  4.62  4.61  4.69  4.72  4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0   1   4   6   4   2  3.12 1338/1434  3.14  3.88  4.10  4.17  3.12


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0   2   2   6   6   5  3.48 1307/1387  3.65  4.24  4.46  4.48  3.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0   0   1   3   8   9  4.19 1282/1387  4.51  4.58  4.73  4.76  4.19
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   3   3   6   6   3  3.14 1316/1386  3.40  4.07  4.32  4.34  3.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0   3   4   6   4   4  3.10 1312/1380  3.13  4.00  4.32  4.34  3.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  18   0   1   1   0   0  2.50 ****/1193  3.20  3.91  4.02  4.00  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15  0   2   2   2   1   0  2.29 1160/1172  3.31  3.78  4.15  4.25  2.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15  0   1   0   4   1   1  3.14 1131/1182  4.07  4.01  4.35  4.49  3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0   1   2   1   1   2  3.14 1130/1170  4.07  4.13  4.38  4.51  3.14
4. Were special techniques successful                   15  6   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/ 800  ****  3.95  4.06  4.19  ****


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   20  1   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/ 189  ****  4.38  4.34  4.74  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 21 0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 192  ****  4.21  4.34  4.61  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 21 0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/ 186  ****  4.57  4.48  4.72  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            21  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 187  ****  4.34  4.33  4.59  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  21  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 168  ****  4.29  4.20  4.53  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19  1   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/  66  ****  4.13  4.58  4.87  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 20 1   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  62  ****  4.00  4.56  4.80  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 20  1   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  58  ****  4.38  4.41  4.59  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     20  1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  65  ****  3.88  4.42  4.55  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 20  0   1   0   1   0   0  2.00 ****/  64  ****  3.75  4.09  4.43  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  19  0   1   2   0   0   0  1.67 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.49  4.68  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria   20  0   1   0   1   0   0  2.00 ****/  36  ****  ****  4.25  4.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        20  0   1   0   0   1   0  2.50 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.52  4.72  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    20  0   0   1   1   0   0  2.50 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.30  4.38  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  20  1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.43  4.62  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 20  0   1   1   0   0   0  1.50 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.72  4.80  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     21  0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.57  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       21  0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.64  4.60  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        21  0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  20  ****  ****  4.60  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      21  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  15  ****  ****  4.61  5.00  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	1	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	7
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: CMSC 441  2                      University of Maryland                              Page  417
Title        Algorithms                            Baltimore County                                 JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:  Sherman,Alan T                         Spring 2010                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     10
Questionnaires:  6                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   1   2   1   2  3.67 1290/1447  3.57  4.13  4.31  4.43  3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   1   0   2   1   2  3.50 1323/1447  3.39  4.09  4.27  4.31  3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   1   0   2   1   2  3.50 1143/1241  3.63  4.18  4.33  4.41  3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   1   0   3   0   2  3.33 1307/1402  3.53  4.14  4.24  4.34  3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   1   1   4  4.50  345/1358  4.20  3.85  4.11  4.15  4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0   1   2   0   2  3.60 1088/1316  3.74  4.09  4.14  4.27  3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   2   1   1   2  3.50 1259/1427  3.58  4.12  4.19  4.20  3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   4   2  4.33 1202/1447  4.62  4.61  4.69  4.72  4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  1   1   1   2   1  3.17 1331/1434  3.14  3.88  4.10  4.17  3.17


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   3   1   2  3.83 1245/1387  3.65  4.24  4.46  4.48  3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   1   5  4.83  707/1387  4.51  4.58  4.73  4.76  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   1   0   1   2   2  3.67 1220/1386  3.40  4.07  4.32  4.34  3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   1   1   2   0   2  3.17 1306/1380  3.13  4.00  4.32  4.34  3.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1  1   1   0   2   1  3.20 1050/1193  3.20  3.91  4.02  4.00  3.20


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  3  0   0   0   1   0   2  4.33  521/1172  3.31  3.78  4.15  4.25  4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  3  0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1182  4.07  4.01  4.35  4.49  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1170  4.07  4.13  4.38  4.51  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                    3  2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 800  ****  3.95  4.06  4.19  ****

                                  Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 442  1                        University of Maryland                                   Page  418
Title       Info & Coding Theory                    Baltimore County                                       JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:  Lomonaco JR,Sam                          Spring 2010                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    19
Questionnaires: 12                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                  Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   1   4   7  4.50   585/1447  4.50 4.13  4.31 4.43  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   2  10  4.83   170/1447  4.83 4.09  4.27 4.31  4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   0  12  5.00     1/1241  5.00 4.18  4.33 4.41  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   5   0   0   0   1   6  4.86   129/1402  4.86 4.14  4.24 4.34  4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   1   1   1   4   5  3.92   905/1358  3.92 3.85  4.11 4.15  3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2  0   0   3   1   6  4.30   572/1316  4.30 4.09  4.14 4.27  4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   0   2  10  4.83   133/1427  4.83 4.12  4.19 4.20  4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   2  10  4.83   673/1447  4.83 4.61  4.69 4.72  4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  0   2   4   6  4.33   540/1434  4.33 3.88  4.10 4.17  4.33


