Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 104 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 41
Title: Prob Sol & Computer Prog		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor: Radtka,Zachary		

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	5	13	4.55	603/1560	4.58	4.15	4.35	4.17	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	701/1559	4.27	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	395/1371	4.23	4.27	4.38	4.27	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	356/1519	4.36	4.13	4.27	4.13	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	868/1452	3.42	3.71	4.18	4.04	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	385/1430	4.41	4.07	4.16	3.98	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	392/1539	4.38	4.11	4.23	4.18	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	877/1560	4.80	4.68	4.64	4.57	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	406/1545	4.10	3.88	4.14	4.07	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	577/1496	4.71	4.34	4.49	4.43	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	886/1498	4.82	4.66	4.75	4.67	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	877/1496	4.35	4.08	4.37	4.31	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	788/1494	4.40	4.05	4.37	4.28	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	266/1352	4.45	4.00	4.12	3.98	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1138/1248	3.35	3.81	4.23	3.95	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/1250	3.50	4.13	4.39	4.13	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/1239	4.00	4.36	4.45	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/906	****	3.76	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 01
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Radtka,Zachary

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	21

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	13	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/206	5.00	4.85	4.25	4.15	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	112/214	4.38	4.50	4.31	4.30	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	104/204	4.57	4.38	4.52	4.54	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	33/207	4.86	4.93	4.44	4.50	4.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	4	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/199	****	4.89	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/24	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/26	****	****	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/25	****	****	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 01		Term - Spring 2013			Enrollment: 41
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog					Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Radtka,Zachary					

Questions	NR	NA	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	17	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	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	5				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 104 02	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 40
Title: Prob Sol & Computer Prog		Questionnaires: 26
Instructor: Tang,Jason		

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	5	7	14	4.35	875/1560	4.58	4.15	4.35	4.17	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	8	10	5	3.65	1400/1559	4.27	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	9	4	7	5	3.23	1335/1371	4.23	4.27	4.38	4.27	3.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	2	2	5	3	7	3.58	1383/1519	4.36	4.13	4.27	4.13	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	5	2	4	1	2	2.50	1439/1452	3.42	3.71	4.18	4.04	2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	2	2	5	7	3.88	1017/1430	4.41	4.07	4.16	3.98	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	5	5	7	9	3.77	1271/1539	4.38	4.11	4.23	4.18	3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	502/1560	4.80	4.68	4.64	4.57	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	1	10	7	1	3.42	1382/1545	4.10	3.88	4.14	4.07	3.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	11	14	4.50	871/1496	4.71	4.34	4.49	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	852/1498	4.82	4.66	4.75	4.67	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	4	7	6	9	3.77	1308/1496	4.35	4.08	4.37	4.31	3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	8	10	3.96	1181/1494	4.40	4.05	4.37	4.28	3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	0	1	9	10	4.29	599/1352	4.45	4.00	4.12	3.98	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1127/1248	3.35	3.81	4.23	3.95	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	3	1	1	3	3.50	1154/1250	3.50	4.13	4.39	4.13	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	971/1239	4.00	4.36	4.45	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	18	6	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/906	****	3.76	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 104 02														
Title: Prob Sol & Computer Prog														
Instructor: Tang,Jason														

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 40

Questionnaires: 26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/214	4.38	4.50	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/204	4.57	4.38	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	4.86	4.93	4.44	4.50	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 104 02	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 40
Title: Prob Sol & Computer Prog		Questionnaires: 26
Instructor: Tang,Jason		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	26	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	1	Electives	7	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	1			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 03	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 40
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog		Questionnaires: 28
Instructor:	Sadeghian,Pedra		

			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	2	25	4.86	218/1560	4.58	4.15	4.35	4.17	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	22	4.71	344/1559	4.27	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	24	4.75	328/1371	4.23	4.27	4.38	4.27	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	170/1519	4.36	4.13	4.27	4.13	4.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	6	0	4	4	13	3.67	1214/1452	3.42	3.71	4.18	4.04	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	143/1430	4.41	4.07	4.16	3.98	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	23	4.75	243/1539	4.38	4.11	4.23	4.18	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	646/1560	4.80	4.68	4.64	4.57	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	559/1545	4.10	3.88	4.14	4.07	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	205/1496	4.71	4.34	4.49	4.43	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	644/1498	4.82	4.66	4.75	4.67	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	144/1496	4.35	4.08	4.37	4.31	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	21	4.79	346/1494	4.40	4.05	4.37	4.28	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	1	3	2	14	4.45	413/1352	4.45	4.00	4.12	3.98	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1248	3.35	3.81	4.23	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1250	3.50	4.13	4.39	4.13	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1239	4.00	4.36	4.45	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	25	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/906	****	3.76	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 03			Term - Spring 2013								Enrollment:	40
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog											Questionnaires:	28
Instructor:	Sadeghian,Pedra												

