# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 104 1 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: 38 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Prob Sol & Computer Prog | | | | Questionnaires: 24 |
| Instructor: | Grasso,Clare T | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 7 | 3.57 | 1419/1542 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.18 | 3.57 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 3.30 | 1463/1542 | 3.84 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.23 | 3.30 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 3.41 | 1239/1339 | 3.97 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.14 | 3.41 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 3.55 | 1327/1498 | 4.18 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.08 | 3.55 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 13 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1.60 | 1427/1428 | 2.54 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 3.98 | 1.60 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 13 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2.90 | 1369/1407 | 3.53 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 3.92 | 2.90 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 11 | 4.13 | 965/1521 | 4.26 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.09 | 4.13 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 5.00 | 1/1541 | 5.00 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.66 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 2.85 | 1456/1518 | 3.48 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.00 | 2.85 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 3.65 | 1372/1472 | 4.06 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.38 | 3.65 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 16 | 4.43 | 1248/1475 | 4.64 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.63 | 4.43 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 3.17 | 1394/1471 | 3.70 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.23 | 3.17 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 3.48 | 1325/1470 | 4.01 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.21 | 3.48 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 3.35 | 1137/1310 | 4.00 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 3.93 | 3.35 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2.40 | 1197/1210 | 3.01 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 3.91 | 2.40 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 13 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 3.18 | 1155/1211 | 3.59 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.15 | 3.18 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 13 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 3.18 | 1164/1207 | 3.65 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.12 | 3.18 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 13 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/859 | **** | 3.80 | 4.08 | 3.95 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 104 1 | Term - Spring 2012 | Enrollment: 38 |
|---|---|---|
| Title: Prob Sol & Computer Prog | | Questionnaires: 24 |
| Instructor: Grasso,Clare T | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Instructor Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Laboratory** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/207 | 4.23 | 3.65 | 4.12 | 3.92 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 22 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/210 | 3.31 | 3.90 | 4.17 | 4.14 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/202 | 4.70 | 4.76 | 4.50 | 4.49 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 23 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/202 | 4.46 | 3.78 | 4.32 | 4.22 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 4 | Required for Majors | 9 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 5 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 8 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 6 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 24 | Non-major | 19 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 0 | Electives | 6 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 3 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 6 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 104 2 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | | | Enrollment: | 40 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Prob Sol & Computer Prog | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: | 23 | | |
| Instructor: | Romano,Ross | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 15 | 4.17 | 1043/1542 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.18 | 4.17 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 3.87 | 1236/1542 | 3.84 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.23 | 3.87 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 3.70 | 1148/1339 | 3.97 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.14 | 3.70 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 12 | 4.45 | 618/1498 | 4.18 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.08 | 4.45 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 5 | 3.00 | 1360/1428 | 2.54 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 3.98 | 3.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 3.50 | 1210/1407 | 3.53 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 3.92 | 3.50 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 11 | 4.13 | 965/1521 | 4.26 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.09 | 4.13 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 5.00 | 1/1541 | 5.00 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.66 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 3.60 | 1248/1518 | 3.48 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.00 | 3.60 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 4.00 | 1222/1472 | 4.06 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.38 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 16 | 4.59 | 1126/1475 | 4.64 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.63 | 4.59 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 3.90 | 1178/1471 | 3.70 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.23 | 3.90 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 11 | 4.14 | 1051/1470 | 4.01 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.21 | 4.14 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 4.21 | 616/1310 | 4.00 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 3.93 | 4.21 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3.63 | 981/1210 | 3.01 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 3.91 | 3.63 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4.00 | 918/1211 | 3.59 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.15 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.13 | 881/1207 | 3.65 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.12 | 4.13 |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 104 2 | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: | 40 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Prob Sol & Computer Prog | | | Questionnaires: | 23 |
| Instructor: | Romano,Ross | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 15 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2.75 | ****/859 | **** | 3.80 | 4.08 | 3.95 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 7 | Required for Majors | 9 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 2 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | B | 7 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 4 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 23 | Non-major | 21 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 0 | Electives | 6 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 1 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 104 3 | Term - Spring 2012 | Enrollment: 40 |
|---|---|---|
| Title: Prob Sol & Computer Prog | | Questionnaires: 19 |
| Instructor: Sheets,David A | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 4.21 | 1006/1542 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.18 | 4.21 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 3.68 | 1332/1542 | 3.84 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.23 | 3.68 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 10 | 4.26 | 817/1339 | 3.97 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.14 | 4.26 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 4.07 | 1022/1498 | 4.18 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.08 | 4.07 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2.45 | 1413/1428 | 2.54 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 3.98 | 2.45 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4.18 | 757/1407 | 3.53 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 3.92 | 4.18 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 10 | 4.26 | 827/1521 | 4.26 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.09 | 4.26 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 5.00 | 1/1541 | 5.00 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.66 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 3.47 | 1304/1518 | 3.48 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.00 | 3.47 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 6 | 3.95 | 1266/1472 | 4.06 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.38 | 3.95 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 4.63 | 1079/1475 | 4.64 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.63 | 4.63 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 3.53 | 1327/1471 | 3.70 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.23 | 3.53 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 3.89 | 1185/1470 | 4.01 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.21 | 3.89 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 5 | 4.00 | 761/1310 | 4.00 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 3.93 | 4.00 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3.25 | ****/1210 | 3.01 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 3.91 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 16 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.67 | ****/1211 | 3.59 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.15 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 17 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.50 | ****/1207 | 3.65 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.12 | **** |
| **Laboratory** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 4.23 | 100/207 | 4.23 | 3.65 | 4.12 | 3.92 | 4.23 |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 104 3 | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: 40 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Prob Sol & Computer Prog | | | Questionnaires: 19 |
| Instructor: | Sheets,David A | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Laboratory** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 6 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3.31 | 201/210 | 3.31 | 3.90 | 4.17 | 4.14 | 3.31 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4.70 | 72/202 | 4.70 | 4.76 | 4.50 | 4.49 | 4.70 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 4.46 | 97/202 | 4.46 | 3.78 | 4.32 | 4.22 | 4.46 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 6 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3.71 | 158/199 | 3.71 | 4.39 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 3.71 |
| **Self Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 4.84 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.84 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.82 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.80 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/13 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 4.77 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 4 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 9 | Required for Majors | 11 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 2 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 9 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 0 | General | 3 | Under-grad | 19 | Non-major | 17 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 3 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 104 4 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | | | | Enrollment: 41 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: Prob Sol & Computer Prog | | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 25 | | | |
| Instructor: Chang,Richard | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | | | | |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 22 | 4.76 | 310/1542 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.18 | 4.76 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 15 | 4.52 | 590/1542 | 3.84 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.23 | 4.52 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 15 | 4.52 | 560/1339 | 3.97 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.14 | 4.52 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 13 | 4.65 | 380/1498 | 4.18 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.08 | 4.65 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 17 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3.13 | 1345/1428 | 2.54 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 3.98 | 3.13 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 20 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.20 | ****/1407 | 3.53 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 3.92 | **** |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 15 | 4.52 | 496/1521 | 4.26 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.09 | 4.52 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 5.00 | 1/1541 | 5.00 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.66 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 4.00 | 920/1518 | 3.48 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 20 | 4.64 | 629/1472 | 4.06 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.38 | 4.64 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 23 | 4.92 | 430/1475 | 4.64 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.63 | 4.92 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 13 | 4.20 | 985/1471 | 3.70 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.23 | 4.20 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 17 | 4.52 | 671/1470 | 4.01 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.21 | 4.52 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 13 | 4.43 | 404/1310 | 4.00 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 3.93 | 4.43 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 21 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3.75 | ****/1210 | 3.01 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 3.91 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4.20 | ****/1211 | 3.59 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.15 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4.20 | ****/1207 | 3.65 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.12 | **** |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 21 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/859 | **** | 3.80 | 4.08 | 3.95 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 104 4 | Term - Spring 2012 | Enrollment: 41 |
|---|---|---|
| Title: Prob Sol & Computer Prog | | Questionnaires: 25 |
| Instructor: Chang,Richard | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Laboratory** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/207 | 4.23 | 3.65 | 4.12 | 3.92 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/210 | 3.31 | 3.90 | 4.17 | 4.14 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/202 | 4.70 | 4.76 | 4.50 | 4.49 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/202 | 4.46 | 3.78 | 4.32 | 4.22 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/199 | 3.71 | 4.39 | 4.15 | 4.14 | **** |
| **Self Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 24 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 4.84 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.84 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 24 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.82 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.80 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 24 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/13 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 4.77 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 4 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 10 | Required for Majors | 13 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 3 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 7 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 1 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 25 | Non-major | 22 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 7 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 4 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 5 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 201 01 | | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | | | Enrollment: 90 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Computer Science I | | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 60 | | |
| Instructor: | Lupoli,Shawn V | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 21 | 26 | 4.19 | 1034/1542 | 4.42 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.19 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 18 | 35 | 4.52 | 602/1542 | 4.56 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.29 | 4.52 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 22 | 27 | 4.31 | 775/1339 | 4.46 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.40 | 4.31 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 20 | 23 | 4.27 | 833/1498 | 4.42 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.31 | 4.27 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 26 | 4 | 3 | 12 | 9 | 5 | 3.24 | 1317/1428 | 3.48 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.17 | 3.24 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 18 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 18 | 17 | 4.22 | 728/1407 | 4.29 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 4.22 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 14 | 35 | 4.38 | 696/1521 | 4.49 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.22 | 4.38 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 5.00 | 1/1541 | 4.80 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 8 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 26 | 16 | 4.12 | 832/1518 | 4.31 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.12 | 4.12 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 18 | 40 | 4.66 | 598/1472 | 4.72 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.53 | 4.66 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 18 | 40 | 4.66 | 1039/1475 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.79 | 4.66 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 21 | 29 | 4.34 | 858/1471 | 4.52 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.37 | 4.34 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 18 | 34 | 4.42 | 788/1470 | 4.40 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.40 | 4.42 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 17 | 32 | 4.40 | 425/1310 | 4.48 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 4.40 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 17 | 20 | 4.04 | 760/1210 | 4.25 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.18 | 4.04 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 10 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 23 | 12 | 3.84 | 1011/1211 | 4.10 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.34 | 3.84 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 11 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 20 | 14 | 3.84 | 1010/1207 | 4.06 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.40 | 3.84 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 10 | 23 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 4.00 | 478/859 | 4.19 | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.00 |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 201 01 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | | | | Enrollment: 90 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Computer Science I | | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 60 | | |
| Instructor: | Lupoli,Shawn V | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Laboratory** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4.11 | ****/207 | **** | 3.65 | 4.12 | 4.26 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4.22 | ****/210 | **** | 3.90 | 4.17 | 4.32 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4.44 | ****/202 | **** | 4.76 | 4.50 | 4.62 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 51 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4.11 | ****/202 | **** | 3.78 | 4.32 | 4.20 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 51 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4.14 | ****/199 | **** | 4.39 | 4.15 | 4.32 | **** |
| **Seminar** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 56 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.67 | ****/69 | **** | 5.00 | 4.56 | 4.68 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/69 | **** | 5.00 | 4.60 | 4.52 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.75 | ****/68 | **** | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.34 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 57 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.67 | ****/73 | **** | 4.80 | 4.54 | 4.63 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/67 | **** | 5.00 | 4.17 | 3.72 | **** |
| **Field Work** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 4.55 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.10 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/25 | **** | **** | 4.59 | 4.70 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.50 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/17 | **** | **** | 4.62 | 4.50 | **** |
| **Self Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 3.95 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.50 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 57 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.67 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.50 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 201 01 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | | | | Enrollment: | 90 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Computer Science I | | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: | 60 |
| Instructor: | Lupoli,Shawn V | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | **Frequencies** | | | | | **Instructor** | | **Course** | **Org** | **UMBC** | **Level** | **Sect** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Questions** | **NR** | **NA** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **Mean** | **Rank** | **Mean** | **Mean** | **Mean** | **Mean** | **Mean** |
| **Self Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.50 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/13 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 4.50 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 14 | 0.00-0.99 | 2 | A | 32 | Required for Majors | 52 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 29 |
| 28-55 | 9 | 1.00-1.99 | 2 | B | 20 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 7 | C | 4 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 60 | Non-major | 31 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 10 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 8 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 5 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 201 08 | Term - Spring 2012 | Enrollment: 102 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Title: Computer Science I | | Questionnaires: 45 |
| Instructor: Block,Dawn M | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 32 | 4.66 | 448/1542 | 4.42 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.66 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 27 | 4.60 | 492/1542 | 4.56 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.29 | 4.60 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 31 | 4.61 | 465/1339 | 4.46 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.40 | 4.61 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 28 | 4.58 | 464/1498 | 4.42 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.31 | 4.58 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 23 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 3.73 | 1119/1428 | 3.48 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.17 | 3.73 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 15 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 20 | 4.37 | 569/1407 | 4.29 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 4.37 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 32 | 4.60 | 408/1521 | 4.49 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.22 | 4.60 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 27 | 4.60 | 1047/1541 | 4.80 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.60 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 25 | 4.50 | 373/1518 | 4.31 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.12 | 4.50 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 36 | 4.77 | 418/1472 | 4.72 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.53 | 4.77 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 41 | 4.91 | 484/1475 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.79 | 4.91 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 33 | 4.70 | 425/1471 | 4.52 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.37 | 4.70 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 26 | 4.37 | 844/1470 | 4.40 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.40 | 4.37 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 26 | 4.56 | 277/1310 | 4.48 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 4.56 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 24 | 4.46 | 467/1210 | 4.25 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.18 | 4.46 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 25 | 4.36 | 723/1211 | 4.10 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.34 | 4.36 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 3 | 24 | 4.28 | 800/1207 | 4.06 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.40 | 4.28 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 5 | 22 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 4.39 | 285/859 | 4.19 | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.39 |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 201 08 | Term - Spring 2012 | Enrollment: 102 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Title: Computer Science I | | Questionnaires: 45 |
| Instructor: Block,Dawn M | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **Laboratory** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 36 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.22 | ****/207 | **** | 3.65 | 4.12 | 4.26 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 36 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.22 | ****/210 | **** | 3.90 | 4.17 | 4.32 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.78 | ****/202 | **** | 4.76 | 4.50 | 4.62 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 36 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.38 | ****/202 | **** | 3.78 | 4.32 | 4.20 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 36 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/199 | **** | 4.39 | 4.15 | 4.32 | **** |
| **Seminar** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | 5.00 | 4.56 | 4.68 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | 5.00 | 4.60 | 4.52 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/68 | **** | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.34 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/73 | **** | 4.80 | 4.54 | 4.63 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/67 | **** | 5.00 | 4.17 | 3.72 | **** |
| **Field Work** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 4.55 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.10 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/25 | **** | **** | 4.59 | 4.70 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.50 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/17 | **** | **** | 4.62 | 4.50 | **** |
| **Self Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 3.95 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.50 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.50 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 201 08 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: | 102 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Computer Science I | | | | Questionnaires: | 45 |
| Instructor: | Block,Dawn M | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **Self Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.50 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/13 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 4.50 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 30 | Required for Majors | 39 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 20 |
| 28-55 | 8 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 13 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 5 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 1 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 45 | Non-major | 25 |
| 84-150 | 4 | 3.00-3.49 | 6 | D | 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 9 | F | 0 | Electives | 2 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 3 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 202 01 | Term - Spring 2012 | Enrollment: 40 |
|---|---|---|
| Title: Computer Science II | | Questionnaires: 27 |
| Instructor: Griffin,Wesley | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 15 | 4.52 | 620/1542 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.52 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 14 | 10 | 4.22 | 967/1542 | 4.49 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.29 | 4.22 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 12 | 4.33 | 757/1339 | 4.44 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.40 | 4.33 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 7 | 4.04 | 1037/1498 | 4.16 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.31 | 4.04 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3.60 | ****/1428 | 3.78 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.17 | **** |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 4.22 | 717/1407 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 4.22 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 13 | 4.37 | 696/1521 | 4.33 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.22 | 4.37 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 22 | 4.85 | 787/1541 | 4.74 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.85 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 9 | 4.35 | 575/1518 | 4.30 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.12 | 4.35 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 17 | 4.63 | 659/1472 | 4.49 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.53 | 4.63 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 23 | 4.88 | 592/1475 | 4.77 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.79 | 4.88 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 12 | 4.35 | 858/1471 | 4.43 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.37 | 4.35 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 15 | 4.42 | 788/1470 | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.40 | 4.42 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 10 | 4.25 | 576/1310 | 4.40 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 4.25 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 1 | 3.33 | 1073/1210 | 3.76 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.18 | 3.33 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 8 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 3.16 | 1161/1211 | 3.82 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.34 | 3.16 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 11 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 2.56 | 1202/1207 | 3.72 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.40 | 2.56 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 8 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/859 | 2.90 | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.07 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 202 01 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | Enrollment: 40 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Computer Science II | | | | | | Questionnaires: 27 |
| Instructor: | Griffin,Wesley | | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Laboratory** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | ****/207 | 3.46 | 3.65 | 4.12 | 4.26 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/210 | 4.10 | 3.90 | 4.17 | 4.32 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/202 | 4.78 | 4.76 | 4.50 | 4.62 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 24 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.67 | ****/202 | 3.55 | 3.78 | 4.32 | 4.20 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 5 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 9 | Required for Majors | 27 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 22 |
| 28-55 | 7 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | B | 14 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 2 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 27 | Non-major | 5 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 7 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 8 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 202 04 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | | | Enrollment: 40 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Computer Science II | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 24 | | | |
| Instructor: | Bergeron,Ryan J | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | **Frequencies** | | | | **Instructor** | | **Course** | **Org** | **UMBC** | **Level** | **Sect** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 19 | 4.75 | 322/1542 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.75 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 20 | 4.79 | 242/1542 | 4.49 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.29 | 4.79 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 15 | 4.50 | 582/1339 | 4.44 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.40 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 13 | 4.48 | 590/1498 | 4.16 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.31 | 4.48 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3.78 | 1082/1428 | 3.78 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.17 | 3.78 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 4.36 | 579/1407 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 4.36 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 16 | 4.50 | 518/1521 | 4.33 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.22 | 4.50 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 21 | 4.88 | 738/1541 | 4.74 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.88 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 8 | 4.41 | 481/1518 | 4.30 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.12 | 4.41 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 17 | 4.58 | 715/1472 | 4.49 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.53 | 4.58 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 22 | 4.88 | 619/1475 | 4.77 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.79 | 4.88 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 18 | 4.67 | 463/1471 | 4.43 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.37 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 21 | 4.88 | 217/1470 | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.40 | 4.88 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 16 | 4.74 | 152/1310 | 4.40 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 4.74 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 5 | 4.07 | 754/1210 | 3.76 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.18 | 4.07 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 9 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 4.13 | 868/1211 | 3.82 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.34 | 4.13 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 4.00 | 918/1207 | 3.72 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.40 | 4.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 9 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.25 | ****/859 | 2.90 | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.07 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 202 04 | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: 40 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Computer Science II | | | Questionnaires: 24 |
| Instructor: | Bergeron,Ryan J | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Laboratory** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 22 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/207 | 3.46 | 3.65 | 4.12 | 4.26 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/210 | 4.10 | 3.90 | 4.17 | 4.32 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/202 | 4.78 | 4.76 | 4.50 | 4.62 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 22 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/202 | 3.55 | 3.78 | 4.32 | 4.20 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/199 | 4.61 | 4.39 | 4.15 | 4.32 | **** |
| **Seminar** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | 5.00 | 4.56 | 4.68 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | 5.00 | 4.60 | 4.52 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/68 | **** | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.34 | **** |
| **Field Work** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 4.55 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 10 | Required for Majors | 19 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 10 |
| 28-55 | 9 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 8 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 3 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 24 | Non-major | 14 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 202 07 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: 40 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: Computer Science II | | | | Questionnaires: 16 |
| Instructor: Bergeron,Ryan J | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | | | | |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 4.38 | 818/1542 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.38 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 4.67 | 416/1542 | 4.49 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.29 | 4.67 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 4.40 | 694/1339 | 4.44 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.40 | 4.40 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 4.23 | 874/1498 | 4.16 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.31 | 4.23 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/1428 | 3.78 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.17 | **** |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.29 | 651/1407 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 4.29 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 4.31 | 772/1521 | 4.33 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.22 | 4.31 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 5.00 | 1/1541 | 4.74 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 4.43 | 469/1518 | 4.30 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.12 | 4.43 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 4.64 | 629/1472 | 4.49 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.53 | 4.64 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 4.93 | 430/1475 | 4.77 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.79 | 4.93 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 4.71 | 399/1471 | 4.43 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.37 | 4.71 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 4.50 | 692/1470 | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.40 | 4.50 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 4.20 | 626/1310 | 4.40 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 4.20 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 4.00 | 774/1210 | 3.76 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.18 | 4.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 4.23 | 809/1211 | 3.82 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.34 | 4.23 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 4.21 | 835/1207 | 3.72 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.40 | 4.21 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.80 | 589/859 | 2.90 | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 3.80 |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 202 07 | Term - Spring 2012 | Enrollment: 40 |
|---|---|---|
| Title: Computer Science II | | Questionnaires: 16 |
| Instructor: Bergeron,Ryan J | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Instructor Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Laboratory** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 11 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3.00 | 195/207 | 3.46 | 3.65 | 4.12 | 4.26 | 3.00 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.60 | 38/210 | 4.10 | 3.90 | 4.17 | 4.32 | 4.60 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/202 | 4.78 | 4.76 | 4.50 | 4.62 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.60 | 79/202 | 3.55 | 3.78 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.60 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 24/199 | 4.61 | 4.39 | 4.15 | 4.32 | 4.75 |
| **Seminar** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/69 | **** | 5.00 | 4.56 | 4.68 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | 5.00 | 4.60 | 4.52 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/68 | **** | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.34 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/73 | **** | 4.80 | 4.54 | 4.63 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/67 | **** | 5.00 | 4.17 | 3.72 | **** |
| **Field Work** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 4.55 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.10 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/25 | **** | **** | 4.59 | 4.70 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.50 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/17 | **** | **** | 4.62 | 4.50 | **** |
| **Self Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 3.95 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.50 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.50 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 202 07 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | Enrollment: 40 | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Title: | Computer Science II | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 16 | | | | |
| Instructor: | Bergeron,Ryan J | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **Self Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.50 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/13 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 4.50 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 4 | Required for Majors | 15 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 10 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 11 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 16 | Non-major | 6 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 202 10 | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: 39 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Computer Science II | | | Questionnaires: 19 |
| Instructor: | Bergeron,Ryan J | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 4.37 | 831/1542 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.37 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 12 | 4.47 | 656/1542 | 4.49 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.29 | 4.47 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 4.37 | 730/1339 | 4.44 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.40 | 4.37 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 4.25 | 854/1498 | 4.16 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.31 | 4.25 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/1428 | 3.78 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.17 | **** |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 4.50 | 405/1407 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 4.50 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 14 | 4.63 | 369/1521 | 4.33 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.22 | 4.63 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 18 | 4.95 | 413/1541 | 4.74 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.95 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 4.50 | 373/1518 | 4.30 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.12 | 4.50 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 9 | 4.37 | 993/1472 | 4.49 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.53 | 4.37 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 11 | 4.47 | 1219/1475 | 4.77 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.79 | 4.47 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 8 | 4.28 | 930/1471 | 4.43 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.37 | 4.28 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 4.32 | 907/1470 | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.40 | 4.32 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 7 | 4.35 | 475/1310 | 4.40 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 4.35 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 3.38 | 1053/1210 | 3.76 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.18 | 3.38 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 4.08 | 895/1211 | 3.82 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.34 | 4.08 |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 202 10 | Term - Spring 2012 | Enrollment: 39 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Computer Science II | | Questionnaires: 19 |
| Instructor: | Bergeron,Ryan J | | |