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   2   2   8  4.50   798/1387  4.50 4.24  4.46 4.48  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0  12  5.00     1/1387  5.00 4.58  4.73 4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   0   5   7  4.58   529/1386  4.58 4.07  4.32 4.34  4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   1   3   8  4.58   571/1380  4.58 4.00  4.32 4.34  4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5 2   1   0   0   3  3.17  1060/1193  3.17 3.91  4.02 4.00  3.17


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0  3   1   1   2   2  2.89  1121/1172  2.89 3.78  4.15 4.25  2.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0  1   0   0   2   6  4.33   691/1182  4.33 4.01  4.35 4.49  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 1   1   0   1   6  4.11   845/1170  4.11 4.13  4.38 4.51  4.11


                Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0  0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 192  **** 4.21  4.34 4.61  ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 11  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  38  **** ****  4.49 4.68  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  11  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  36  **** ****  4.25 4.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        11  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  28  **** ****  4.52 4.72  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    11  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  30  **** ****  4.30 4.38  ****


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 11  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  31  **** ****  4.72 4.80  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     11  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  21  **** ****  4.57 5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       11  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  31  **** ****  4.64 4.60  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        11  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  20  **** ****  4.60 5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      11  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  15  **** ****  4.61 5.00  ****


                                           Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 443  1                      University of Maryland                              Page  419
Title          Cryptology                          Baltimore County                                 JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Stephens,Arthur                       Spring 2010                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires: 12                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                   Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                    NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
       -------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
       1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   0   2   4   6  4.33   790/1447  4.33  4.13  4.31  4.43  4.33
       2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   2   0   3   2   5  3.67  1262/1447  3.67  4.09  4.27  4.31  3.67
       3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   1   1   2   3   5  3.83  1034/1241  3.83  4.18  4.33  4.41  3.83
       4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1   0   1   2   4   4  4.00   976/1402  4.00  4.14  4.24  4.34  4.00
       5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0   0   1   2   5   3  3.91   917/1358  3.91  3.85  4.11  4.15  3.91
       6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  2   1   0   2   4   2  3.67  1050/1316  3.67  4.09  4.14  4.27  3.67
       7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0   0   1   2   2   6  4.18   850/1427  4.18  4.12  4.19  4.20  4.18
       8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0   0   0   6   5  4.45  1117/1447  4.45  4.61  4.69  4.72  4.45
       9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  1   1   2   2   4   2  3.36  1286/1434  3.36  3.88  4.10  4.17  3.36


                Lecture
       1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   1   1   4   5   1  3.33  1325/1387  3.33  4.24  4.46  4.48  3.33
       2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   2   5   5  4.25  1260/1387  4.25  4.58  4.73  4.76  4.25
       3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   3   2   2   4   1  2.83  1344/1386  2.83  4.07  4.32  4.34  2.83
       4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   3   1   2   2   4  3.25  1297/1380  3.25  4.00  4.32  4.34  3.25
       5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  4   3   0   2   2   1  2.75  1136/1193  2.75  3.91  4.02  4.00  2.75


                Discussion
       1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/1172  ****  3.78  4.15  4.25  ****
       2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00  ****/1182  ****  4.01  4.35  4.49  ****
       3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00  ****/1170  ****  4.13  4.38  4.51  ****
       4. Were special techniques successful                   10  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 800  ****  3.95  4.06  4.19  ****


                                          Frequency Distribution

       Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                    Majors
       --------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
         00-27     0       0.00-0.99   0      A    4       Required for Majors  6     Graduate     0        Major        9
         28-55     0       1.00-1.99   0      B    5                                                                     
         56-83     0       2.00-2.99   0      C    2       General              0     Under-grad   12       Non-major    3
         84-150    5       3.00-3.49   4      D    0
         Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   3      F    0       Electives            6     #### - Means there are not enough
                                              P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                              I    0       Other                0
                                              ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 451  1                      University of Maryland                            Page  420
Title      Automata Thry& Form La                   Baltimore County                             JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Chang,Richard                           Spring 2010                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   15
Questionnaires:  12                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  1  0  0 10  4.42  709/1447  4.42  4.13  4.31  4.43  4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  2 10  4.83  170/1447  4.83  4.09  4.27  4.31  4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  2 10  4.83  204/1241  4.83  4.18  4.33  4.41  4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2  0  0  0  1  9  4.90   93/1402  4.90  4.14  4.24  4.34  4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1  0  0  0  1  9  4.90   87/1358  4.90  3.85  4.11  4.15  4.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 3 0 0 0  1  7  4.88   91/1316  4.88  4.09  4.14  4.27  4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82  147/1427  4.82  4.12  4.19  4.20  4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1447  5.00  4.61  4.69  4.72  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 2  9  4.82  114/1434  4.82  3.88  4.10  4.17  4.82


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1387  5.00  4.24  4.46  4.48  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1387  5.00  4.58  4.73  4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82  241/1386  4.82  4.07  4.32  4.34  4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  0  3  8  4.73  379/1380  4.73  4.00  4.32  4.34  4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 5 0 0 1  2  2  4.20  526/1193  4.20  3.91  4.02  4.00  4.20


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00  ****/1172  ****  3.78  4.15  4.25  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00  ****/1182  ****  4.01  4.35  4.49  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0 0 0 0  1  5.00  ****/1170  ****  4.13  4.38  4.51  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  11   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 800  ****  3.95  4.06  4.19  ****