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/206	5.00	4.85	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/214	4.38	4.50	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/204	4.57	4.38	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	4.86	4.93	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.89	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Report Help

Course-Section: CMSC 104 03	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 40
Title: Prob Sol & Computer Prog		Questionnaires: 28
Instructor: Sadeghian,Pedra		

Questions	NR	NA	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	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	28	Non-major	23
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	4						

Run Date: 7/9/2013 2:31:03 PM   Page 9 of 125

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 01		Term - Spring 2013						Enrollment: 101
Title:	Computer Science I								Questionnaires: 36
Instructor:	Sadeghian,Pedra								

| | | | 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	5	2	11	18	4.17	1082/1560	4.35	4.15	4.35	4.37	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	10	17	4.14	1058/1559	4.46	4.11	4.31	4.33	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	5	3	6	20	4.03	1055/1371	4.30	4.27	4.38	4.40	4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	2	1	4	10	12	4.00	1060/1519	4.33	4.13	4.27	4.29	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	24	5	3	0	3	1	2.33	1446/1452	3.19	3.71	4.18	4.22	2.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	24	0	2	1	1	8	4.25	700/1430	4.45	4.07	4.16	4.15	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	6	8	17	4.06	1047/1539	4.29	4.11	4.23	4.25	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	6	29	4.75	776/1560	4.78	4.68	4.64	4.61	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	3	17	9	4	3.35	1411/1545	3.95	3.88	4.14	4.09	3.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	3	16	14	4.14	1230/1496	4.49	4.34	4.49	4.52	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	2	7	9	16	3.97	1446/1498	4.54	4.66	4.75	4.78	3.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	3	4	10	17	4.03	1164/1496	4.44	4.08	4.37	4.36	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	8	10	12	3.67	1343/1494	4.30	4.05	4.37	4.41	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	3	10	6	11	3.74	1057/1352	4.27	4.00	4.12	4.14	3.74
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	1	1	3	9	4.20	716/1248	3.59	3.81	4.23	4.25	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	1	2	2	3	6	3.79	1080/1250	3.66	4.13	4.39	4.40	3.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	2	1	2	4	5	3.64	1132/1239	3.56	4.36	4.45	4.45	3.64
4. Were special techniques successful	23	8	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/906	4.04	3.76	4.13	4.19	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 201 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 101
Title: Computer Science I		Questionnaires: 36
Instructor: Sadeghian,Pedra		

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	34	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/206	****	4.85	4.25	4.58	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/214	****	4.50	4.31	4.60	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/204	****	4.38	4.52	4.64	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/207	****	4.93	4.44	4.67	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/199	****	4.89	4.27	4.51	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	4.75	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 01		Term - Spring 2013		Enrollment: 101
Title:	Computer Science I				Questionnaires: 36
Instructor:	Sadeghian,Pedra				

				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	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	4.75	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	30	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	36	Non-major	23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	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 201 09		Term - Spring 2013								Enrollment: 100

Title:	Computer Science I										Questionnaires: 57

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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	1	3	14	36	4.45	750/1560	4.35	4.15	4.35	4.37	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	8	44	4.63	453/1559	4.46	4.11	4.31	4.33	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	17	33	4.37	783/1371	4.30	4.27	4.38	4.40	4.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	1	0	0	11	34	4.67	343/1519	4.33	4.13	4.27	4.29	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	34	8	2	2	1	10	3.13	1389/1452	3.19	3.71	4.18	4.22	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	43	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	****/1430	4.45	4.07	4.16	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	6	11	35	4.30	809/1539	4.29	4.11	4.23	4.25	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	48	4.84	598/1560	4.78	4.68	4.64	4.61	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	2	1	19	23	4.40	546/1545	3.95	3.88	4.14	4.09	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	8	47	4.79	437/1496	4.49	4.34	4.49	4.52	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	5	50	4.84	763/1498	4.54	4.66	4.75	4.78	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	7	45	4.73	401/1496	4.44	4.08	4.37	4.36	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	8	44	4.63	570/1494	4.30	4.05	4.37	4.41	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	3	10	41	4.64	240/1352	4.27	4.00	4.12	4.14	4.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	9	11	29	4.23	693/1248	3.59	3.81	4.23	4.25	4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	5	12	11	21	3.81	1074/1250	3.66	4.13	4.39	4.40	3.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	4	7	11	10	19	3.65	1132/1239	3.56	4.36	4.45	4.45	3.65

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2013

| Enrollment: | 100 |
| Questionnaires: | 57 |

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	6	24	3	2	1	6	15	4.04	508/906	4.04	3.76	4.13	4.19	4.04