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Questions** | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3.92 | 972/1207 | 3.72 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.40 | 3.92 |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 4 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 10 | Required for Majors | 15 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 8 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 7 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 2 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 19 | Non-major | 11 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 6 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 202 13 | Term - Spring 2012 | Enrollment: 24 |
|---|---|---|
| Title: Computer Science II | | Questionnaires: 10 |
| Instructor: Rushe,Michael | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.60 | 512/1542 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.60 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 4.60 | 492/1542 | 4.49 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.29 | 4.60 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 157/1339 | 4.44 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.40 | 4.90 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4.00 | 1058/1498 | 4.16 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.31 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1428 | 3.78 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.17 | **** |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 178/1407 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 4.75 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4.00 | 1046/1521 | 4.33 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.22 | 4.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 4.20 | 1360/1541 | 4.74 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.20 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 4.20 | 744/1518 | 4.30 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.12 | 4.20 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4.70 | 538/1472 | 4.49 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.53 | 4.70 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 538/1475 | 4.77 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.79 | 4.90 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.50 | 637/1471 | 4.43 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.37 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.60 | 588/1470 | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.40 | 4.60 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 4.50 | 324/1310 | 4.40 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 4.50 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3.63 | 981/1210 | 3.76 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.18 | 3.63 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3.63 | 1076/1211 | 3.82 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.34 | 3.63 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3.88 | 996/1207 | 3.72 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.40 | 3.88 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.00 | 855/859 | 2.90 | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 2.00 |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 202 13 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: 24 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Computer Science II | | | | Questionnaires: 10 |
| Instructor: | Rushe,Michael | | | | |

| | | | **Frequencies** | | | | | **Instructor** | | **Course** | **Org** | **UMBC** | **Level** | **Sect** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Questions** | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | **Mean** | **Rank** | **Mean** | **Mean** | **Mean** | **Mean** | **Mean** |
| **Laboratory** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.50 | 180/207 | 3.46 | 3.65 | 4.12 | 4.26 | 3.50 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 112/210 | 4.10 | 3.90 | 4.17 | 4.32 | 4.25 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/202 | 4.78 | 4.76 | 4.50 | 4.62 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | 201/202 | 3.55 | 3.78 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 2.00 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/199 | 4.61 | 4.39 | 4.15 | 4.32 | 5.00 |