                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1      0.00-0.99   0       A   6       Required for Majors  4   Graduate    0      Major       9
  28-55     0      1.00-1.99   0       B   5
  56-83     1      2.00-2.99   0       C   0       General              0   Under-grad  12     Non-major   3
  84-150    8      3.00-3.49   0       D   0
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00  10       F   0       Electives            5   #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   1                               responses to be significant
                                       I   0       Other                1
                                       ?   0
```

```
                                                  Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                    NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0   1   0   5   9   9  4.04 1037/1447  4.04  4.13  4.31  4.43  4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   3   1   5  10   6  3.60 1286/1447  3.60  4.09  4.27  4.31  3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   2   1   8   6   8  3.68 1089/1241  3.68  4.18  4.33  4.41  3.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2   1   1   7   3  11  3.96 1026/1402  3.96  4.14  4.24  4.34  3.96
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   4   1   3   4   7   6  3.67 1084/1358  3.67  3.85  4.11  4.15  3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3   2   1   5   6   8  3.77  985/1316  3.77  4.09  4.14  4.27  3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   4   1   3   8   9  3.68 1192/1427  3.68  4.12  4.19  4.20  3.68
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   1  23   1  4.00 1361/1447  4.00  4.61  4.69  4.72  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0   0   4   7   5   2  3.28 1307/1434  3.28  3.88  4.10  4.17  3.28


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0   0   1   6  11   6  3.92 1222/1387  3.92  4.24  4.46  4.48  3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0   0   0   5   8  11  4.25 1260/1387  4.25  4.58  4.73  4.76  4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   0   4   8   8   4  3.50 1258/1386  3.50  4.07  4.32  4.34  3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0   3   3   7   6   5  3.29 1292/1380  3.29  4.00  4.32  4.34  3.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  3   0   2   7   5   7  3.81  813/1193  3.81  3.91  4.02  4.00  3.81