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	24	Required for Majors	48	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	24						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	57	Non-major	40
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	19	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 17	Term - Spring 2013		Enrollment:	50
Title:	Computer Science I			Questionnaires:	20
Instructor:	Sadeghian,Pedra				

			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	1	5	13	4.45	736/1560	4.35	4.15	4.35	4.37	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	495/1559	4.46	4.11	4.31	4.33	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	634/1371	4.30	4.27	4.38	4.40	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	804/1519	4.33	4.13	4.27	4.29	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	857/1452	3.19	3.71	4.18	4.22	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	285/1430	4.45	4.07	4.16	4.15	4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	540/1539	4.29	4.11	4.23	4.25	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	808/1560	4.78	4.68	4.64	4.61	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	12	4	4.11	876/1545	3.95	3.88	4.14	4.09	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	807/1496	4.49	4.34	4.49	4.52	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	852/1498	4.54	4.66	4.75	4.78	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	644/1496	4.44	4.08	4.37	4.36	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	596/1494	4.30	4.05	4.37	4.41	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	449/1352	4.27	4.00	4.12	4.14	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	2	1	0	1	2.33	1239/1248	3.59	3.81	4.23	4.25	2.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1175/1250	3.66	4.13	4.39	4.40	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1189/1239	3.56	4.36	4.45	4.45	3.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 201 17	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 50
Title: Computer Science I		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Sadeghian,Pedra		

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	15	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/906	4.04	3.76	4.13	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
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	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 01		Term - Spring 2013			Enrollment: 80
Title:	Computer Science II					Questionnaires: 46
Instructor:	Morawski,Maksym					

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	4	2	16	22	4.13	1109/1560	4.28	4.15	4.35	4.37	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	6	8	10	20	3.87	1294/1559	4.28	4.11	4.31	4.33	3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	6	9	8	22	4.02	1055/1371	4.35	4.27	4.38	4.40	4.02
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	1	2	7	10	13	3.97	1106/1519	4.27	4.13	4.27	4.29	3.97
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	37	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	****/1452	4.38	3.71	4.18	4.22	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	30	0	1	4	2	9	4.19	762/1430	4.32	4.07	4.16	4.15	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	7	14	21	4.11	1018/1539	4.29	4.11	4.23	4.25	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	13	30	2	3.72	1535/1560	4.17	4.68	4.64	4.61	3.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	3	4	8	11	5	3.35	1411/1545	4.02	3.88	4.14	4.09	3.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	6	5	13	15	6	3.22	1463/1496	4.05	4.34	4.49	4.52	3.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	5	8	31	4.53	1215/1498	4.70	4.66	4.75	4.78	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	5	5	12	14	9	3.38	1415/1496	4.15	4.08	4.37	4.36	3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	5	8	10	17	3.70	1331/1494	4.18	4.05	4.37	4.41	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	4	2	7	5	18	3.86	971/1352	4.24	4.00	4.12	4.14	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	6	2	5	10	11	3.53	1071/1248	4.01	3.81	4.23	4.25	3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	4	3	9	6	12	3.56	1143/1250	4.06	4.13	4.39	4.40	3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	6	3	7	3	13	3.44	1181/1239	4.02	4.36	4.45	4.45	3.44
4. Were special techniques successful	14	27	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	****/906	4.25	3.76	4.13	4.19	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	80
Questionnaires:	46

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	38	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	****/206	4.69	4.85	4.25	4.58	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	****/214	4.62	4.50	4.31	4.60	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	1	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	****/204	4.18	4.38	4.52	4.64	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	****/207	5.00	4.93	4.44	4.67	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	2	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/199	4.89	4.89	4.27	4.51	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	42	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	42	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/29	****	****	4.19	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/26	****	****	3.89	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/25	****	****	4.01	4.75	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/29	****	****	4.41	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 80
Title:	Computer Science II		Questionnaires: 46
Instructor:	Morawski,Maksym		

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	43	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	4.75	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	25	Required for Majors	38	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	15	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	46	Non-major	22
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	22	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 202 06	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 80
Title: Computer Science II		Questionnaires: 35
Instructor: Romano,Ross		