## Frequency Distribution

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

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 202 16 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | Enrollment: 40 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: Computer Science II | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 21 |
| Instructor: Mitchell,Susan | | | | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 9 | 4.24 | 984/1542 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.24 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 7 | 4.19 | 1000/1542 | 4.49 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.29 | 4.19 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 11 | 4.14 | 911/1339 | 4.44 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.40 | 4.14 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 3.94 | 1119/1498 | 4.16 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.31 | 3.94 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.00 | ****/1428 | 3.78 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.17 | **** |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4.29 | 651/1407 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 4.29 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 11 | 4.19 | 902/1521 | 4.33 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.22 | 4.19 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 16 | 4.55 | 1085/1541 | 4.74 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.55 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 3.88 | 1071/1518 | 4.30 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.12 | 3.88 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 6 | 4.00 | 1222/1472 | 4.49 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.53 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 14 | 4.57 | 1142/1475 | 4.77 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.79 | 4.57 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 5 | 4.05 | 1087/1471 | 4.43 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.37 | 4.05 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 11 | 4.29 | 934/1470 | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.40 | 4.29 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 11 | 4.35 | 475/1310 | 4.40 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 4.35 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 4.15 | 704/1210 | 3.76 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.18 | 4.15 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 8 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3.69 | 1059/1211 | 3.82 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.34 | 3.69 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 3.77 | 1034/1207 | 3.72 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.40 | 3.77 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 8 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | ****/859 | 2.90 | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.07 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 202 16 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: 40 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: Computer Science II | | | | Questionnaires: 21 | |
| Instructor: Mitchell,Susan | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Laboratory** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 3 | 3.89 | 144/207 | 3.46 | 3.65 | 4.12 | 4.26 | 3.89 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3.44 | 193/210 | 4.10 | 3.90 | 4.17 | 4.32 | 3.44 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 4.33 | 147/202 | 4.78 | 4.76 | 4.50 | 4.62 | 4.33 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 4.06 | 144/202 | 3.55 | 3.78 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.06 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 4.08 | 117/199 | 4.61 | 4.39 | 4.15 | 4.32 | 4.08 |
| **Seminar** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/69 | **** | 5.00 | 4.56 | 4.68 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 19 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | 5.00 | 4.60 | 4.52 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 19 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/73 | **** | 4.80 | 4.54 | 4.63 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 19 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/67 | **** | 5.00 | 4.17 | 3.72 | **** |
| **Field Work** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 19 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 4.55 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.10 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/25 | **** | **** | 4.59 | 4.70 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 19 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.50 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 19 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/17 | **** | **** | 4.62 | 4.50 | **** |
| **Self Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 3.95 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 19 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.50 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 202 16 | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: | 40 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Computer Science II | | | Questionnaires: | 21 |
| Instructor: | Mitchell,Susan | | | | |

| | | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **Self Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 19 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.50 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 4 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 4 | Required for Majors | 16 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 9 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | B | 10 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 5 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 21 | Non-major | 12 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 0 | Electives | 2 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 203 01 | Term - Spring 2012 | Enrollment: 47 |
| Title: Discrete Structures | | Questionnaires: 38 |
| Instructor: Lomonaco JR,Sam | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 21 | 4.29 | 929/1542 | 3.79 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.29 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 18 | 4.16 | 1035/1542 | 3.57 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.29 | 4.16 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 27 | 4.61 | 476/1339 | 4.20 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.40 | 4.61 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 14 | 4.33 | 767/1498 | 3.80 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.31 | 4.33 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 18 | 4.11 | 792/1428 | 3.58 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.17 | 4.11 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 12 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 14 | 4.12 | 819/1407 | 4.05 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 4.12 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 20 | 4.30 | 795/1521 | 3.95 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.22 | 4.30 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 34 | 4.94 | 413/1541 | 4.96 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.94 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 8 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 12 | 8 | 3.90 | 1064/1518 | 3.16 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.12 | 3.90 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 16 | 17 | 4.27 | 1072/1472 | 4.11 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.53 | 4.27 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 28 | 4.62 | 1092/1475 | 4.45 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.79 | 4.62 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 12 | 14 | 3.97 | 1126/1471 | 3.38 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.37 | 3.97 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 21 | 4.31 | 918/1470 | 3.41 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.40 | 4.31 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 24 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 3.67 | 991/1310 | 3.14 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 3.67 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 4.25 | 634/1210 | 4.25 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.18 | 4.25 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 27 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.27 | 783/1211 | 4.27 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.34 | 4.27 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | 333/1207 | 4.82 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.40 | 4.82 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 27 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | ****/859 | **** | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.07 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 203 01 | Term - Spring 2012 | Enrollment: 47 |
|---|---|---|
| Title: Discrete Structures | | Questionnaires: 38 |
| Instructor: Lomonaco JR,Sam | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Laboratory** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 35 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/207 | **** | 3.65 | 4.12 | 4.26 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/210 | **** | 3.90 | 4.17 | 4.32 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 36 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/202 | **** | 4.76 | 4.50 | 4.62 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 36 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/202 | **** | 3.78 | 4.32 | 4.20 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 36 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/199 | **** | 4.39 | 4.15 | 4.32 | **** |
| **Seminar** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 36 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | 5.00 | 4.56 | 4.68 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 36 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | 5.00 | 4.60 | 4.52 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 36 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/68 | **** | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.34 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 36 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/73 | **** | 4.80 | 4.54 | 4.63 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 36 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/67 | **** | 5.00 | 4.17 | 3.72 | **** |
| **Field Work** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 4.55 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.10 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/25 | **** | **** | 4.59 | 4.70 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.50 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/17 | **** | **** | 4.62 | 4.50 | **** |
| **Self Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 3.95 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.50 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.50 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 203 01 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | Enrollment: 47 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Discrete Structures | | | | | | Questionnaires: 38 |
| Instructor: | Lomonaco JR,Sam | | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **Self Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 35 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.50 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 35 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/13 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 4.50 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 27 | Required for Majors | 35 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 20 |
| 28-55 | 12 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 2 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 38 | Non-major | 18 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | 8 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 11 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 203 02 | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: 43 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Discrete Structures | | | Questionnaires: 21 |
| Instructor: | Menyuk,Curtis R | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 3 | 3.00 | 1504/1542 | 3.79 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 3.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 2.90 | 1514/1542 | 3.57 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.29 | 2.90 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 3.81 | 1111/1339 | 4.20 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.40 | 3.81 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 3 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 3.33 | 1401/1498 | 3.80 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.31 | 3.33 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 3.31 | 1300/1428 | 3.58 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.17 | 3.31 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3.63 | 1144/1407 | 4.05 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 3.63 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 2.82 | 1467/1521 | 3.95 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.22 | 2.82 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 5.00 | 1/1541 | 4.96 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2.57 | 1486/1518 | 3.16 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.12 | 2.57 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 3.48 | 1403/1472 | 4.11 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.53 | 3.48 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 10 | 4.05 | 1392/1475 | 4.45 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.79 | 4.05 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 2.62 | 1450/1471 | 3.38 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.37 | 2.62 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 2.76 | 1433/1470 | 3.41 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.40 | 2.76 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 14 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2.83 | 1254/1310 | 3.14 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 2.83 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.33 | ****/1210 | 4.25 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.18 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 17 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.25 | ****/1211 | 4.27 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.34 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 18 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/1207 | 4.82 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.40 | **** |
| **Laboratory** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 20 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/207 | **** | 3.65 | 4.12 | 4.26 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 203 02 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | Enrollment: 43 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Discrete Structures | | | | | Questionnaires: 21 |
| Instructor: | Menyuk,Curtis R | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Laboratory** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 20 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/210 | **** | 3.90 | 4.17 | 4.32 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 6 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 3 | Required for Majors | 20 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 10 |
| 28-55 | 6 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 7 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 9 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 21 | Non-major | 11 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 8 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 203 03 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | | | Enrollment: 40 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: Discrete Structures | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 9 | | | | |
| Instructor: Nirenburg,Serge | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | **Frequencies** | | | | | **Instructor** | | **Course** | **Org** | **UMBC** | **Level** | **Sect** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 3.89 | 1275/1542 | 3.79 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 3.89 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3.33 | 1453/1542 | 3.57 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.29 | 3.33 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4.00 | 982/1339 | 4.20 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.40 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3.88 | 1176/1498 | 3.80 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.31 | 3.88 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3.40 | 1263/1428 | 3.58 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.17 | 3.40 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | 599/1407 | 4.05 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 4.33 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4.33 | 746/1521 | 3.95 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.22 | 4.33 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 721/1541 | 4.96 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.89 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3.29 | 1367/1518 | 3.16 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.12 | 3.29 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4.44 | 899/1472 | 4.11 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.53 | 4.44 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 4.67 | 1039/1475 | 4.45 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.79 | 4.67 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 3.44 | 1348/1471 | 3.38 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.37 | 3.44 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3.44 | 1333/1470 | 3.41 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.40 | 3.44 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3.14 | 1200/1310 | 3.14 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 3.14 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1210 | 4.25 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.18 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1211 | 4.27 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.34 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 203 03 | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: 40 |
| Title: | Discrete Structures | | | Questionnaires: 9 |
| Instructor: | Nirenburg,Serge | | | |

| | | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1207 | 4.82 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.40 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

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

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 203 04 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | | | Enrollment: 40 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Discrete Structures | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 15 | | | |
| Instructor: | Nirenburg,Serge | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 4.00 | 1173/1542 | 3.79 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 3.87 | 1236/1542 | 3.57 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.29 | 3.87 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 4.40 | 694/1339 | 4.20 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.40 | 4.40 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3.67 | 1281/1498 | 3.80 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.31 | 3.67 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 3.50 | 1231/1428 | 3.58 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.17 | 3.50 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4.11 | 819/1407 | 4.05 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 4.11 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 4.33 | 746/1521 | 3.95 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.22 | 4.33 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1541 | 4.96 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 2.87 | 1454/1518 | 3.16 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.12 | 2.87 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 4.27 | 1079/1472 | 4.11 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.53 | 4.27 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 8 | 4.47 | 1226/1475 | 4.45 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.79 | 4.47 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3.47 | 1342/1471 | 3.38 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.37 | 3.47 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 3.14 | 1394/1470 | 3.41 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.40 | 3.14 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2.91 | 1246/1310 | 3.14 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 2.91 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1210 | 4.25 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.18 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/1211 | 4.27 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.34 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 203 04 | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: 40 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Discrete Structures | | | Questionnaires: 15 |
| Instructor: | Nirenburg,Serge | | | |

| | | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/1207 | 4.82 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.40 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 3 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 3 | Required for Majors | 14 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 6 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 8 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 3 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 15 | Non-major | 9 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 304 1 | Term - Spring 2012 | Enrollment: 54 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Social/Ethical Iss In IT | | Questionnaires: 37 |
| Instructor: | Wilson,Richard | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 13 | 7 | 6 | 3.03 | 1501/1542 | 3.03 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 3.03 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 3.19 | 1482/1542 | 3.19 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 3.19 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 11 | 6 | 3.08 | 1287/1339 | 3.08 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 3.08 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 9 | 12 | 3.69 | 1267/1498 | 3.69 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 3.69 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 14 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 3.30 | 1305/1428 | 3.30 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 3.30 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 12 | 3.59 | 1158/1407 | 3.59 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 3.59 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 6 | 9 | 3.14 | 1414/1521 | 3.14 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 3.14 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 22 | 4 | 3.81 | 1512/1541 | 3.81 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 3.81 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 3.18 | 1395/1518 | 3.18 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 3.18 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 3.11 | 1432/1472 | 3.11 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 3.11 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 31 | 4.81 | 781/1475 | 4.81 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.81 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 11 | 6 | 8 | 3.08 | 1404/1471 | 3.08 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 3.08 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 12 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 11 | 2.92 | 1420/1470 | 2.92 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 2.92 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 22 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 3.29 | 1159/1310 | 3.29 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 3.29 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 32 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.40 | ****/1210 | **** | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.27 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | ****/1211 | **** | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.45 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | ****/1207 | **** | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.51 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 304 1 | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: 54 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Social/Ethical Iss In IT | | | Questionnaires: 37 |
| Instructor: | Wilson,Richard | | | |

| | | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 32 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | ****/859 | **** | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.13 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 22 | Required for Majors | 31 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 34 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 11 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 9 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 37 | Non-major | 3 |
| 84-150 | 6 | 3.00-3.49 | 12 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 313 1 | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: 40 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Comp Organ & Assemb Lang | | | Questionnaires: 33 |
| Instructor: | Frey,Dennis L | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | **Frequencies** | | | | | **Instructor** | | **Course** | **Org** | **UMBC** | **Level** | **Sect** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 27 | 4.81 | 250/1542 | 4.62 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.81 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 23 | 4.63 | 466/1542 | 4.64 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.63 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 21 | 4.53 | 550/1339 | 4.63 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.53 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 20 | 4.38 | 722/1498 | 4.43 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.38 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 14 | 4.21 | 681/1428 | 4.15 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.21 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 13 | 4.75 | 178/1407 | 4.64 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.75 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 24 | 4.69 | 304/1521 | 4.63 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 4.69 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 5.00 | 1/1541 | 5.00 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 15 | 4.48 | 397/1518 | 4.27 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.48 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 26 | 4.81 | 367/1472 | 4.76 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.81 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 27 | 4.87 | 619/1475 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.87 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 25 | 4.77 | 333/1471 | 4.68 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.77 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 25 | 4.65 | 528/1470 | 4.66 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.65 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 5 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 15 | 4.38 | 445/1310 | 4.35 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 4.38 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | ****/1210 | **** | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.27 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 213/1211 | 4.89 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.45 | 4.89 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | ****/1207 | **** | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.51 | **** |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 26 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/859 | **** | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.13 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 313 1 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | | Enrollment: 40 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Title:** | Comp Organ & Assemb Lang | | | | | | | | | **Questionnaires: 33** | | | |
| **Instructor:** | Frey,Dennis L | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Instructor Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Laboratory** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/207 | **** | 3.65 | 4.12 | 4.17 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/210 | **** | 3.90 | 4.17 | 4.21 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/202 | **** | 4.76 | 4.50 | 4.54 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/202 | **** | 3.78 | 4.32 | 4.44 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/199 | **** | 4.39 | 4.15 | 4.18 | **** |
| **Seminar** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | 5.00 | 4.56 | 4.70 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/69 | **** | 5.00 | 4.60 | 4.68 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/68 | **** | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.51 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 31 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/73 | **** | 4.80 | 4.54 | 4.55 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 31 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/67 | **** | 5.00 | 4.17 | 4.46 | **** |
| **Field Work** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 3.88 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.08 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/25 | **** | **** | 4.59 | 4.24 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 3.84 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/17 | **** | **** | 4.62 | 4.17 | **** |
| **Self Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 31 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.33 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 2.17 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 313 1 | | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | | | Enrollment: 40 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Comp Organ & Assemb Lang | | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 33 | | |
| Instructor: | Frey,Dennis L | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | **Frequencies** | | | | | **Instructor** | | **Course** | **Org** | **UMBC** | **Level** | **Sect** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Questions** | **NR** | **NA** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **Mean** | **Rank** | **Mean** | **Mean** | **Mean** | **Mean** | **Mean** |
| **Self Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 31 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 1.00 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 15 | Required for Majors | 29 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 30 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 14 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 8 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 1 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 33 | Non-major | 3 |
| 84-150 | 6 | 3.00-3.49 | 14 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 8 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 313 2 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | | | Enrollment: 40 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Comp Organ & Assemb Lang | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 26 | | | |
| Instructor: | Frey,Dennis L | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 18 | 4.42 | 750/1542 | 4.62 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.42 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 20 | 4.65 | 429/1542 | 4.64 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.65 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 21 | 4.73 | 337/1339 | 4.63 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.73 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 14 | 4.48 | 590/1498 | 4.43 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.48 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 11 | 4.10 | 797/1428 | 4.15 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.10 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 4.54 | 375/1407 | 4.64 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.54 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 17 | 4.58 | 441/1521 | 4.63 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 4.58 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 5.00 | 1/1541 | 5.00 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 9 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 4.06 | 881/1518 | 4.27 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.06 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 22 | 4.72 | 503/1472 | 4.76 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.72 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 21 | 4.71 | 987/1475 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.71 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 18 | 4.60 | 538/1471 | 4.68 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.60 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 21 | 4.68 | 468/1470 | 4.66 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.68 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 14 | 4.32 | 515/1310 | 4.35 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 4.32 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/1210 | **** | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.27 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1211 | 4.89 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.45 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1207 | **** | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.51 | **** |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/859 | **** | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.13 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 313 2 | Term - Spring 2012 | Enrollment: 40 |
|---|---|---|
| Title: Comp Organ & Assemb Lang | | Questionnaires: 26 |
| Instructor: Frey,Dennis L | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Laboratory** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/210 | **** | 3.90 | 4.17 | 4.21 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/202 | **** | 4.76 | 4.50 | 4.54 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/202 | **** | 3.78 | 4.32 | 4.44 | **** |
| **Seminar** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | 5.00 | 4.60 | 4.68 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/68 | **** | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.51 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/73 | **** | 4.80 | 4.54 | 4.55 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/67 | **** | 5.00 | 4.17 | 4.46 | **** |
| **Field Work** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 3.88 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/25 | **** | **** | 4.59 | 4.24 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 3.84 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/17 | **** | **** | 4.62 | 4.17 | **** |
| **Self Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 3.17 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 2.17 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 1.00 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 313 2 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | Enrollment: | 40 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Comp Organ & Assemb Lang | | | | | Questionnaires: | 26 |
| Instructor: | Frey,Dennis L | | | | | | |

| | | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **Self Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/13 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 1.00 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 10 | Required for Majors | 26 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 23 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 15 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 5 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 1 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 26 | Non-major | 3 |
| 84-150 | 6 | 3.00-3.49 | 6 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 7 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 331 02 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | Enrollment: 40 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Prin Of Prog Languages | | | | | Questionnaires: 26 |
| Instructor: | Park,John | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 19 | 4.73 | 347/1542 | 4.56 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.73 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 17 | 4.58 | 528/1542 | 4.24 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.58 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 22 | 4.81 | 254/1339 | 4.16 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.81 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 13 | 4.65 | 380/1498 | 4.28 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.65 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 9 | 3.52 | 1223/1428 | 3.40 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 3.52 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 4.69 | 234/1407 | 4.27 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.69 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 12 | 4.36 | 708/1521 | 4.30 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 4.36 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 23 | 4.88 | 721/1541 | 4.93 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.88 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 11 | 4.39 | 507/1518 | 3.82 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.39 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 17 | 4.64 | 629/1472 | 4.18 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.64 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 24 | 4.92 | 430/1475 | 4.55 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.92 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 20 | 4.68 | 438/1471 | 4.00 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.68 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 23 | 4.80 | 311/1470 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.80 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 17 | 4.67 | 201/1310 | 4.26 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 4.67 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/1210 | **** | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.27 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1211 | **** | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.45 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/1207 | **** | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.51 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 331 02 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: | 40 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Prin Of Prog Languages | | | | Questionnaires: | 26 |
| Instructor: | Park,John | | | | | |

| | | | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Questions** | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/859 | **** | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.13 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 13 | Required for Majors | 25 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 19 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 7 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 3 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 26 | Non-major | 7 |
| 84-150 | 4 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 8 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 331 1 | Term - Spring 2012 | Enrollment: 40 |
|---|---|---|
| Title: Prin Of Prog Languages | | Questionnaires: 29 |
| Instructor: Lupoli,Shawn V | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Instructor Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 17 | 4.38 | 818/1542 | 4.56 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.38 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 10 | 9 | 3.90 | 1215/1542 | 4.24 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 3.90 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 11 | 6 | 3.52 | 1209/1339 | 4.16 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 3.52 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 10 | 3.92 | 1139/1498 | 4.28 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 3.92 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 18 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3.27 | 1311/1428 | 3.40 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 3.27 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3.85 | 1021/1407 | 4.27 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 3.85 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 14 | 4.24 | 849/1521 | 4.30 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 4.24 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 28 | 4.97 | 276/1541 | 4.93 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.97 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 12 | 10 | 2 | 3.25 | 1375/1518 | 3.82 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 3.25 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 11 | 7 | 3.72 | 1353/1472 | 4.18 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 3.72 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 12 | 13 | 4.17 | 1361/1475 | 4.55 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.17 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 9 | 4 | 3.32 | 1375/1471 | 4.00 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 3.32 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 12 | 7 | 3.57 | 1297/1470 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 3.57 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 11 | 9 | 3.86 | 887/1310 | 4.26 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 3.86 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1210 | **** | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.27 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 25 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/1211 | **** | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.45 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 26 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1207 | **** | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.51 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 331 1 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | Enrollment: | 40 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Prin Of Prog Languages | | | | | Questionnaires: | 29 |
| Instructor: | Lupoli,Shawn V | | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 26 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/859 | **** | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.13 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 18 | Required for Majors | 27 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 27 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 8 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 6 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 2 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 29 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 9 | 3.00-3.49 | 8 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 7 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 341 02 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: 40 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: Data Structures | | | | Questionnaires: 21 |
| Instructor: Caban,Jesus J. | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 15 | 4.57 | 548/1542 | 4.52 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.57 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 14 | 4.33 | 833/1542 | 4.60 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.33 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 17 | 4.71 | 361/1339 | 4.67 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.71 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 4.56 | 488/1498 | 4.51 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.56 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 11 | 4.28 | 608/1428 | 4.04 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.28 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 4.50 | 405/1407 | 4.37 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.50 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 15 | 4.57 | 441/1521 | 4.61 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 4.57 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 19 | 4.81 | 853/1541 | 4.94 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.81 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 4.07 | 865/1518 | 4.24 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.07 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 4.50 | 817/1472 | 4.64 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 14 | 4.71 | 987/1475 | 4.76 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.71 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 4.35 | 846/1471 | 4.43 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.35 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 4.53 | 671/1470 | 4.57 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.53 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 4.67 | 201/1310 | 4.27 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 4.67 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/1210 | **** | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.27 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/1211 | **** | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.45 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/1207 | **** | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.51 | **** |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/859 | **** | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.13 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 341 02 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | | | Enrollment: 40 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Data Structures | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 21 | | | |
| Instructor: | Caban,Jesus J. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **Laboratory** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/207 | **** | 3.65 | 4.12 | 4.17 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/210 | **** | 3.90 | 4.17 | 4.21 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/202 | **** | 4.76 | 4.50 | 4.54 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/202 | **** | 3.78 | 4.32 | 4.44 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/199 | **** | 4.39 | 4.15 | 4.18 | **** |
| **Seminar** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/69 | **** | 5.00 | 4.56 | 4.70 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | 5.00 | 4.60 | 4.68 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/68 | **** | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.51 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/73 | **** | 4.80 | 4.54 | 4.55 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/67 | **** | 5.00 | 4.17 | 4.46 | **** |
| **Field Work** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 3.88 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.08 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/25 | **** | **** | 4.59 | 4.24 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 3.84 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/17 | **** | **** | 4.62 | 4.17 | **** |
| **Self Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.33 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 2.17 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 341 02 | Term - Spring 2012 | Enrollment: | 40 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Data Structures | | Questionnaires: | 21 |
| Instructor: | Caban,Jesus J. | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Instructor Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Self Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 1.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/13 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 1.00 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 7 | Required for Majors | 18 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 18 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 8 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 7 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 2 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 21 | Non-major | 3 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 7 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 341 03 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | Enrollment: 42 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Data Structures | | | | | Questionnaires: 27 |
| Instructor: | Bergeron,Ryan J | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 21 | 4.70 | 385/1542 | 4.52 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.70 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 21 | 4.74 | 311/1542 | 4.60 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.74 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 22 | 4.78 | 289/1339 | 4.67 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.78 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 17 | 4.62 | 416/1498 | 4.51 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.62 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 4.42 | 483/1428 | 4.04 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.42 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 11 | 4.30 | 629/1407 | 4.37 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.30 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 19 | 4.63 | 382/1521 | 4.61 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 4.63 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 5.00 | 1/1541 | 4.94 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 14 | 4.52 | 357/1518 | 4.24 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.52 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 15 | 4.48 | 844/1472 | 4.64 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.48 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 26 | 4.93 | 430/1475 | 4.76 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.93 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 15 | 4.48 | 666/1471 | 4.43 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.48 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 19 | 4.56 | 640/1470 | 4.57 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.56 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 13 | 4.12 | 698/1310 | 4.27 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 4.12 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | ****/1210 | **** | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.27 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | ****/1211 | **** | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.45 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | ****/1207 | **** | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.51 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 341 03 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | Enrollment: | 42 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Title: | Data Structures | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: | 27 |
| Instructor: | Bergeron,Ryan J | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | **Frequencies** | | | | | **Instructor** | | **Course** | **Org** | **UMBC** | **Level** | **Sect** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Questions** | **NR** | **NA** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **Mean** | **Rank** | **Mean** | **Mean** | **Mean** | **Mean** | **Mean** |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 22 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/859 | **** | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.13 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 10 | Required for Majors | 27 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 8 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 9 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 7 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 7 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 27 | Non-major | 19 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 10 | D | 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 341 04 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | Enrollment: 21 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Data Structures | | | | | Questionnaires: 9 |
| Instructor: | Peng,Yun | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.00 | 1173/1542 | 4.52 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4.56 | 553/1542 | 4.60 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.56 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.44 | 649/1339 | 4.67 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.44 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 549/1498 | 4.51 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.50 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3.80 | 1061/1428 | 4.04 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 3.80 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.29 | 651/1407 | 4.37 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.29 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4.56 | 463/1521 | 4.61 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 4.56 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1541 | 4.94 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3.83 | 1107/1518 | 4.24 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 3.83 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.63 | 659/1472 | 4.64 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.63 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 1197/1475 | 4.76 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.50 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4.13 | 1046/1471 | 4.43 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.13 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4.38 | 844/1470 | 4.57 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.38 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3.83 | 905/1310 | 4.27 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 3.83 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/1210 | **** | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.27 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/1211 | **** | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.45 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1207 | **** | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.51 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 341 04 | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: 21 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Data Structures | | | Questionnaires: 9 |
| Instructor: | Peng,Yun | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | | | | |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/859 | **** | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.13 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