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17  0   0   2   3   3   0  3.13 1079/1172  3.13  3.78  4.15  4.25  3.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17  0   0   2   2   4   0  3.25 1121/1182  3.25  4.01  4.35  4.49  3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0   1   1   4   2   0  2.88 1144/1170  2.88  4.13  4.38  4.51  2.88
4. Were special techniques successful                   17  7   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 800  ****  3.95  4.06  4.19  ****
```

                                  Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                    Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0         A    8       Required for Majors   6    Graduate      0      Major       25
 28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0         B   15
 56-83      0       2.00-2.99    0         C    2       General               0    Under-grad   25      Non-major    0
 84-150    10       3.00-3.49    7         D    0
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    8         F    0       Electives            16    #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                          I    0       Other                 0
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 479  1                      University of Maryland                              Page  422
Title         Introduction To Roboti                 Baltimore County                             JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Oates,James T                          Spring 2010                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   33
Questionnaires: 28                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                  Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  1   0  0  1  0  8  18  4.59   485/1447  4.59  4.13  4.31  4.43  4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1   0  0  0  1  6  20  4.70   303/1447  4.70  4.09  4.27  4.31  4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  20  0  0  0  4   4  4.50   541/1241  4.50  4.18  4.33  4.41  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1   1  1  0  0  6  19  4.62   369/1402  4.62  4.14  4.24  4.34  4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 2  1  3  7  7   7  3.64  1097/1358  3.64  3.85  4.11  4.15  3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2 1 0 3 10 11  4.20   671/1316  4.20  4.09  4.14  4.27  4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0  0  2  0  7  18  4.52   446/1427  4.52  4.12  4.19  4.20  4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0  0  0  1 25   1  4.00  1361/1447  4.00  4.61  4.69  4.72  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0  6 17  4.74   174/1434  4.74  3.88  4.10  4.17  4.74


                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  0  0 10  17  4.63   626/1387  4.63  4.24  4.46  4.48  4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  0  0  1  26  4.96   211/1387  4.96  4.58  4.73  4.76  4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  0  0  0 11  16  4.59   519/1386  4.59  4.07  4.32  4.34  4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  0  0  1  7  19  4.67   463/1380  4.67  4.00  4.32  4.34  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 1  8  17  4.62   217/1193  4.62  3.91  4.02  4.00  4.62


                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 1 4  1  4.00 ****/1172  ****  3.78  4.15  4.25  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22 0 0 0 1 2  3  4.33 ****/1182  ****  4.01  4.35  4.49  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 0 0 1 2  3  4.33 ****/1170  ****  4.13  4.38  4.51  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                 22   5  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 800  ****  3.95  4.06  4.19  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                 Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0       A   21      Required for Majors  8    Graduate     1       Major       25
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0       B    6                                                     
  56-83      0      2.00-2.99    2       C    1      General              0    Under-grad  27       Non-major    3
  84-150    17      3.00-3.49    4       D    0
  Grad.      1      3.50-4.00   15       F    0      Electives           18    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                               responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other                1
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 481  1                          University of Maryland                                    Page  423
Title          Computer Networks                       Baltimore County                                      JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Green,Frank E                             Spring 2010                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      31
Questionnaires:  23                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                     Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                     Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                     General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   3   1   6   4   9  3.65 1293/1447  3.65  4.13  4.31 4.43  3.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   2   5   6   7   3  3.17 1381/1447  3.17  4.09  4.27 4.31  3.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   5   3   6   3   6  3.09 1212/1241  3.09  4.18  4.33 4.41  3.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   3   2   2   6   5   5  3.45 1275/1402  3.45  4.14  4.24 4.34  3.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1   4   0   3   5  10  3.77 1008/1358  3.77  3.85  4.11 4.15  3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4   4   1   7   3   4  3.11 1249/1316  3.11  4.09  4.14 4.27  3.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   2   4   7   8   2  3.17 1346/1427  3.17  4.12  4.19 4.20  3.17
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   1   2  13   7  4.13 1316/1447  4.13  4.61  4.69 4.72  4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0   4   5   8   5   1  2.74 1390/1434  2.74  3.88  4.10 4.17  2.74


                     Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0   3   4   5   2   8  3.36 1321/1387  3.36  4.24  4.46 4.48  3.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   3   3   3   6   8  3.57 1360/1387  3.57  4.58  4.73 4.76  3.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   3   7   7   5   1  2.74 1350/1386  2.74  4.07  4.32 4.34  2.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   5   5  10   1   2  2.57 1353/1380  2.57  4.00  4.32 4.34  2.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  4   6   0   6   7   0  2.74 1139/1193  2.74  3.91  4.02 4.00  2.74


                     Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18  0   2   1   1   0   1  2.40 ****/1172  ****  3.78  4.15 4.25  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17  0   0   0   2   1   3  4.17  788/1182  4.17  4.01  4.35 4.49  4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0   0   0   0   2   4  4.67  480/1170  4.67  4.13  4.38 4.51  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                   17  5   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 800  ****  3.95  4.06 4.19  ****


                     Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   22  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 189  ****  4.38  4.34 4.74  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 22 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 192  ****  4.21  4.34 4.61  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 22 0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 186  ****  4.57  4.48 4.72  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            22  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 187  ****  4.34  4.33 4.59  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  22  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 168  ****  4.29  4.20 4.53  ****


                     Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  22  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.49 4.68  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  22  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  36  ****  ****  4.25 4.42  ****


                     Self  Paced
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     22  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.57 5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       22  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.64 4.60  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        22  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  20  ****  ****  4.60 5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      22  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  15  ****  ****  4.61 5.00  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons                  Type                   Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0          0.00-0.99   0       A    2        Required for Majors  10      Graduate      0        Major        16
28-55      0          1.00-1.99   0       B   14
56-83      1          2.00-2.99   3       C    5        General               1      Under-grad   23        Non-major     7
84-150    12          3.00-3.49   4       D    0
Grad.      0          3.50-4.00   4       F    0        Electives            10      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                          I    0        Other                 0
                                          ?    0
```

```
                                                  Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                    NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean   Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
        General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0   0   4  14   5  4.04 1037/1447  4.04 4.13  4.31 4.43  4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   0   3   8  12  4.39  689/1447  4.39 4.09  4.27 4.31  4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   0   0   0   9  14  4.61  451/1241  4.61 4.18  4.33 4.41  4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   1   2  12   8  4.17  845/1402  4.17 4.14  4.24 4.34  4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   0   1   0   4   9   9  4.09  756/1358  4.09 3.85  4.11 4.15  4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0   0   0   1   3   9  10  4.22  653/1316  4.22 4.09  4.14 4.27  4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0   0   1   5   5  11  4.18  850/1427  4.18 4.12  4.19 4.20  4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0   0   1  15   5   1  3.27 1436/1447  3.27 4.61  4.69 4.72  3.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  4   1   0   0   3   7   8  4.28  611/1434  4.28 3.88  4.10 4.17  4.28


        Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0   0   2  13   8  4.26 1031/1387  4.26 4.24  4.46 4.48  4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0   0   2   3  18  4.70  946/1387  4.70 4.58  4.73 4.76  4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0   0   0   0   2  10  11  4.39  757/1386  4.39 4.07  4.32 4.34  4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   0   0   2  12   9  4.30  840/1380  4.30 4.00  4.32 4.34  4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  2   3   0   0   3   9   6  4.17  555/1193  4.17 3.91  4.02 4.00  4.17


        Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  10   0   0   0   1   8   4  4.23  593/1172  4.23 3.78  4.15 4.25  4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  10   0   0   0   0   5   8  4.62  480/1182  4.62 4.01  4.35 4.49  4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10   0   0   0   1   4   8  4.54  559/1170  4.54 4.13  4.38 4.51  4.54
4. Were special techniques successful                 10   8   0   0   2   3   0  3.60 ****/ 800  **** 3.95  4.06 4.19  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades           Reasons                    Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     1      0.00-0.99    1      A   15        Required for Majors  2      Graduate     9      Major       17
28-55     0      1.00-1.99    0      B    5                                   
56-83     0      2.00-2.99    0      C    1        General              2      Under-grad  14      Non-major    6
84-150    6      3.00-3.49    7      D    0
Grad.     9      3.50-4.00    5      F    0        Electives           16      #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                      I    0        Other                1
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 491  2                  University of Maryland                                  Page  425
Title        Spec Topics In Comp Sc          Baltimore County                                       JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:  Hirsch,Katherin                 Spring 2010                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     21
Questionnaires:  18                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                     Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                  Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0  1  1  2  6  7  4.00 1058/1447  4.35  4.13  4.31 4.43  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  1  4  9  3  3.82 1196/1447  4.16  4.09  4.27 4.31  3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  2  5  4  6  3.82 1041/1241  4.13  4.18  4.33 4.41  3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   1  0  2  3  7  4  3.81 1132/1402  4.17  4.14  4.24 4.34  3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  15  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/1358  4.44  3.85  4.11 4.15  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  7  1  0  2  3  4  3.90  910/1316  4.32  4.09  4.14 4.27  3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  3  0  3 11  4.29  727/1427  4.16  4.12  4.19 4.20  4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  3 14  4.82  700/1447  4.49  4.61  4.69 4.72  4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0  1  1  3  7  4  3.75 1088/1434  4.00  3.88  4.10 4.17  3.75

                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  1  9  7  4.35  951/1387  4.60  4.24  4.46 4.48  4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  2 15  4.88  579/1387  4.88  4.58  4.73 4.76  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  1  0  2  7  6  4.06 1022/1386  4.33  4.07  4.32 4.34  4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  1  1  0  7  8  4.18  952/1380  4.38  4.00  4.32 4.34  4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  1  0  0  5  6  4  3.93  726/1193  4.10  3.91  4.02 4.00  3.93

                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14  0  1  0  1  1  1  3.25 ****/1172  4.02  3.78  4.15 4.25  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14  0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25 ****/1182  4.45  4.01  4.35 4.49  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14  0  0  1  1  0  2  3.75 ****/1170  4.57  4.13  4.38 4.51  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  14   2  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 800  3.83  3.95  4.06 4.19  ****

                  Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 192  5.00  4.21  4.34 4.61  ****

                  Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  66  4.75  4.13  4.58 4.87  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    17   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  65  4.75  3.88  4.42 4.55  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                17   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  64  4.50  3.75  4.09 4.43  ****

                  Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.49 4.68  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  36  ****  ****  4.25 4.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       17   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.52 4.72  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   17   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.30 4.38  ****

                  Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.72 4.80  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      17   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.64 4.60  ****
```