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	1	8	7	18	4.14	1100/1560	4.28	4.15	4.35	4.37	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	6	23	4.49	656/1559	4.28	4.11	4.31	4.33	4.49
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	9	22	4.49	656/1371	4.35	4.27	4.38	4.40	4.49
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	1	4	8	18	4.28	837/1519	4.27	4.13	4.27	4.29	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	23	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	876/1452	4.38	3.71	4.18	4.22	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	0	0	6	2	8	4.13	811/1430	4.32	4.07	4.16	4.15	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	10	20	4.40	677/1539	4.29	4.11	4.23	4.25	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	26	4.74	792/1560	4.17	4.68	4.64	4.61	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	0	0	1	20	4	4.12	866/1545	4.02	3.88	4.14	4.09	4.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	7	25	4.68	627/1496	4.05	4.34	4.49	4.52	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	8	25	4.66	1091/1498	4.70	4.66	4.75	4.78	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	7	25	4.65	532/1496	4.15	4.08	4.37	4.36	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	3	5	8	17	4.18	1047/1494	4.18	4.05	4.37	4.41	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	5	7	17	4.33	547/1352	4.24	4.00	4.12	4.14	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	2	2	9	15	4.21	716/1248	4.01	3.81	4.23	4.25	4.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	4	7	17	4.30	781/1250	4.06	4.13	4.39	4.40	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	5	6	18	4.33	812/1239	4.02	4.36	4.45	4.45	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	6	20	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	360/906	4.25	3.76	4.13	4.19	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 06		Term - Spring 2013							Enrollment: 80				
Title:	Computer Science II									Questionnaires: 35				
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
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	44/206	4.69	4.85	4.25	4.58	4.69
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	61/214	4.62	4.50	4.31	4.60	4.62
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	2	0	1	3	0	7	4.18	174/204	4.18	4.38	4.52	4.64	4.18
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/207	5.00	4.93	4.44	4.67	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	4	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	19/199	4.89	4.89	4.27	4.51	4.89
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	2	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/29	****	****	4.19	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/24	****	****	4.25	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/26	****	****	3.89	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/25	****	****	4.01	4.75	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/22	****	****	4.13	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 202 06	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 80
Title: Computer Science II		Questionnaires: 35
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
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/10	****	****	3.94	4.75	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	30	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	35	Non-major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 202 11	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 81
Title: Computer Science II		Questionnaires: 38
Instructor: Morawski,Maksym		

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	8	27	4.58	578/1560	4.28	4.15	4.35	4.37	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	14	22	4.47	671/1559	4.28	4.11	4.31	4.33	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	11	24	4.55	573/1371	4.35	4.27	4.38	4.40	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	13	19	4.55	503/1519	4.27	4.13	4.27	4.29	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	24	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	272/1452	4.38	3.71	4.18	4.22	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	275/1430	4.32	4.07	4.16	4.15	4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	4	10	21	4.35	737/1539	4.29	4.11	4.23	4.25	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	27	6	4.05	1426/1560	4.17	4.68	4.64	4.61	4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	9	21	4.59	323/1545	4.02	3.88	4.14	4.09	4.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	6	16	16	4.26	1136/1496	4.05	4.34	4.49	4.52	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	34	4.89	585/1498	4.70	4.66	4.75	4.78	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	17	19	4.42	805/1496	4.15	4.08	4.37	4.36	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	9	27	4.66	545/1494	4.18	4.05	4.37	4.41	4.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	2	9	22	4.53	335/1352	4.24	4.00	4.12	4.14	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	3	12	15	4.29	649/1248	4.01	3.81	4.23	4.25	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	4	9	17	4.32	765/1250	4.06	4.13	4.39	4.40	4.32
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	0	2	10	17	4.29	838/1239	4.02	4.36	4.45	4.45	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	7	19	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	449/906	4.25	3.76	4.13	4.19	4.17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 11
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Morawski,Maksym

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	81
Questionnaires:	38

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/206	4.69	4.85	4.25	4.58	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/214	4.62	4.50	4.31	4.60	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/204	4.18	4.38	4.52	4.64	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/207	5.00	4.93	4.44	4.67	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/199	4.89	4.89	4.27	4.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	33	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	38	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 40
Title:	Discrete Structures		Questionnaires: 12
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	1	0	2	1	3	5	0	3.00	1539/1560	3.64	4.15	4.35	4.37	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1464/1559	3.90	4.11	4.31	4.33	3.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1197/1371	4.26	4.27	4.38	4.40	3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	693/1519	4.31	4.13	4.27	4.29	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1331/1452	3.24	3.71	4.18	4.22	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1404/1430	3.66	4.07	4.16	4.15	2.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	934/1539	4.26	4.11	4.23	4.25	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	824/1560	4.91	4.68	4.64	4.61	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	2	2	5	1	0	2.50	1518/1545	3.35	3.88	4.14	4.09	2.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	3	1	2	4	3.45	1442/1496	4.15	4.34	4.49	4.52	3.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	3	0	2	4	3.27	1493/1498	4.18	4.66	4.75	4.78	3.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	1	3	2	0	2.30	1489/1496	3.54	4.08	4.37	4.36	2.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	1	3	3	0	2.60	1478/1494	3.70	4.05	4.37	4.41	2.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	3	2	2	3	0	2.50	1326/1352	3.49	4.00	4.12	4.14	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	1	0	1	0	2.00	1243/1248	3.10	3.81	4.23	4.25	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	1221/1250	3.80	4.13	4.39	4.40	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	1233/1239	3.58	4.36	4.45	4.45	2.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment:	40
Title:	Discrete Structures		Questionnaires:	12
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														
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/906	****	3.76	4.13	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 203 02	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 40
Title: Discrete Structures		Questionnaires: 31
Instructor: Winner,Kevin A		