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

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 341 1 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | Enrollment: 42 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: Data Structures | | | | | Questionnaires: 33 | |
| Instructor: Frey,Dennis L | | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 26 | 4.79 | 285/1542 | 4.52 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.79 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 25 | 4.76 | 297/1542 | 4.60 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.76 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 26 | 4.76 | 313/1339 | 4.67 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.76 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 15 | 4.38 | 722/1498 | 4.51 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.38 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 16 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 3.65 | 1168/1428 | 4.04 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 3.65 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 11 | 4.40 | 530/1407 | 4.37 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.40 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 24 | 4.67 | 330/1521 | 4.61 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 4.67 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 32 | 4.97 | 276/1541 | 4.94 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.97 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 16 | 4.54 | 349/1518 | 4.24 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.54 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 31 | 4.94 | 146/1472 | 4.64 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.94 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 29 | 4.91 | 538/1475 | 4.76 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.91 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 25 | 4.76 | 346/1471 | 4.43 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.76 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 27 | 4.82 | 297/1470 | 4.57 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.82 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 17 | 4.46 | 364/1310 | 4.27 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 4.46 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/1210 | **** | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.27 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/1211 | **** | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.45 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/1207 | **** | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.51 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 341 1 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | Enrollment: 42 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Data Structures | | | | | Questionnaires: 33 |
| Instructor: | Frey,Dennis L | | | | | |

| | | | **Frequencies** | | | | | **Instructor** | | **Course** | **Org** | **UMBC** | **Level** | **Sect** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Questions** | **NR** | **NA** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **Mean** | **Rank** | **Mean** | **Mean** | **Mean** | **Mean** | **Mean** |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 30 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/859 | **** | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.13 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 8 | Required for Majors | 31 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 26 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 15 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 8 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 7 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 33 | Non-major | 7 |
| 84-150 | 7 | 3.00-3.49 | 8 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 9 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 345 01 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: 30 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: Software Design/Develop | | | | Questionnaires: 21 |
| Instructor: Sidhu,Deepinder | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 3.00 | 1504/1542 | 3.91 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 3.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 2 | 5 | 3.25 | 1471/1542 | 3.99 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 3.25 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 3.45 | 1225/1339 | 4.13 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 3.45 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 3.41 | 1373/1498 | 4.04 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 3.41 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2.67 | 1403/1428 | 3.23 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 2.67 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 3.06 | 1342/1407 | 3.74 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 3.06 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 2.80 | 1470/1521 | 3.74 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 2.80 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 11 | 4.50 | 1124/1541 | 4.50 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.50 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 2.85 | 1456/1518 | 3.75 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 2.85 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3.42 | 1411/1472 | 4.15 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 3.42 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 3.40 | 1457/1475 | 4.23 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 3.40 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 1 | 5 | 3.40 | 1359/1471 | 4.20 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 3.40 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 3.30 | 1370/1470 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 3.30 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 3.24 | 1174/1310 | 4.00 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 3.24 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.33 | ****/1210 | 4.33 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.27 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 18 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2.67 | ****/1211 | 4.50 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.45 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 18 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1207 | 4.83 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.51 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 345 01 | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: | 30 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Software Design/Develop | | | Questionnaires: | 21 |
| Instructor: | Sidhu,Deepinder | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/859 | **** | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.13 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 15 | Required for Majors | 19 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 15 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 4 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 21 | Non-major | 6 |
| 84-150 | 7 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 345 02 | Term - Spring 2012 | Enrollment: 32 |
|---|---|---|
| Title: Software Design/Develop | | Questionnaires: 22 |
| Instructor: Wilson,Michael | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 11 | 4.24 | 984/1542 | 3.91 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.24 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 12 | 4.33 | 833/1542 | 3.99 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.33 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 4.28 | 809/1339 | 4.13 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.28 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 4.41 | 674/1498 | 4.04 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.41 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | ****/1428 | 3.23 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.15 | **** |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 4.64 | 270/1407 | 3.74 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.64 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 14 | 4.53 | 496/1521 | 3.74 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 4.53 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 5.00 | 1/1541 | 4.50 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 9 | 4.41 | 481/1518 | 3.75 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.41 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 16 | 4.71 | 520/1472 | 4.15 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.71 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 14 | 4.60 | 1119/1475 | 4.23 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.60 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 16 | 4.70 | 413/1471 | 4.20 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.70 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 14 | 4.14 | 1044/1470 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.14 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 7 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 4.38 | 445/1310 | 4.00 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 4.38 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.33 | 578/1210 | 4.33 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.27 | 4.33 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 580/1211 | 4.50 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.45 | 4.50 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 311/1207 | 4.83 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.51 | 4.83 |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 345 02 | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: 32 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Software Design/Develop | | | Questionnaires: 22 |
| Instructor: | Wilson,Michael | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 17 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/859 | **** | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.13 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 17 | Required for Majors | 16 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 16 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 2 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 22 | Non-major | 6 |
| 84-150 | 8 | 3.00-3.49 | 7 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 | Electives | 2 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 345 03 | Term - Spring 2012 | Enrollment: 10 |
|---|---|---|
| Title: Software Design/Develop | | Questionnaires: 10 |
| Instructor: Mitchell,Susan | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 4.50 | 632/1542 | 3.91 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4.40 | 754/1542 | 3.99 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.40 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 414/1339 | 4.13 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4.30 | 802/1498 | 4.04 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.30 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3.80 | 1061/1428 | 3.23 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 3.80 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3.50 | 1210/1407 | 3.74 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 3.50 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3.90 | 1139/1521 | 3.74 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 3.90 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 4.00 | 1455/1541 | 4.50 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.71 | 4.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4.00 | 920/1518 | 3.75 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.00 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4.30 | 1052/1472 | 4.15 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.30 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4.70 | 987/1475 | 4.23 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.70 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 4.50 | 637/1471 | 4.20 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 4.30 | 918/1470 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.30 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4.38 | 455/1310 | 4.00 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 4.38 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1210 | 4.33 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.27 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1211 | 4.50 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.45 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1207 | 4.83 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.51 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 345 03 | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: | 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Software Design/Develop | | | Questionnaires: | 10 |
| Instructor: | Mitchell,Susan | | | | |

| | | | **Frequencies** | | | | | **Instructor** | | **Course** | **Org** | **UMBC** | **Level** | **Sect** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Questions** | **NR** | **NA** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **Mean** | **Rank** | **Mean** | **Mean** | **Mean** | **Mean** | **Mean** |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/859 | **** | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.13 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

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

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 411 1 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: 33 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: Computer Architecture | | | | Questionnaires: 22 |
| Instructor: Younis,Mohamed | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | | | | |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 16 | 4.71 | 372/1542 | 4.52 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.42 | 4.71 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 15 | 4.67 | 416/1542 | 4.27 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.67 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 14 | 4.62 | 465/1339 | 4.04 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.44 | 4.62 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 4.63 | 404/1498 | 4.38 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.35 | 4.63 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 4.00 | 851/1428 | 3.81 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.22 | 4.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 4.53 | 375/1407 | 4.24 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.53 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 15 | 4.71 | 268/1521 | 4.38 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 4.71 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 5.00 | 1/1541 | 5.00 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 4.25 | 686/1518 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.18 | 4.25 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 20 | 4.95 | 105/1472 | 4.55 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 4.95 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 18 | 4.81 | 808/1475 | 4.71 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.81 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 12 | 4.52 | 617/1471 | 4.33 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.52 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 16 | 4.76 | 361/1470 | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.76 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 9 | 4.32 | 515/1310 | 3.78 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.09 | 4.32 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1210 | **** | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.34 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1211 | **** | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.47 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 411 1 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | | Enrollment: 33 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Computer Architecture | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 22 |
| Instructor: | Younis,Mohamed | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | Frequencies | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Questions** | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1207 | **** | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.53 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 11 | Required for Majors | 20 | Graduate | 1 | Major | 18 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 10 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 21 | Non-major | 4 |
| 84-150 | 9 | 3.00-3.49 | 6 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 1 | 3.50-4.00 | 10 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 411 2 | Term - Spring 2012 | Enrollment: 32 |
|---|---|---|
| Title: Computer Architecture | | Questionnaires: 22 |
| Instructor: Olano,Thomas M | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 11 | 4.32 | 895/1542 | 4.52 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.42 | 4.32 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 8 | 3.86 | 1236/1542 | 4.27 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 3.86 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 5 | 3.45 | 1225/1339 | 4.04 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.44 | 3.45 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 4.13 | 986/1498 | 4.38 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.35 | 4.13 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 3.63 | 1179/1428 | 3.81 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.22 | 3.63 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 3.94 | 933/1407 | 4.24 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 3.94 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 4.05 | 1026/1521 | 4.38 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 4.05 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 5.00 | 1/1541 | 5.00 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 3.89 | 1064/1518 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.18 | 3.89 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 8 | 4.14 | 1162/1472 | 4.55 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 4.14 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 14 | 4.62 | 1105/1475 | 4.71 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.62 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 4.14 | 1031/1471 | 4.33 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.14 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 13 | 4.24 | 976/1470 | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.24 |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 411 2 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | | | | | Enrollment: | 32 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Computer Architecture | | | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: | 22 |
| Instructor: | Olano,Thomas M | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 3.24 | 1174/1310 | 3.78 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.09 | 3.24 |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 5 | Required for Majors | 19 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 20 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 4 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 10 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 22 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | 9 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 0 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 421 02 | Term - Spring 2012 | Enrollment: 40 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Princ Of Oper Systems | | Questionnaires: 26 |
| Instructor: | Carback,Richard | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | | | | |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 17 | 4.54 | 584/1542 | 4.55 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.42 | 4.54 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 3.88 | 1229/1542 | 4.06 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 3.88 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 10 | 5 | 3.58 | 1190/1339 | 3.92 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.44 | 3.58 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 3.95 | 1109/1498 | 4.17 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.35 | 3.95 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 3.78 | 1075/1428 | 3.81 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.22 | 3.78 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 3.84 | 1021/1407 | 3.97 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 3.84 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 12 | 4.25 | 838/1521 | 4.18 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 4.25 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 5.00 | 1/1541 | 5.00 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 7 | 3.91 | 1043/1518 | 4.21 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.18 | 3.91 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 12 | 4.17 | 1141/1472 | 4.39 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 4.17 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 21 | 4.71 | 987/1475 | 4.75 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.71 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 3.79 | 1228/1471 | 4.06 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 3.79 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 11 | 3.96 | 1145/1470 | 4.09 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 3.96 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 11 | 4.09 | 711/1310 | 4.05 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.09 | 4.09 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1210 | **** | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.34 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.67 | ****/1211 | **** | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.47 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/1207 | **** | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.53 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 421 02 | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: | 40 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Princ Of Oper Systems | | | Questionnaires: | 26 |
| Instructor: | Carback,Richard | | | | |

| | | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 23 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/859 | **** | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.19 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 6 | Required for Majors | 24 | Graduate | 1 | Major | 16 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 10 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 8 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 25 | Non-major | 10 |
| 84-150 | 8 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 1 | 3.50-4.00 | 9 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 421 1 | | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | | Enrollment: 40 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Princ Of Oper Systems | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 30 | | | |
| Instructor: | Kalpakis,Konsta | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | **Frequencies** | | | | | **Instructor** | | **Course** | **Org** | **UMBC** | **Level** | **Sect** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Questions** | **NR** | **NA** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **Mean** | **Rank** | **Mean** | **Mean** | **Mean** | **Mean** | **Mean** |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 18 | 4.55 | 572/1542 | 4.55 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.42 | 4.55 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 15 | 4.24 | 942/1542 | 4.06 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.24 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 15 | 4.25 | 825/1339 | 3.92 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.44 | 4.25 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 15 | 4.38 | 710/1498 | 4.17 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.35 | 4.38 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 3.85 | 1030/1428 | 3.81 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.22 | 3.85 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 9 | 4.09 | 832/1407 | 3.97 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.09 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 13 | 4.11 | 997/1521 | 4.18 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 4.11 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 5.00 | 1/1541 | 5.00 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 13 | 4.50 | 373/1518 | 4.21 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.18 | 4.50 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 21 | 4.61 | 690/1472 | 4.39 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 4.61 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 24 | 4.79 | 843/1475 | 4.75 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.79 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 16 | 4.32 | 882/1471 | 4.06 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.32 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 15 | 4.21 | 993/1470 | 4.09 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.21 |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 421 1 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | Enrollment: | 40 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Princ Of Oper Systems | | | | | | Questionnaires: | 30 |
| Instructor: | Kalpakis,Konsta | | | | | | | |