                                    Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned       Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0     A  10       Required for Majors  3      Graduate     1      Major        14
28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0     B   7
56-83      0      2.00-2.99    0     C   0       General              1      Under-grad  17      Non-major     4
84-150     7      3.00-3.49    5     D   0
Grad.      1      3.50-4.00    8     F   0       Electives           11      #### - Means there are not enough
                                     P   0                                  responses to be significant
                                     I   0       Other                1
                                     ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 491  3                   University of Maryland                              Page  426
Title         Spec Topics In Comp Sc          Baltimore County                             JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Zhou,Shujia                     Spring 2010                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   24
Questionnaires: 20                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course     0   0  1  1  0  4 14  4.45   667/1447  4.35  4.13 4.31 4.43  4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      0   0  1  1  3  4 11  4.15   947/1447  4.16  4.09 4.27 4.31  4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     1  12  0  0  1  2  4  4.43   634/1241  4.13  4.18 4.33 4.41  4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      1   0  1  0  3  5 10  4.21   807/1402  4.17  4.14 4.24 4.34  4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   4  0  0  2  6  8  4.38   485/1358  4.44  3.85 4.11 4.15  4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  4  1  0  1  2 11  4.47   434/1316  4.32  4.09 4.14 4.27  4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              0   1  1  3  4  6  5  3.58  1237/1427  4.16  4.12 4.19 4.20  3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled                    0   0  0  0  0  1 19  4.95   291/1447  4.49  4.61 4.69 4.72  4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5  0  1  1  3  5  5  3.80  1052/1434  4.00  3.88 4.10 4.17  3.80


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          0   0  1  0  3  1 15  4.45   860/1387  4.60  4.24 4.46 4.48  4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     0   0  0  0  0  5 15  4.75   859/1387  4.88  4.58 4.73 4.76  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0   0  1  1  2  8  8  4.05  1026/1386  4.33  4.07 4.32 4.34  4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       0   0  1  2  2  2 13  4.20   940/1380  4.38  4.00 4.32 4.34  4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0   1  2  0  2  5 10  4.11   612/1193  4.10  3.91 4.02 4.00  4.11


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  5   0  3  2  2  5  3  3.20  1067/1172  4.02  3.78 4.15 4.25  3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  5   0  0  0  5  4  6  4.07   841/1182  4.45  4.01 4.35 4.49  4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5   0  0  0  4  5  6  4.13   833/1170  4.57  4.13 4.38 4.51  4.13
4. Were special techniques successful                    5  10  0  0  4  0  1  3.40   683/ 800  3.83  3.95 4.06 4.19  3.40

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  66  4.75  4.13 4.58 4.87  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 19  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  62  5.00  4.00 4.56 4.80  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 19   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  58  4.75  4.38 4.41 4.59  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     19   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  65  4.75  3.88 4.42 4.55  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 19   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  64  4.50  3.75 4.09 4.43  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 491  4                University of Maryland                            Page  427
Title      Spec Topics In Comp Sc          Baltimore County                               JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Grasso,Michael               Spring 2010                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   13
Questionnaires:  10                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  4  6  4.60   474/1447  4.35  4.13  4.31  4.43  4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  5  5  4.50   532/1447  4.16  4.09  4.27  4.31  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   9  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1241  4.13  4.18  4.33  4.41  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  3  6  4.50   494/1402  4.17  4.14  4.24  4.34  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  0  0  1  8  4.50   345/1358  4.44  3.85  4.11  4.15  4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  1  2  7  4.60   292/1316  4.32  4.09  4.14  4.27  4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  1  2  7  4.60   337/1427  4.16  4.12  4.19  4.20  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  4  5  1  3.70  1424/1447  4.49  4.61  4.69  4.72  3.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0  0  0  5  4  4.44   408/1434  4.00  3.88  4.10  4.17  4.44