			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	2	8	21	4.61	528/1560	3.64	4.15	4.35	4.37	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	21	4.58	521/1559	3.90	4.11	4.31	4.33	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	22	4.61	501/1371	4.26	4.27	4.38	4.40	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	408/1519	4.31	4.13	4.27	4.29	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	4	1	4	7	7	3.52	1282/1452	3.24	3.71	4.18	4.22	3.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	406/1430	3.66	4.07	4.16	4.15	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	8	22	4.68	335/1539	4.26	4.11	4.23	4.25	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	182/1560	4.91	4.68	4.64	4.61	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	4	8	15	4.29	700/1545	3.35	3.88	4.14	4.09	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	4	24	4.65	677/1496	4.15	4.34	4.49	4.52	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	28	4.87	644/1498	4.18	4.66	4.75	4.78	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	6	20	4.48	726/1496	3.54	4.08	4.37	4.36	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	22	4.65	557/1494	3.70	4.05	4.37	4.41	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	2	9	17	4.54	326/1352	3.49	4.00	4.12	4.14	4.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	716/1248	3.10	3.81	4.23	4.25	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	542/1250	3.80	4.13	4.39	4.40	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	563/1239	3.58	4.36	4.45	4.45	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	21	3	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	****/906	****	3.76	4.13	4.19	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 203 02	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 40
Title: Discrete Structures		Questionnaires: 31
Instructor: Winner,Kevin 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	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/214	****	4.50	4.31	4.60	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	30	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 03
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Novey,Michael P

Term - Spring 2013

| Enrollment: 40 |
| Questionnaires: 27 |

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	5	4	13	5	3.67	1424/1560	3.64	4.15	4.35	4.37	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	4	10	9	3.96	1200/1559	3.90	4.11	4.31	4.33	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	16	4.52	621/1371	4.26	4.27	4.38	4.40	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	934/1519	4.31	4.13	4.27	4.29	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	1	1	6	3	3	3.43	1322/1452	3.24	3.71	4.18	4.22	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	889/1430	3.66	4.07	4.16	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	8	16	4.48	567/1539	4.26	4.11	4.23	4.25	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1560	4.91	4.68	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	1	12	9	2	3.40	1392/1545	3.35	3.88	4.14	4.09	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	8	14	4.38	1028/1496	4.15	4.34	4.49	4.52	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	4	6	15	4.35	1349/1498	4.18	4.66	4.75	4.78	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	4	6	10	4	3.48	1384/1496	3.54	4.08	4.37	4.36	3.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	7	8	8	3.77	1301/1494	3.70	4.05	4.37	4.41	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	2	1	4	3	5	3.53	1146/1352	3.49	4.00	4.12	4.14	3.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1248	3.10	3.81	4.23	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1250	3.80	4.13	4.39	4.40	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1239	3.58	4.36	4.45	4.45	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 03		Term - Spring 2013		Enrollment:	40
Title:	Discrete Structures				Questionnaires:	27
Instructor:	Novey,Michael P					

| | | | | | 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	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/906	****	3.76	4.13	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 203 04	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 41
Title: Discrete Structures		Questionnaires: 25
Instructor: Yesha,Yaacov		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	6	10	5	4	3.28	1522/1560	3.64	4.15	4.35	4.37	3.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	9	7	6	3.60	1423/1559	3.90	4.11	4.31	4.33	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	8	11	4.08	1024/1371	4.26	4.27	4.38	4.40	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	2	9	8	4.05	1038/1519	4.31	4.13	4.27	4.29	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	7	3	7	2	3	2.59	1437/1452	3.24	3.71	4.18	4.22	2.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	3	1	6	7	3	3.30	1332/1430	3.66	4.07	4.16	4.15	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	7	3	6	9	3.68	1318/1539	4.26	4.11	4.23	4.25	3.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	182/1560	4.91	4.68	4.64	4.61	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	2	11	7	1	3.23	1451/1545	3.35	3.88	4.14	4.09	3.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	9	4	12	4.12	1236/1496	4.15	4.34	4.49	4.52	4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	5	9	11	4.24	1395/1498	4.18	4.66	4.75	4.78	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	8	5	10	3.88	1261/1496	3.54	4.08	4.37	4.36	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	5	7	9	3.80	1281/1494	3.70	4.05	4.37	4.41	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	4	0	8	3	7	3.41	1203/1352	3.49	4.00	4.12	4.14	3.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	3	1	1	0	2.33	****/1248	3.10	3.81	4.23	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	1	3	0	1	0	2.20	****/1250	3.80	4.13	4.39	4.40	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	****/1239	3.58	4.36	4.45	4.45	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	5	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/906	****	3.76	4.13	4.19	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	25