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 10 | 4.00 | 761/1310 | 4.05 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.09 | 4.00 |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 8 | Required for Majors | 29 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 15 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 14 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 2 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 30 | Non-major | 15 |
| 84-150 | 15 | 3.00-3.49 | 12 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 8 | F | 1 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 426 01 | Term - Spring 2012 | Enrollment: 40 |
|---|---|---|
| Title: Princ Computer Security | | Questionnaires: 24 |
| Instructor: Phatak,Dhananja | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 3 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 2.57 | 1533/1542 | 2.57 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.42 | 2.57 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2.10 | 1536/1542 | 2.10 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 2.10 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 2.90 | 1307/1339 | 2.90 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.44 | 2.90 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 3 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2.12 | 1495/1498 | 2.12 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.35 | 2.12 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 4 | 3.00 | 1360/1428 | 3.00 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.22 | 3.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 3 | 12 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2.56 | 1392/1407 | 2.56 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 2.56 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 3 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2.39 | 1504/1521 | 2.39 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 2.39 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5 | 4.25 | 1327/1541 | 4.25 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.25 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2.00 | 1512/1518 | 2.00 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.18 | 2.00 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 2.33 | 1468/1472 | 2.33 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 2.33 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 10 | 4.29 | 1326/1475 | 4.29 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.29 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2.05 | 1465/1471 | 2.05 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 2.05 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 11 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 2.10 | 1460/1470 | 2.10 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 2.10 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2.44 | 1288/1310 | 2.44 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.09 | 2.44 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2.20 | 1204/1210 | 2.20 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.34 | 2.20 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 14 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3.20 | 1151/1211 | 3.20 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.47 | 3.20 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 14 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3.50 | 1097/1207 | 3.50 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.53 | 3.50 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 13 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/859 | **** | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.19 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 426 01 | Term - Spring 2012 | Enrollment: 40 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Title: | Princ Computer Security | | Questionnaires: 24 |
| Instructor: | Phatak,Dhananja | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | | | | |
| **Laboratory** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 21 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/207 | **** | 3.65 | 4.12 | 4.41 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 22 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/210 | **** | 3.90 | 4.17 | 4.02 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/202 | **** | 4.76 | 4.50 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 22 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/202 | **** | 3.78 | 4.32 | 4.23 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/199 | **** | 4.39 | 4.15 | 3.77 | **** |
| **Seminar** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 22 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/69 | **** | 5.00 | 4.56 | 4.62 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | 5.00 | 4.60 | 4.67 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/68 | **** | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.65 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/73 | **** | 4.80 | 4.54 | 4.72 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/67 | **** | 5.00 | 4.17 | 4.37 | **** |
| **Field Work** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 4.39 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.25 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/25 | **** | **** | 4.59 | 4.56 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.33 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/17 | **** | **** | 4.62 | 4.70 | **** |
| **Self Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 3.00 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.00 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.00 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 426 01 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | Enrollment: 40 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Princ Computer Security | | | | | Questionnaires: 24 |
| Instructor: | Phatak,Dhananja | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **Self Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 2.67 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/13 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 3.33 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 10 | Required for Majors | 9 | Graduate | 7 | Major | 12 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 4 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 17 | Non-major | 12 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 7 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 0 | Electives | 6 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 6 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 433 1 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: 40 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: Scripting Languages | | | | Questionnaires: 32 |
| Instructor: Hood,Daniel J | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 28 | 4.88 | 196/1542 | 4.88 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.42 | 4.88 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 22 | 4.56 | 541/1542 | 4.56 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.56 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 16 | 4.30 | 785/1339 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.44 | 4.30 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 22 | 4.68 | 345/1498 | 4.68 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.35 | 4.68 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 15 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 4.18 | 714/1428 | 4.18 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.22 | 4.18 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 14 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 4.50 | 405/1407 | 4.50 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.50 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 19 | 4.41 | 658/1521 | 4.41 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 4.41 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 4.97 | 276/1541 | 4.97 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.97 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 19 | 4.50 | 373/1518 | 4.50 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.18 | 4.50 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 27 | 4.84 | 319/1472 | 4.84 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 4.84 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 4.97 | 215/1475 | 4.97 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.97 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 25 | 4.73 | 373/1471 | 4.73 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.73 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 21 | 4.45 | 752/1470 | 4.45 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.45 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 17 | 4.48 | 344/1310 | 4.48 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.09 | 4.48 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 27 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3.80 | ****/1210 | **** | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.34 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | ****/1211 | **** | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.47 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 433 1 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | | | Enrollment: | 40 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Scripting Languages | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: | 32 |
| Instructor: | Hood,Daniel J | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | ****/1207 | **** | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.53 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 11 | Required for Majors | 9 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 31 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 13 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 6 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 32 | Non-major | 1 |
| 84-150 | 11 | 3.00-3.49 | 9 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 8 | F | 0 | Electives | 21 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 435 1 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | Enrollment: 34 | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Computer Graphics | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 26 | | | | | |
| Instructor: | Rheingans,Penny | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | **Frequencies** | | | | | **Instructor** | | **Course** | **Org** | **UMBC** | **Level** | **Sect** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 4.65 | 448/1542 | 4.65 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.42 | 4.65 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 16 | 4.50 | 615/1542 | 4.50 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.50 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 17 | 4.54 | 550/1339 | 4.54 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.44 | 4.54 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 18 | 4.71 | 310/1498 | 4.71 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.35 | 4.71 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 9 | 6 | 3.72 | 1119/1428 | 3.72 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.22 | 3.72 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 11 | 4.40 | 530/1407 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.40 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 19 | 4.73 | 250/1521 | 4.73 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 4.73 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 5.00 | 1/1541 | 5.00 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 12 | 4.48 | 409/1518 | 4.48 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.18 | 4.48 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 19 | 4.69 | 553/1472 | 4.69 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 4.69 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 4.96 | 215/1475 | 4.96 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.96 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 12 | 4.19 | 992/1471 | 4.19 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.19 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 15 | 4.46 | 740/1470 | 4.46 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.46 |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 435 1 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | Enrollment: | 34 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Computer Graphics | | | | | Questionnaires: | 26 |
| Instructor: | Rheingans,Penny | | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | | | | |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 19 | 4.65 | 209/1310 | 4.65 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.09 | 4.65 |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 5 | Required for Majors | 15 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 24 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 10 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 8 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 26 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 0 | Electives | 6 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 1 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 441 1 | Term - Spring 2012 | Enrollment: 37 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Algorithms | | Questionnaires: 32 |
| Instructor: | Lomonaco JR,Sam | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 22 | 4.55 | 584/1542 | 4.32 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.42 | 4.55 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 22 | 4.58 | 516/1542 | 4.12 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.58 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 27 | 4.84 | 224/1339 | 4.44 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.44 | 4.84 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 13 | 4.55 | 488/1498 | 4.36 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.35 | 4.55 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 4.40 | 494/1428 | 4.08 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.22 | 4.40 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 15 | 4.67 | 252/1407 | 4.28 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.67 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 24 | 4.68 | 317/1521 | 3.76 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 4.68 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 4.97 | 276/1541 | 4.93 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.97 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 14 | 4.36 | 561/1518 | 4.18 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.18 | 4.36 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 23 | 4.48 | 844/1472 | 4.19 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 4.48 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 28 | 4.81 | 808/1475 | 4.88 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.81 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 21 | 4.39 | 809/1471 | 4.04 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.39 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 23 | 4.68 | 483/1470 | 4.39 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.68 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 17 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 3.85 | 899/1310 | 3.85 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.09 | 3.85 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.00 | ****/1210 | **** | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.34 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | ****/1211 | **** | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.47 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 441 1 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: | 37 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Algorithms | | | | Questionnaires: | 32 |
| Instructor: | Lomonaco JR,Sam | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | ****/1207 | **** | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.53 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 21 | Required for Majors | 25 | Graduate | 1 | Major | 27 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 1 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 31 | Non-major | 5 |
| 84-150 | 9 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 1 | 3.50-4.00 | 9 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 4 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 441 2 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | | Enrollment: 24 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Algorithms | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 20 | | | | |
| Instructor: | Kalpakis,Konsta | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 6 | 4.10 | 1104/1542 | 4.32 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.42 | 4.10 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 3.65 | 1349/1542 | 4.12 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 3.65 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 4.05 | 962/1339 | 4.44 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.44 | 4.05 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 4.17 | 946/1498 | 4.36 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.35 | 4.17 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 3.76 | 1090/1428 | 4.08 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.22 | 3.76 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 3.90 | 973/1407 | 4.28 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 3.90 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 2.84 | 1464/1521 | 3.76 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 2.84 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 4.90 | 689/1541 | 4.93 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.90 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 4.00 | 920/1518 | 4.18 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.18 | 4.00 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 5 | 3.90 | 1296/1472 | 4.19 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 3.90 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 4.95 | 269/1475 | 4.88 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.95 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 4 | 3.70 | 1267/1471 | 4.04 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 3.70 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 4.10 | 1072/1470 | 4.39 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.10 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 14 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.25 | ****/1310 | 3.85 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.09 | **** |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 19 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/1210 | **** | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.34 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1211 | **** | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.47 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 441 2 | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: 24 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Algorithms | | | Questionnaires: 20 |
| Instructor: | Kalpakis,Konsta | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1207 | **** | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.53 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 1 | Required for Majors | 18 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 20 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 1 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 20 | Non-major | 0 |
| 84-150 | 10 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 7 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 443 1 | | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | Enrollment: | 35 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Title:** | **Cryptology** | | | | | | | | | **Questionnaires:** | **27** | | |
| **Instructor:** | **Lomonaco JR,Sam** | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 17 | 4.60 | 512/1542 | 4.60 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.42 | 4.60 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 19 | 4.65 | 429/1542 | 4.65 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.65 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 22 | 4.77 | 301/1339 | 4.77 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.44 | 4.77 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 16 | 4.75 | 252/1498 | 4.75 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.35 | 4.75 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 14 | 3.96 | 904/1428 | 3.96 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.22 | 3.96 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 4.59 | 325/1407 | 4.59 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.59 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 20 | 4.76 | 222/1521 | 4.76 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 4.76 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 23 | 4.88 | 721/1541 | 4.88 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.88 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 11 | 4.32 | 615/1518 | 4.32 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.18 | 4.32 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 4.50 | 817/1472 | 4.50 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 4.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 22 | 4.79 | 825/1475 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.79 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 17 | 4.42 | 770/1471 | 4.42 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.42 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 17 | 4.54 | 650/1470 | 4.54 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.54 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 3.94 | 832/1310 | 3.94 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.09 | 3.94 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | ****/1210 | **** | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.34 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/1211 | **** | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.47 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1207 | **** | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.53 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 443 1 | Term - Spring 2012 | Enrollment: | 35 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Cryptology | | Questionnaires: | 27 |
| Instructor: | Lomonaco JR,Sam | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Instructor Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 25 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/859 | **** | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.19 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 18 | Required for Majors | 9 | Graduate | 1 | Major | 23 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 0 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 26 | Non-major | 4 |
| 84-150 | 7 | 3.00-3.49 | 7 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 1 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 | Electives | 12 | | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |

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

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 445 01 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | Enrollment: 24 | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Software Engineering | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 16 | | | | | |
| Instructor: | Sidhu,Deepinder | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 2 | 3.80 | 1315/1542 | 3.80 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.42 | 3.80 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 4.13 | 1052/1542 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.13 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 4.36 | 739/1339 | 4.36 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.44 | 4.36 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 4.21 | 895/1498 | 4.21 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.35 | 4.21 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 4.38 | 510/1428 | 4.38 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.22 | 4.38 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 4.21 | 728/1407 | 4.21 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.21 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 4.00 | 1046/1521 | 4.00 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 4.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 1 | 4.07 | 1439/1541 | 4.07 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.07 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 3.75 | 1160/1518 | 3.75 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.18 | 3.75 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 4.29 | 1065/1472 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 4.29 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 4.57 | 1142/1475 | 4.57 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.57 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 4.43 | 755/1471 | 4.43 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.43 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 4.50 | 692/1470 | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.50 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3.91 | 863/1310 | 3.91 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.09 | 3.91 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4.00 | 774/1210 | 4.00 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.34 | 4.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.40 | 682/1211 | 4.40 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.47 | 4.40 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.40 | 722/1207 | 4.40 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.53 | 4.40 |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 445 01 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | Enrollment: 24 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Software Engineering | | | | | Questionnaires: 16 |
| Instructor: | Sidhu,Deepinder | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 11 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/859 | **** | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.19 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 11 | Required for Majors | 8 | Graduate | 4 | Major | 9 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 12 | Non-major | 7 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 4 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | Electives | 4 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 461 1 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | | | Enrollment: 40 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Database Mangmt Systems | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 26 | | | | |
| Instructor: | Kalpakis,Konsta | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 14 | 4.56 | 560/1542 | 4.56 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.42 | 4.56 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 12 | 4.48 | 642/1542 | 4.48 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.48 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 12 | 4.40 | 694/1339 | 4.40 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.44 | 4.40 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 15 | 4.63 | 404/1498 | 4.63 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.35 | 4.63 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 12 | 5 | 3.84 | 1030/1428 | 3.84 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.22 | 3.84 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 7 | 4.16 | 784/1407 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.16 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 11 | 4.28 | 806/1521 | 4.28 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 4.28 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 24 | 4.96 | 276/1541 | 4.96 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.96 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 9 | 4.36 | 548/1518 | 4.36 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.18 | 4.36 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 17 | 4.64 | 629/1472 | 4.64 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 4.64 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 24 | 4.92 | 430/1475 | 4.92 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.92 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 13 | 4.44 | 725/1471 | 4.44 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.44 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 14 | 4.48 | 716/1470 | 4.48 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.48 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 10 | 4.14 | 682/1310 | 4.14 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.09 | 4.14 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/1210 | **** | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.34 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | ****/1211 | **** | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.47 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | ****/1207 | **** | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.53 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 461 1 | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: 40 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Database Mangmt Systems | | | Questionnaires: 26 |
| Instructor: | Kalpakis,Konsta | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/859 | **** | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.19 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 7 | Required for Majors | 19 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 22 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 13 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 2 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 26 | Non-major | 4 |
| 84-150 | 13 | 3.00-3.49 | 6 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 10 | F | 0 | Electives | 6 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 479 1 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: 43 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Title: Introduction To Robotics** | | | | **Questionnaires: 31** |
| **Instructor: Oates,James T** | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Instructor Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 22 | 4.72 | 360/1542 | 4.72 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.42 | 4.72 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 21 | 4.72 | 338/1542 | 4.72 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.72 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 3 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 4.14 | 911/1339 | 4.14 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.44 | 4.14 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 19 | 4.70 | 310/1498 | 4.70 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.35 | 4.70 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 9 | 7 | 3.76 | 1090/1428 | 3.76 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.22 | 3.76 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 11 | 4.17 | 766/1407 | 4.17 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.17 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 18 | 4.43 | 630/1521 | 4.43 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 4.43 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 14 | 4.50 | 1124/1541 | 4.50 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.50 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 20 | 4.68 | 227/1518 | 4.68 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.18 | 4.68 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 23 | 4.79 | 384/1472 | 4.79 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 4.79 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 28 | 4.97 | 215/1475 | 4.97 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.97 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 24 | 4.79 | 293/1471 | 4.79 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.79 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 24 | 4.83 | 284/1470 | 4.83 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.83 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 14 | 4.50 | 324/1310 | 4.50 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.09 | 4.50 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 21 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3.90 | 854/1210 | 3.90 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.34 | 3.90 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.80 | 290/1211 | 4.80 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.47 | 4.80 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 234/1207 | 4.90 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.53 | 4.90 |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 479 1 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | Enrollment: 43 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Introduction To Robotics | | | | | | Questionnaires: 31 |
| Instructor: | Oates,James T | | | | | | |

| | | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Questions** | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 21 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.25 | 361/859 | 4.25 | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.19 | 4.25 |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 24 | Required for Majors | 4 | Graduate | 12 | Major | 13 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 4 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 19 | Non-major | 18 |
| 84-150 | 6 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 12 | 3.50-4.00 | 17 | F | 0 | Electives | 19 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 3 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 481 1 | Term - Spring 2012 | Enrollment: 39 |
|---|---|---|
| Title: Computer Networks | | Questionnaires: 30 |
| Instructor: Patwardhan,Anan | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 3.50 | 1432/1542 | 3.50 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.42 | 3.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 10 | 9 | 1 | 2.80 | 1517/1542 | 2.80 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 2.80 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 10 | 7 | 3.59 | 1190/1339 | 3.59 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.44 | 3.59 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 3.24 | 1425/1498 | 3.24 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.35 | 3.24 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 10 | 3.93 | 958/1428 | 3.93 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.22 | 3.93 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 3 | 3.38 | 1265/1407 | 3.38 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 3.38 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 3.21 | 1400/1521 | 3.21 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 3.21 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 28 | 4.97 | 276/1541 | 4.97 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.97 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 14 | 3 | 1 | 2.76 | 1470/1518 | 2.76 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.18 | 2.76 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 10 | 3.74 | 1346/1472 | 3.74 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 3.74 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 10 | 8 | 3.64 | 1440/1475 | 3.64 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 3.64 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 2.93 | 1427/1471 | 2.93 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 2.93 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 2.78 | 1432/1470 | 2.78 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 2.78 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 3.25 | 1168/1310 | 3.25 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.09 | 3.25 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.25 | ****/1210 | **** | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.34 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 26 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.25 | ****/1211 | **** | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.47 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 481 1 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | Enrollment: 39 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Computer Networks | | | | | Questionnaires: 30 |
| Instructor: | Patwardhan,Anan | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 26 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.25 | ****/1207 | **** | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.53 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 8 | Required for Majors | 15 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 21 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 11 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 7 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 30 | Non-major | 9 |
| 84-150 | 9 | 3.00-3.49 | 7 | D | 2 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 | Electives | 7 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 483 01 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | Enrollment: 20 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Parallel & Distr Process | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 11 | | | | |
| Instructor: | Zhou,Shujia | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | **Frequencies** | | | | | **Instructor** | | **Course** | **Org** | **UMBC** | **Level** | **Sect** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4.18 | 1034/1542 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.42 | 4.18 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 4.18 | 1009/1542 | 4.18 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.18 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1339 | **** | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.44 | **** |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 4.45 | 618/1498 | 4.45 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.35 | 4.45 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4.13 | 769/1428 | 4.13 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.22 | 4.13 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 4.33 | 599/1407 | 4.33 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.33 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 4.36 | 708/1521 | 4.36 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 4.36 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1541 | 5.00 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 3.50 | 1283/1518 | 3.50 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.18 | 3.50 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 3.80 | 1327/1472 | 3.80 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 3.80 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | 781/1475 | 4.82 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.82 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3.91 | 1178/1471 | 3.91 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 3.91 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 3.73 | 1247/1470 | 3.73 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 3.73 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3.78 | 938/1310 | 3.78 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.09 | 3.78 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3.86 | 875/1210 | 3.86 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.34 | 3.86 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4.29 | 777/1211 | 4.29 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.47 | 4.29 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.29 | 800/1207 | 4.29 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.53 | 4.29 |
| **Laboratory** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 9 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/207 | **** | 3.65 | 4.12 | 4.41 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 483 01 | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: 20 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Parallel & Distr Process | | | Questionnaires: 11 |
| Instructor: | Zhou,Shujia | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Instructor Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Laboratory** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/210 | **** | 3.90 | 4.17 | 4.02 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/202 | **** | 4.76 | 4.50 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 9 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/202 | **** | 3.78 | 4.32 | 4.23 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 9 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/199 | **** | 4.39 | 4.15 | 3.77 | **** |
| **Seminar** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/69 | **** | 5.00 | 4.56 | 4.62 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/69 | **** | 5.00 | 4.60 | 4.67 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 9 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/68 | **** | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.65 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/73 | **** | 4.80 | 4.54 | 4.72 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/67 | **** | 5.00 | 4.17 | 4.37 | **** |
| **Field Work** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 4.39 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.25 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 9 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/25 | **** | **** | 4.59 | 4.56 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.33 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/17 | **** | **** | 4.62 | 4.70 | **** |
| **Self Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.50 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 3.00 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.00 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.00 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 9 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 2.67 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 483 01 | **Term - Spring 2012** | | **Enrollment:** | 20 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Parallel & Distr Process | | | **Questionnaires:** | 11 |
| Instructor: | Zhou,Shujia | | | | |

| | | | **Frequencies** | | | | | **Instructor** | | **Course** | **Org** | **UMBC** | **Level** | **Sect** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Questions** | **NR** | **NA** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **Mean** | **Rank** | **Mean** | **Mean** | **Mean** | **Mean** | **Mean** |
| **Self Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/13 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 3.33 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 7 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 5 | Major | 8 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 2 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 6 | Non-major | 3 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 5 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 8 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 491 04 | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | | | | Enrollment: 15 | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Title: | Spec Topics In Comp Sci | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 11 | | | |
| Instructor: | Olano,Thomas M | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | | | | |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | 250/1542 | 4.50 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.42 | 4.82 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 4.36 | 799/1542 | 4.42 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.36 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/1339 | 4.74 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.44 | **** |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4.67 | 357/1498 | 4.63 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.35 | 4.67 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1428 | 4.39 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.22 | **** |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | 599/1407 | 4.46 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.33 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4.64 | 369/1521 | 4.44 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 4.64 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 689/1541 | 4.64 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.91 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | 146/1518 | 4.58 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.18 | 4.82 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 4.45 | 885/1472 | 4.68 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 4.45 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1475 | 4.96 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 4.10 | 1062/1471 | 4.53 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.10 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4.09 | 1075/1470 | 4.53 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.09 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 4.36 | 465/1310 | 3.92 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.09 | 4.36 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1210 | 4.26 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.34 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1211 | 4.42 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.47 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 491 04 | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: | 15 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Spec Topics In Comp Sci | | | Questionnaires: | 11 |
| Instructor: | Olano,Thomas M | | | | |

| | | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Questions** | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1207 | 4.69 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.53 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

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

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 491 05 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | | Enrollment: 11 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Spec Topics In Comp Sci | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 7 | | | | |
| Instructor: | Kargupta,Hillol | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | 548/1542 | 4.50 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.42 | 4.57 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | 528/1542 | 4.42 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.57 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 205/1339 | 4.74 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.44 | 4.86 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 174/1498 | 4.63 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.35 | 4.83 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.43 | 473/1428 | 4.39 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.22 | 4.43 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | 335/1407 | 4.46 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.57 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4.43 | 630/1521 | 4.44 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 4.43 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 4.29 | 1308/1541 | 4.64 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.29 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 373/1518 | 4.58 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.18 | 4.50 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 319/1472 | 4.68 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 4.83 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1475 | 4.96 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 463/1471 | 4.53 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 498/1470 | 4.53 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.67 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.60 | 247/1310 | 3.92 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.09 | 4.60 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | 578/1210 | 4.26 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.34 | 4.33 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 451/1211 | 4.42 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.47 | 4.67 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 499/1207 | 4.69 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.53 | 4.67 |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 491 05 | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: 11 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Spec Topics In Comp Sci | | | Questionnaires: 7 |
| Instructor: | Kargupta,Hillol | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/859 | 2.89 | 3.80 | 4.08 | 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 | 0 | Graduate | 3 | Major | 4 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 0 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 4 | Non-major | 3 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 3 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | Electives | 4 | | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 491 06 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | | Enrollment: 32 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Spec Topics In Comp Sci | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 28 | | | |
| Instructor: | Finin,Timothy W | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 18 | 4.44 | 720/1542 | 4.50 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.42 | 4.44 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 12 | 4.22 | 967/1542 | 4.42 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.22 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.58 | 497/1339 | 4.74 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.44 | 4.58 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 11 | 4.33 | 767/1498 | 4.63 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.35 | 4.33 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 14 | 4.36 | 527/1428 | 4.39 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.22 | 4.36 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 14 | 4.42 | 505/1407 | 4.46 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.42 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 3.92 | 1129/1521 | 4.44 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 3.92 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 5.00 | 1/1541 | 4.64 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 16 | 4.64 | 261/1518 | 4.58 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.18 | 4.64 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 21 | 4.74 | 469/1472 | 4.68 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 4.74 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 24 | 4.85 | 673/1475 | 4.96 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 4.85 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 19 | 4.67 | 463/1471 | 4.53 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 18 | 4.59 | 598/1470 | 4.53 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.59 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 14 | 4.28 | 546/1310 | 3.92 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.09 | 4.28 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 11 | 4.44 | 485/1210 | 4.26 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.34 | 4.44 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 11 | 4.44 | 641/1211 | 4.42 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.47 | 4.44 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 4.56 | 593/1207 | 4.69 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.53 | 4.56 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 13 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2.89 | 826/859 | 2.89 | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.19 | 2.89 |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 491 06 | Term - Spring 2012 | Enrollment: 32 |
|---|---|---|
| Title: Spec Topics In Comp Sci | | Questionnaires: 28 |
| Instructor: Finin,Timothy W | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Laboratory** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/210 | **** | 3.90 | 4.17 | 4.02 | **** |
| **Seminar** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | 5.00 | 4.60 | 4.67 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/68 | **** | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.65 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/73 | **** | 4.80 | 4.54 | 4.72 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 27 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/67 | **** | 5.00 | 4.17 | 4.37 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 3 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 20 | Required for Majors | 2 | Graduate | 11 | Major | 23 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 1 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 1 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 17 | Non-major | 5 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 11 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 16 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 3 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 5 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Course-Section:** CMSC 491 07 | | **Term - Spring 2012** | | | **Enrollment: 25** | |
| **Title:** Spec Topics In Comp Sci | | | | | **Questionnaires: 17** | |
| **Instructor:** Grasso,Michael | | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 4.15 | 1060/1542 | 4.50 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.42 | 4.15 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 4.54 | 578/1542 | 4.42 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.54 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 4.77 | 301/1339 | 4.74 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.44 | 4.77 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 4.69 | 321/1498 | 4.63 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.35 | 4.69 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 4.38 | 510/1428 | 4.39 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.22 | 4.38 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 4.50 | 405/1407 | 4.46 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.50 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 4.77 | 222/1521 | 4.44 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 4.77 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 4.38 | 1225/1541 | 4.64 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.38 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 4.36 | 548/1518 | 4.58 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.18 | 4.36 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 4.69 | 553/1472 | 4.68 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.50 | 4.69 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 5.00 | 1/1475 | 4.96 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.74 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 4.69 | 425/1471 | 4.53 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.69 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 4.77 | 361/1470 | 4.53 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.77 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2.43 | 1290/1310 | 3.92 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 4.09 | 2.43 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.00 | 774/1210 | 4.26 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.34 | 4.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.14 | 863/1211 | 4.42 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.47 | 4.14 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 289/1207 | 4.69 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.53 | 4.86 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 10 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/859 | 2.89 | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.19 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 491 07 | Term - Spring 2012 | Enrollment: 25 |
|---|---|---|
| Title: Spec Topics In Comp Sci | | Questionnaires: 17 |
| Instructor: Grasso,Michael | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Laboratory** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 16 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/210 | **** | 3.90 | 4.17 | 4.02 | **** |
| **Seminar** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | 5.00 | 4.60 | 4.67 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/68 | **** | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.65 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/67 | **** | 5.00 | 4.17 | 4.37 | **** |
| **Self Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 3.00 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.00 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.00 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 10 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 6 | Major | 8 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 2 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 1 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 11 | Non-major | 9 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 6 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 0 | Electives | 12 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 4 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 601 1 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | | | Enrollment: 13 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Research Skills For Cs | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 12 | | | |
| Instructor: | desJardins,Mari | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | **Frequencies** | | | | | **Instructor** | | **Course** | **Org** | **UMBC** | **Level** | **Sect** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 169/1542 | 4.90 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.39 | 4.90 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 4.70 | 366/1542 | 4.70 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.70 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1339 | **** | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.31 | **** |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.80 | 194/1498 | 4.80 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.80 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4.00 | 851/1428 | 4.00 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.13 | 4.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.80 | 141/1407 | 4.80 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.80 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 4.40 | 658/1521 | 4.40 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 4.40 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1541 | 5.00 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 110/1518 | 4.90 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.15 | 4.90 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.80 | 367/1472 | 4.80 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.48 | 4.80 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1475 | 5.00 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.76 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 163/1471 | 4.90 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.90 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 177/1470 | 4.90 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.34 | 4.90 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4.11 | 698/1310 | 4.11 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 4.11 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 373/1210 | 4.60 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.28 | 4.60 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1211 | 5.00 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.51 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 344/1207 | 4.80 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.53 | 4.80 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | 478/859 | 4.00 | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 4.00 |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 601 1 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | Enrollment: 13 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Research Skills For Cs | | | | | Questionnaires: 12 |
| Instructor: | desJardins,Mari | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Seminar** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/69 | **** | 5.00 | 4.56 | 4.62 | **** |
| **Self Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 4.36 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.45 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.35 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/13 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 4.23 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