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00     1/1387  4.60  4.24  4.46  4.48  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00     1/1387  4.88  4.58  4.73  4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88   171/1386  4.33  4.07  4.32  4.34  4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75   339/1380  4.38  4.00  4.32  4.34  4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 4 0  0  1  1  2  4.25   478/1193  4.10  3.91  4.02  4.00  4.25


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83   163/1172  4.02  3.78  4.15  4.25  4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83   271/1182  4.45  4.01  4.35  4.49  4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0  0  0  0  6  5.00     1/1170  4.57  4.13  4.38  4.51  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   2  0  0  1  1  2  4.25   335/ 800  3.83  3.95  4.06  4.19  4.25


            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/ 192  5.00  4.21  4.34  4.61  5.00


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75    35/  66  4.75  4.13  4.58  4.87  4.75
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 0 0  0  0  0  4  5.00     1/  62  5.00  4.00  4.56  4.80  5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75    23/  58  4.75  4.38  4.41  4.59  4.75
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    6   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75    27/  65  4.75  3.88  4.42  4.55  4.75
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                6   0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50    23/  64  4.50  3.75  4.09  4.43  4.50


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/  38  ****  ****  4.49  4.68  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 8  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/  36  ****  ****  4.25  4.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       8   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/  28  ****  ****  4.52  4.72  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   8   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/  30  ****  ****  4.30  4.38  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  27  ****  ****  4.43  4.62  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/  31  ****  ****  4.72  4.80  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    8   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/  21  ****  ****  4.57  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      8   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/  31  ****  ****  4.64  4.60  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       8   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  20  ****  ****  4.60  5.00  ****
```

Title   Spec Topics In Comp Sc   Baltimore County   JUN 28, 2010
Instructor: Grasso,Michael   Spring 2010   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 10   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   1   0.00-0.99   0   A   8   Required for Majors   0   Graduate   4   Major   8
 28-55   0   1.00-1.99   0   B   0
 56-83   0   2.00-2.99   0   C   0   General   0   Under-grad   6   Non-major   2
 84-150   1   3.00-3.49   2   D   0
 Grad.   4   3.50-4.00   5   F   0   Electives   7   #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0   responses to be significant
                                         I   0   Other   0
                                         ?   0

```
Course-Section: CMSC 493  1                    University of Maryland                        Page  428
Title       Games Group Project                   Baltimore County                         JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:  McDonald,David                          Spring 2010                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   25
Questionnaires:  10                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  2  4  4  4.20   927/1447  4.20  4.13  4.31  4.43  4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  1  0  5  1  3  3.50  1323/1447  3.50  4.09  4.27  4.31  3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   9  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1241  ****  4.18  4.33  4.41  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2  0  2  1  2  3  3.75  1163/1402  3.75  4.14  4.24  4.34  3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   9  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1358  ****  3.85  4.11  4.15  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7  0  1  0  0  2  4.00   812/1316  4.00  4.09  4.14  4.27  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  3  1  3  3  3.60  1228/1427  3.60  4.12  4.19  4.20  3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80   754/1447  4.80  4.61  4.69  4.72  4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  0  5  3  2  3.70  1125/1434  3.70  3.88  4.10  4.17  3.70


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  1  1  5  0  2  3.11  1344/1387  3.11  4.24  4.46  4.48  3.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78   829/1387  4.78  4.58  4.73  4.76  4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  3  2  4  4.11   997/1386  4.11  4.07  4.32  4.34  4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   1  0  3  3  0  2  3.13  1310/1380  3.13  4.00  4.32  4.34  3.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  2  0  1  3  1  2  3.57   936/1193  3.57  3.91  4.02  4.00  3.57


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/1172  ****  3.78  4.15  4.25  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/1182  ****  4.01  4.35  4.49  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1170  ****  4.13  4.38  4.51  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                  Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0        A    8        Required for Majors   9      Graduate      0        Major      6
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0        B    1                                                            
  56-83      0        2.00-2.99    0        C    1        General               0      Under-grad   10        Non-major  4
  84-150     7        3.00-3.49    4        D    0
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    4        F    0        Electives             1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                            I    0        Other                 0
                                            ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 601  1                        University of Maryland                              Page  429
Title       Research Skills For Cs                 Baltimore County                                    JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:  Nicholas,Charle                       Spring 2010                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    31
Questionnaires:  24                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                               Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean   Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0  0  3  3 11  6  3.87 1190/1447  3.87  4.13  4.31 4.46   3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  1  3 11  8  4.13  965/1447  4.13  4.09  4.27 4.30   4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  19  1  0  0  1  2  3.75 ****/1241  ****  4.18  4.33 4.38   ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0  2  3  3  6  9  3.74 1173/1402  3.74  4.14  4.24 4.29   3.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1  0  2  6  5  9  3.95  858/1358  3.95  3.85  4.11 4.26   3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 1  1  2  7 12  4.22  653/1316  4.22  4.09  4.14 4.34   4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   4  1  2  4  4  8  3.84 1117/1427  3.84  4.12  4.19 4.25   3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   1  0  0  1  2 19  4.82  727/1447  4.82  4.61  4.69 4.74   4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0  2  2 12  6  4.00  849/1434  4.00  3.88  4.10 4.21   4.00