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	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/214	****	4.50	4.31	4.60	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	4.75	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.75	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 04		Term - Spring 2013		Enrollment:	41
Title:	Discrete Structures				Questionnaires:	25
Instructor:	Yesha,Yaacov					

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	4.75	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	22	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 304 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 54
Title:	Social/Ethical Iss In IT		Questionnaires: 34
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	1	0	3	1	7	9	13	3.85	1320/1560	4.21	4.15	4.35	4.42	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	2	8	10	10	3.67	1395/1559	4.12	4.11	4.31	4.35	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	28	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/1371	4.48	4.27	4.38	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	2	3	9	16	4.19	925/1519	4.38	4.13	4.27	4.33	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	6	0	5	5	10	3.50	1290/1452	4.04	3.71	4.18	4.21	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	4	9	18	4.38	587/1430	4.38	4.07	4.16	4.20	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	2	1	5	3	9	11	3.83	1233/1539	4.13	4.11	4.23	4.27	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	2	9	21	4.52	1042/1560	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.66	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	3	0	1	6	12	9	4.04	932/1545	4.23	3.88	4.14	4.19	4.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	9	7	13	4.00	1281/1496	4.21	4.34	4.49	4.54	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	2	27	4.81	852/1498	4.83	4.66	4.75	4.79	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	5	9	14	4.10	1128/1496	4.20	4.08	4.37	4.43	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	6	6	16	4.10	1110/1494	4.29	4.05	4.37	4.43	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	2	2	24	4.79	127/1352	4.39	4.00	4.12	4.23	4.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	1008/1248	4.26	3.81	4.23	4.33	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1074/1250	4.40	4.13	4.39	4.47	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	889/1239	4.54	4.36	4.45	4.53	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	24	5	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/906	4.73	3.76	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	54
Questionnaires:	34

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/206	****	4.85	4.25	4.22	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/214	****	4.50	4.31	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	3.58	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 304 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 54
Title: Social/Ethical Iss In IT		Questionnaires: 34
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
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	29	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	26
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	34	Non-major	8
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 304 02	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 26
Title: Social/Ethical Iss In IT		Questionnaires: 21
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	0	0	0	1	0	6	14	4.57	578/1560	4.21	4.15	4.35	4.42	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	534/1559	4.12	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	667/1371	4.48	4.27	4.38	4.41	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	14	4.57	469/1519	4.38	4.13	4.27	4.33	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	9	12	4.57	360/1452	4.04	3.71	4.18	4.21	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	6	13	4.38	578/1430	4.38	4.07	4.16	4.20	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	14	4.43	649/1539	4.13	4.11	4.23	4.27	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	227/1560	4.73	4.68	4.64	4.66	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	8	10	4.42	518/1545	4.23	3.88	4.14	4.19	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	981/1496	4.21	4.34	4.49	4.54	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	704/1498	4.83	4.66	4.75	4.79	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	6	11	4.30	946/1496	4.20	4.08	4.37	4.43	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	15	4.48	763/1494	4.29	4.05	4.37	4.43	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	5	4	8	4.00	823/1352	4.39	4.00	4.12	4.23	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	219/1248	4.26	3.81	4.23	4.33	4.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1250	4.40	4.13	4.39	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	292/1239	4.54	4.36	4.45	4.53	4.88

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 304 02	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 26
Title: Social/Ethical Iss In IT		Questionnaires: 21
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
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	133/906	4.73	3.76	4.13	4.14	4.73

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 313 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 41
Title:	Comp Organ & Assemb Lang		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Chang,Richard		