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

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 641 1 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | | Enrollment: | 30 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Design & Analy Algorthms | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: | 27 |
| Instructor: | Kargupta,Hillol | | | | | | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 12 | 4.33 | 869/1542 | 4.33 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.39 | 4.33 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 10 | 4.05 | 1104/1542 | 4.05 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.05 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 12 | 4.43 | 671/1339 | 4.43 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.43 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 8 | 3.90 | 1160/1498 | 3.90 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 3.90 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 4.10 | 792/1428 | 4.10 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.13 | 4.10 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 6 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 4.22 | 717/1407 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.22 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 9 | 3.91 | 1139/1521 | 3.91 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 3.91 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 5 | 4.18 | 1373/1541 | 4.18 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 4.18 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 4.00 | 920/1518 | 4.00 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.15 | 4.00 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 4.00 | 1222/1472 | 4.00 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.48 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 14 | 4.50 | 1197/1475 | 4.50 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.76 | 4.50 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 6 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 3.67 | 1283/1471 | 3.67 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 3.67 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 4.05 | 1093/1470 | 4.05 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.34 | 4.05 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 3.58 | 1033/1310 | 3.58 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 3.58 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 9 | 4.26 | 628/1210 | 4.26 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.28 | 4.26 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 15 | 4.74 | 377/1211 | 4.74 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.51 | 4.74 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 13 | 4.61 | 546/1207 | 4.61 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.53 | 4.61 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3.11 | 811/859 | 3.11 | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 3.11 |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 641 1 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | | | Enrollment: 30 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Design & Analy Algorthms | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 27 | | | |
| Instructor: | Kargupta,Hillol | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Instructor Mean | Rank | Course Mean | Org Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Laboratory** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/207 | **** | 3.65 | 4.12 | 4.20 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/210 | **** | 3.90 | 4.17 | 4.12 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/202 | **** | 4.76 | 4.50 | 4.23 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/202 | **** | 3.78 | 4.32 | 4.24 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/199 | **** | 4.39 | 4.15 | 4.30 | **** |
| **Seminar** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/69 | **** | 5.00 | 4.56 | 4.62 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/69 | **** | 5.00 | 4.60 | 4.71 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/68 | **** | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.55 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/73 | **** | 4.80 | 4.54 | 4.54 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/67 | **** | 5.00 | 4.17 | 4.35 | **** |
| **Field Work** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 4.06 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.40 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/25 | **** | **** | 4.59 | 4.53 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.39 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/17 | **** | **** | 4.62 | 4.43 | **** |
| **Self Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 4.36 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.45 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.42 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 641 1 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | Enrollment: | 30 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Design & Analy Algorthms | | | | | Questionnaires: | 27 |
| Instructor: | Kargupta,Hillol | | | | | | |

| | | | | **Frequencies** | | | | | **Instructor** | | **Course** | **Org** | **UMBC** | **Level** | **Sect** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Questions** | **NR** | **NA** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **Mean** | **Rank** | **Mean** | **Mean** | **Mean** | **Mean** | **Mean** |
| **Self Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.35 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 5 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 8 | Required for Majors | 18 | Graduate | 8 | Major | 16 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 8 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 1 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 19 | Non-major | 11 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 8 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 9 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 661 01 | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: 26 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Prin Of Database Sys | | | Questionnaires: 19 |
| Instructor: | Yesha,Yelena | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 3.84 | 1295/1542 | 3.84 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.39 | 3.84 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 3.95 | 1173/1542 | 3.95 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 3.95 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 3.58 | 1193/1339 | 3.58 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 3.58 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 3.59 | 1315/1498 | 3.59 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 3.59 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 3.41 | 1259/1428 | 3.41 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.13 | 3.41 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3.59 | 1164/1407 | 3.59 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 3.59 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 4.41 | 644/1521 | 4.41 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 4.41 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 4.89 | 721/1541 | 4.89 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 4.89 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3.38 | 1344/1518 | 3.38 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.15 | 3.38 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 9 | 3.74 | 1350/1472 | 3.74 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.48 | 3.74 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 10 | 4.50 | 1197/1475 | 4.50 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.76 | 4.50 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 3.84 | 1205/1471 | 3.84 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 3.84 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 3.74 | 1243/1470 | 3.74 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.34 | 3.74 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 3.59 | 1028/1310 | 3.59 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 3.59 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3.40 | 1045/1210 | 3.40 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.28 | 3.40 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 3.80 | 1025/1211 | 3.80 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.51 | 3.80 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 4.13 | 876/1207 | 4.13 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.53 | 4.13 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4.14 | 427/859 | 4.14 | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 4.14 |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 661 01 | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: 26 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Prin Of Database Sys | | | Questionnaires: 19 |
| Instructor: | Yesha,Yelena | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **Laboratory** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/210 | **** | 3.90 | 4.17 | 4.12 | **** |
| **Seminar** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 16 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/69 | **** | 5.00 | 4.56 | 4.62 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/69 | **** | 5.00 | 4.60 | 4.71 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 16 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1.67 | ****/68 | **** | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.55 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 16 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/73 | **** | 4.80 | 4.54 | 4.54 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/67 | **** | 5.00 | 4.17 | 4.35 | **** |
| **Field Work** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.50 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 4.06 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 17 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.40 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/25 | **** | **** | 4.59 | 4.53 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.39 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 17 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/17 | **** | **** | 4.62 | 4.43 | **** |
| **Self Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 16 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2.33 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 4.36 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 16 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.67 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.45 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.35 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 661 01 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | Enrollment: 26 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Prin Of Database Sys | | | | | Questionnaires: 19 |
| Instructor: | Yesha,Yelena | | | | | |

| | | | | **Frequencies** | | | | | **Instructor** | | **Course** | **Org** | **UMBC** | **Level** | **Sect** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Questions** | **NR** | **NA** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **Mean** | **Rank** | **Mean** | **Mean** | **Mean** | **Mean** | **Mean** |
| **Self Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/13 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 4.23 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 3 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 13 | Required for Majors | 9 | Graduate | 10 | Major | 14 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 4 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 3 | Under-grad | 9 | Non-major | 5 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 10 | 3.50-4.00 | 7 | F | 0 | Electives | 4 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 682 01 | Term - Spring 2012 | Enrollment: 6 |
|---|---|---|
| Title: Networking Technol | | Questionnaires: 5 |
| Instructor: Sidhu,Deepinder | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 512/1542 | 4.60 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.39 | 4.60 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 492/1542 | 4.60 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.60 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 414/1339 | 4.67 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 252/1498 | 4.75 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.75 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1428 | 5.00 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.13 | 5.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1407 | 5.00 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 5.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 231/1521 | 4.75 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 4.75 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4.00 | 1455/1541 | 4.00 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 4.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | 588/1518 | 4.33 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.15 | 4.33 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 367/1472 | 4.80 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.48 | 4.80 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1475 | 5.00 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.76 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 637/1471 | 4.50 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 311/1470 | 4.80 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.34 | 4.80 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 425/1310 | 4.40 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 4.40 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 212/1210 | 4.80 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.28 | 4.80 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 290/1211 | 4.80 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.51 | 4.80 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 344/1207 | 4.80 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.53 | 4.80 |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Course-Section:** CMSC 682 01 | | | | **Term - Spring 2012** | | | | | | **Enrollment: 6** | |
| **Title:** Networking Technol | | | | | | | | | | **Questionnaires: 5** | |
| **Instructor:** Sidhu,Deepinder | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | **Frequencies** | | | | | **Instructor** | | **Course** Mean | **Org** Mean | **UMBC** Mean | **Level** Mean | **Sect** Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | | | | |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 120/859 | 4.75 | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 4.75 |

## Frequency Distribution

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

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: CMSC 684 01 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: 23 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Title: Wireless Sensor Networks | | | | Questionnaires: 19 |
| Instructor: Younis,Mohamed | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **General** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 13 | 4.61 | 499/1542 | 4.61 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.39 | 4.61 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 4.17 | 1026/1542 | 4.17 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.17 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 4.11 | 935/1339 | 4.11 | 4.26 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.11 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 4.39 | 710/1498 | 4.39 | 4.24 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.39 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 4.29 | 588/1428 | 4.29 | 3.75 | 4.12 | 4.13 | 4.29 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 9 | 4.06 | 851/1407 | 4.06 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.20 | 4.06 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 13 | 4.72 | 259/1521 | 4.72 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.24 | 4.72 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 5.00 | 1/1541 | 5.00 | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 4.20 | 744/1518 | 4.20 | 3.98 | 4.11 | 4.15 | 4.20 |
| **Lecture** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 4.89 | 240/1472 | 4.89 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.48 | 4.89 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 5.00 | 1/1475 | 5.00 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.76 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 4.65 | 488/1471 | 4.65 | 4.14 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.65 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 4.39 | 834/1470 | 4.39 | 4.19 | 4.33 | 4.34 | 4.39 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 9 | 4.28 | 556/1310 | 4.28 | 3.99 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 4.28 |
| **Discussion** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 3.63 | 981/1210 | 3.63 | 3.88 | 4.18 | 4.28 | 3.63 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 4.00 | 918/1211 | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.51 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 4.31 | 783/1207 | 4.31 | 4.22 | 4.41 | 4.53 | 4.31 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 4.43 | 261/859 | 4.43 | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 4.43 |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 684 01 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | | | | | | | Enrollment: 23 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Wireless Sensor Networks | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 19 | | | |
| Instructor: | Younis,Mohamed | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **Laboratory** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/210 | **** | 3.90 | 4.17 | 4.12 | **** |
| **Seminar** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/69 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.56 | 4.62 | 5.00 |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/69 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.60 | 4.71 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/68 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.55 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 31/73 | 4.80 | 4.80 | 4.54 | 4.54 | 4.80 |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/67 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.17 | 4.35 | 5.00 |
| **Field Work** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.20 | 4.06 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/35 | **** | **** | 4.36 | 4.40 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/25 | **** | **** | 4.59 | 4.53 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.39 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/17 | **** | **** | 4.62 | 4.43 | **** |
| **Self Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/30 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 4.36 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | ****/19 | **** | **** | 4.57 | 4.45 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.29 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/18 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.35 | **** |

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 684 01 | | Term - Spring 2012 | | Enrollment: | 23 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title: | Wireless Sensor Networks | | | | Questionnaires: | 19 |
| Instructor: | Younis,Mohamed | | | | | |

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| **Self Paced** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/13 | **** | **** | 4.14 | 4.23 | **** |

## Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 00-27 | 5 | 0.00-0.99 | 3 | A | 12 | Required for Majors | 3 | Graduate | 6 | Major | 6 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 13 | Non-major | 13 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 6 | 3.50-4.00 | 7 | F | 0 | Electives | 8 | **** - Means there are not enough responses | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | to be significant | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 3 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 4 | | | | | | |