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  1  1  5 12  4  3.74 1266/1387  3.74  4.24  4.46 4.51   3.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  1  1  1  4 16  4.43 1185/1387  4.43  4.58  4.73 4.81   4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  1  2 10 10  4.26  871/1386  4.26  4.07  4.32 4.43   4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  2  1  2 10  8  3.91 1096/1380  3.91  4.00  4.32 4.38   3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 2 0  2  3  9  7  4.00  652/1193  4.00  3.91  4.02 4.02   4.00


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 1  0  3  5  3  3.75  881/1172  3.75  3.78  4.15 4.32   3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 0  0  3  4  5  4.17  788/1182  4.17  4.01  4.35 4.46   4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 0 0  2  4  6  4.33  710/1170  4.33  4.13  4.38 4.52   4.33
4. Were special techniques successful                  12  9  1  0  0  1  1  3.33 ****/ 800  ****  3.95  4.06 4.10   ****


                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  22  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 189  ****  4.38  4.34 4.82   ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 22 0 0 0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 192  ****  4.21  4.34 4.79   ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 22 0 0 0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 186  ****  4.57  4.48 4.73   ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           22  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 187  ****  4.34  4.33 4.67   ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 22  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 168  ****  4.29  4.20 4.55   ****


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 22 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  66  ****  4.13  4.58 4.71   ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 22 0 0 0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  62  ****  4.00  4.56 4.69   ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 22 0 0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/  58  ****  4.38  4.41 4.75   ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    22  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  65  ****  3.88  4.42 4.64   ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                22  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  64  ****  3.75  4.09 4.18   ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 22  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.49 4.77   ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 22  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  36  ****  ****  4.25 4.39   ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       22  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.52 4.83   ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   22  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.30 4.66   ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 22  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.43 4.71   ****


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.72 4.85   ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    22  0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.57 4.65   ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      22  0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.64 4.59   ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       22  0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/  20  ****  ****  4.60 4.56   ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     22  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  15  ****  ****  4.61 4.80   ****
```

Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 24   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   4   0.00-0.99   1   A   21   Required for Majors   1   Graduate   13   Major   21
 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   3
 84-150   2   3.00-3.49   3   D   0
 Grad.   13   3.50-4.00   11   F   0   Electives   18   #### - Means there are not enough
                                             P   0   responses to be significant
                                             I   0   Other   1
                                             ?   0

```
Course-Section: CMSC 635  1                        University of Maryland                              Page  430
Title      Adv Comp Graphics                        Baltimore County                                   JUN 28, 2010
Instructor: Livingston,Mark                         Spring 2010                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     8
Questionnaires:  7                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                  Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
       -----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0  2  0  1  1  2  3.17 1394/1447  3.17 4.13  4.31 4.46  3.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  2  0  0  2  2  3.33 1361/1447  3.33 4.09  4.27 4.30  3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   2  0  0  1  2  1  4.00  923/1241  4.00 4.18  4.33 4.38  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0  1  1  1  2  1  3.17 1347/1402  3.17 4.14  4.24 4.29  3.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  1  0  1  2  2  3.67 1084/1358  3.67 3.85  4.11 4.26  3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 2 1 2  3.50 1134/1316  3.50 4.09  4.14 4.34  3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  2  0  1  3  0  2.83 1372/1427  2.83 4.12  4.19 4.25  2.83
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1447  5.00 4.61  4.69 4.74  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 2 0 1 2 1  3.00 1349/1434  3.00 3.88  4.10 4.21  3.00


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  1  1  1  2  3.80 1253/1387  3.80 4.24  4.46 4.51  3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  2  1  1  2  3.50 1362/1387  3.50 4.58  4.73 4.81  3.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  1  1  1  2  1  3.17 1312/1386  3.17 4.07  4.32 4.43  3.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  2  0  2  1  1  2.83 1334/1380  2.83 4.00  4.32 4.38  2.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0  2  0  0  0  4  3.67  895/1193  3.67 3.91  4.02 4.02  3.67


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00  710/1172  4.00 3.78  4.15 4.32  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00  856/1182  4.00 4.01  4.35 4.46  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33  710/1170  4.33 4.13  4.38 4.52  4.33
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   2  0  0  1  0  1  4.00  423/ 800  4.00 3.95  4.06 4.10  4.00


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5  0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50   61/ 66  3.50 4.13  4.58 4.71  3.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 5 0  1  0  0  0  1  3.00   58/ 62  3.00 4.00  4.56 4.69  3.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 5  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00   47/ 58  4.00 4.38  4.41 4.75  4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    5   0  1  0  0  0  1  3.00   62/ 65  3.00 3.88  4.42 4.64  3.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                5   0  1  0  0  0  1  3.00   56/ 64  3.00 3.75  4.09 4.18  3.00


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  **** ****  4.72 4.85  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    6   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  21  **** ****  4.57 4.65  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      6   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  31  **** ****  4.64 4.59  ****