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	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	161/1560	4.76	4.15	4.35	4.42	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	178/1559	4.70	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	261/1371	4.64	4.27	4.38	4.41	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	188/1519	4.48	4.13	4.27	4.33	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	620/1452	3.73	3.71	4.18	4.21	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	108/1430	4.49	4.07	4.16	4.20	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	153/1539	4.72	4.11	4.23	4.27	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.68	4.64	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	350/1545	4.41	3.88	4.14	4.19	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	114/1496	4.84	4.34	4.49	4.54	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	556/1498	4.91	4.66	4.75	4.79	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	546/1496	4.38	4.08	4.37	4.43	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	702/1494	4.39	4.05	4.37	4.43	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	0	4	14	4.58	292/1352	4.29	4.00	4.12	4.23	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1248	****	3.81	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1250	****	4.13	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1239	****	4.36	4.45	4.53	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 313 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 41
Title:	Comp Organ & Assemb Lang		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Chang,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	18	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/906	****	3.76	4.13	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 313 02	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 45
Title:	Comp Organ & Assemb Lang		Questionnaires: 29
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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	6	20	4.61	542/1560	4.76	4.15	4.35	4.42	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	9	17	4.54	587/1559	4.70	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	6	18	4.46	679/1371	4.64	4.27	4.38	4.41	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	1	0	1	6	6	4.14	969/1519	4.48	4.13	4.27	4.33	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	14	5	0	2	4	4	3.13	1389/1452	3.73	3.71	4.18	4.21	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	3	9	7	4.10	828/1430	4.49	4.07	4.16	4.20	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	10	18	4.59	456/1539	4.72	4.11	4.23	4.27	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.68	4.64	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	3	12	9	4.25	733/1545	4.41	3.88	4.14	4.19	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	7	18	4.72	542/1496	4.84	4.34	4.49	4.54	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	445/1498	4.91	4.66	4.75	4.79	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	0	3	8	12	4.12	1105/1496	4.38	4.08	4.37	4.43	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	3	0	0	6	15	4.25	993/1494	4.39	4.05	4.37	4.43	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	1	1	4	4	9	4.00	823/1352	4.29	4.00	4.12	4.23	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	****/1248	****	3.81	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	****/1250	****	4.13	4.39	4.47	****

Run Date: 7/9/2013 2:31:05 PM

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 45
Questionnaires: 29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/1239	****	4.36	4.45	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	26	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	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				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 331 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 46
Title: Prin Of Prog Languages		Questionnaires: 28
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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	5	19	4.46	721/1560	4.54	4.15	4.35	4.42	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	3	8	12	3.93	1242/1559	4.18	4.11	4.31	4.35	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	5	8	11	3.86	1177/1371	4.20	4.27	4.38	4.41	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	7	7	10	3.81	1254/1519	3.96	4.13	4.27	4.33	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	0	9	4	7	3.64	1233/1452	3.77	3.71	4.18	4.21	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	1	4	5	8	3.95	959/1430	4.13	4.07	4.16	4.20	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	5	7	13	4.04	1059/1539	4.29	4.11	4.23	4.27	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	26	4.86	574/1560	4.85	4.68	4.64	4.66	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	4	2	8	8	3.91	1099/1545	4.15	3.88	4.14	4.19	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	5	4	16	4.44	953/1496	4.61	4.34	4.49	4.54	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	7	16	4.52	1223/1498	4.72	4.66	4.75	4.79	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	3	6	13	4.16	1070/1496	4.41	4.08	4.37	4.43	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	7	14	4.36	891/1494	4.49	4.05	4.37	4.43	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	0	1	6	16	4.50	353/1352	4.38	4.00	4.12	4.23	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1248	****	3.81	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1250	****	4.13	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1239	****	4.36	4.45	4.53	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	46
Questionnaires:	28

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	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/906	****	3.76	4.13	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 331 02	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 44
Title: Prin Of Prog Languages		Questionnaires: 28
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	1	0	8	19	4.61	542/1560	4.54	4.15	4.35	4.42	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	12	14	4.43	745/1559	4.18	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	11	16	4.54	597/1371	4.20	4.27	4.38	4.41	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	5	5	9	4.10	1005/1519	3.96	4.13	4.27	4.33	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	1	6	8	6	3.90	1056/1452	3.77	3.71	4.18	4.21	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	13	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	655/1430	4.13	4.07	4.16	4.20	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	7	17	4.54	508/1539	4.29	4.11	4.23	4.27	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	598/1560	4.85	4.68	4.64	4.66	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	14	11	4.38	572/1545	4.15	3.88	4.14	4.19	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	21	4.78	454/1496	4.61	4.34	4.49	4.54	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	445/1498	4.72	4.66	4.75	4.79	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	9	18	4.67	504/1496	4.41	4.08	4.37	4.43	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	8	18	4.63	583/1494	4.49	4.05	4.37	4.43	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	1	2	11	10	4.25	629/1352	4.38	4.00	4.12	4.23	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/1248	****	3.81	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1250	****	4.13	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/1239	****	4.36	4.45	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	23	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/906	****	3.76	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 331 02						Term - Spring 2013							Enrollment: 44
Title:	Prin Of Prog Languages													Questionnaires: 28
Instructor:	Park,John													

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/214	****	4.50	4.31	4.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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 341 01
Title:	Data Structures
Instructor:	Nicholas,Charle