                             Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 641  1                University of Maryland                              Page  431
Title         Design & Analy Algorth            Baltimore County                           JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Chang,Richard                       Spring 2010                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   54
Questionnaires: 40                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
         General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   4   0  0  1  6  7  22  4.39  742/1447  4.39 4.13  4.31 4.46  4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    4   0  0  0  3 13  20  4.47  575/1447  4.47 4.09  4.27 4.30  4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   4   1  0  1  2  5  27  4.66  392/1241  4.66 4.18  4.33 4.38  4.66
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    5   7  0  1  5  8  14  4.25  766/1402  4.25 4.14  4.24 4.29  4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5  1  0  1  6  9  18  4.29  572/1358  4.29 3.85  4.11 4.26  4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5 2  0  0  4 12  17  4.39  504/1316  4.39 4.09  4.14 4.34  4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            4   0  0  1  4  4  27  4.58  361/1427  4.58 4.12  4.19 4.25  4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled                  5   0  0  0  0  4  31  4.89  538/1447  4.89 4.61  4.69 4.74  4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0 0  0  1  9  19  4.62  262/1434  4.62 3.88  4.10 4.21  4.62


         Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4   0  0  0  1  7  28  4.75  429/1387  4.75 4.24  4.46 4.51  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   4   0  0  0  1  1  34  4.92  475/1387  4.92 4.58  4.73 4.81  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0  0  0  7 13  16  4.25  879/1386  4.25 4.07  4.32 4.43  4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4   0  0  1  4 11  20  4.39  775/1380  4.39 4.00  4.32 4.38  4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 5  2  3  8  8   8  3.59  933/1193  3.59 3.91  4.02 4.02  3.59


         Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0  3  2  3  8  11  3.81  853/1172  3.81 3.78  4.15 4.32  3.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0  1  1  9  5  11  3.89  952/1182  3.89 4.01  4.35 4.46  3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0  1  2  8  16  4.44  624/1170  4.44 4.13  4.38 4.52  4.44
4. Were special techniques successful                  14  18  0  2  2  2   2  3.50  ****/ 800  **** 3.95  4.06 4.10  ****


         Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 39 0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  66  **** 4.13  4.58 4.71  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 39 0 0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  62  **** 4.00  4.56 4.69  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 39 0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  58  **** 4.38  4.41 4.75  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    39  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  65  **** 3.88  4.42 4.64  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                39  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  64  **** 3.75  4.09 4.18  ****


                               Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons                 Type                 Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      8       0.00-0.99    1      A   20     Required for Majors  35     Graduate    24     Major       33
  28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0      B   12
  56-83      0       2.00-2.99    0      C    0     General               0     Under-grad  16     Non-major    7
  84-150     1       3.00-3.49    8      D    0
  Grad.     24       3.50-4.00   18      F    0     Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                         I    0     Other                 0
                                         ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 661  1                      University of Maryland                              Page  432
Title          Prin Of Database Sys                Baltimore County                                 JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Grasso,Michael                        Spring 2010                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    25
Questionnaires: 22                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                 Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                  Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   2   0  0  0  0 11   9  4.45   667/1447  4.45  4.13  4.31  4.46  4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2   0  0  0  1  7  12  4.55   479/1447  4.55  4.09  4.27  4.30  4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2   0  0  0  2  5  13  4.55   496/1241  4.55  4.18  4.33  4.38  4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2   1  0  0  1  5  13  4.63   347/1402  4.63  4.14  4.24  4.29  4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  0  4  4  10  4.33   529/1358  4.33  3.85  4.11  4.26  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5 1  0  0  5  2   9  4.25   617/1316  4.25  4.09  4.14  4.34  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            4   0  0  0  2  2  14  4.67   283/1427  4.67  4.12  4.19  4.25  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  4   0  0  0  4 10   4  4.00  1361/1447  4.00  4.61  4.69  4.74  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  2 13   5  4.15   744/1434  4.15  3.88  4.10  4.21  4.15

                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  1  5  14  4.65   581/1387  4.65  4.24  4.46  4.51  4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  0  5  15  4.75   859/1387  4.75  4.58  4.73  4.81  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  0  7  13  4.65   444/1386  4.65  4.07  4.32  4.43  4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  0  1  2  5  12  4.40   759/1380  4.40  4.00  4.32  4.38  4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 2  0  1  3  5   8  4.18   545/1193  4.18  3.91  4.02  4.02  4.18

                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  0  3  4   7  4.29   559/1172  4.29  3.78  4.15  4.32  4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0  0  0  3  5   6  4.21   755/1182  4.21  4.01  4.35  4.46  4.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0  0  0  1  6   7  4.43   640/1170  4.43  4.13  4.38  4.52  4.43
4. Were special techniques successful                  9   4  0  1  3  2   3  3.78   573/ 800  3.78  3.95  4.06  4.10  3.78

                  Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21  0  1  0  0  0   0  1.00   ****/  38  ****  ****  4.49  4.77  ****
```

```
                                         Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      5        0.00-0.99    2        A   15          Required for Majors   3     Graduate    10      Major        18
28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0        B    3
56-83      0        2.00-2.99    0        C    0          General               6     Under-grad  12      Non-major     4
84-150     1        3.00-3.49    3        D    0
Grad.     10        3.50-4.00    8        F    0          Electives             9     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                       responses to be significant
                                         I    0          Other                 0
                                         ?    0
```