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	20

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	1	2	8	8	4.05	1164/1560	4.01	4.15	4.35	4.42	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	8	5	3.90	1263/1559	4.10	4.11	4.31	4.35	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	9	9	4.30	838/1371	4.40	4.27	4.38	4.41	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	4	11	3	3.94	1130/1519	3.70	4.13	4.27	4.33	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	2	1	5	2	2	3.08	1395/1452	3.06	3.71	4.18	4.21	3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	395/1430	3.90	4.07	4.16	4.20	4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	7	3	7	3.89	1194/1539	3.37	4.11	4.23	4.27	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	727/1560	4.90	4.68	4.64	4.66	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	7	9	2	3.72	1231/1545	3.84	3.88	4.14	4.19	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	7	9	3	3.79	1380/1496	4.11	4.34	4.49	4.54	3.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	1223/1498	4.38	4.66	4.75	4.79	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	5	7	5	3.89	1261/1496	3.97	4.08	4.37	4.43	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	6	7	3.95	1198/1494	3.84	4.05	4.37	4.43	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	2	2	5	6	0	3.00	1277/1352	3.54	4.00	4.12	4.23	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	822/1248	4.00	3.81	4.23	4.33	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1029/1250	3.89	4.13	4.39	4.47	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	861/1239	4.25	4.36	4.45	4.53	4.25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 341 01 **Term - Spring 2013** **Enrollment:** 32

Title: Data Structures **Questionnaires:** 20

Instructor: Nicholas,Charle

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	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/906	****	3.76	4.13	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 341 02	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 39
Title: Data Structures		Questionnaires: 22
Instructor: Winner,Kevin A		

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	0	0	7	14	4.50	664/1560	4.01	4.15	4.35	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	384/1559	4.10	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	418/1371	4.40	4.27	4.38	4.41	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	549/1519	3.70	4.13	4.27	4.33	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	1	4	2	4	3.82	1114/1452	3.06	3.71	4.18	4.21	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	375/1430	3.90	4.07	4.16	4.20	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	7	11	4.14	986/1539	3.37	4.11	4.23	4.27	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	454/1560	4.90	4.68	4.64	4.66	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	255/1545	3.84	3.88	4.14	4.19	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	693/1496	4.11	4.34	4.49	4.54	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	822/1498	4.38	4.66	4.75	4.79	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	355/1496	3.97	4.08	4.37	4.43	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	391/1494	3.84	4.05	4.37	4.43	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	141/1352	3.54	4.00	4.12	4.23	4.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/1248	4.00	3.81	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1250	3.89	4.13	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1239	4.25	4.36	4.45	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/906	****	3.76	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 341 02		Term - Spring 2013		Enrollment: 39
Title:	Data Structures				Questionnaires: 22
Instructor:	Winner,Kevin A				

| 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	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/206	****	4.85	4.25	4.22	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/214	****	4.50	4.31	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/204	****	4.38	4.52	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.93	4.44	4.42	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.89	4.27	4.17	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	3.98	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	3.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.78	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Report Help

Course-Section: CMSC 341 02	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 39
Title: Data Structures		Questionnaires: 22
Instructor: Winner,Kevin A		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 341 03	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 22
Title:	Data Structures		Questionnaires: 7
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	2	0	2	0	3	3.29	1522/1560	4.01	4.15	4.35	4.42	3.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	1493/1559	4.10	4.11	4.31	4.35	3.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1066/1371	4.40	4.27	4.38	4.41	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	2	0	2.57	1510/1519	3.70	4.13	4.27	4.33	2.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	1433/1452	3.06	3.71	4.18	4.21	2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1373/1430	3.90	4.07	4.16	4.20	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	1	0	2.57	1512/1539	3.37	4.11	4.23	4.27	2.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1560	4.90	4.68	4.64	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	3	1	0	2.67	1514/1545	3.84	3.88	4.14	4.19	2.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	1445/1496	4.11	4.34	4.49	4.54	3.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	4	0	2	3.29	1493/1498	4.38	4.66	4.75	4.79	3.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	3	0	1	2.86	1471/1496	3.97	4.08	4.37	4.43	2.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	1	1	1	2.43	1485/1494	3.84	4.05	4.37	4.43	2.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	1	1	1	0	2.20	1339/1352	3.54	4.00	4.12	4.23	2.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1248	4.00	3.81	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1250	3.89	4.13	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1239	4.25	4.36	4.45	4.53	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 341 03	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 22
Title: Data Structures		Questionnaires: 7
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
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/906	****	3.76	4.13	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 341 04		Term - Spring 2013		Enrollment: 40
Title: Data Structures				Questionnaires: 25
Instructor: Winner,Kevin A				

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	2	2	10	11	4.20	1047/1560	4.01	4.15	4.35	4.42	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	14	4.52	600/1559	4.10	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	513/1371	4.40	4.27	4.38	4.41	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	7	6	5	3.79	1275/1519	3.70	4.13	4.27	4.33	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	16	2	2	3	1	1	2.67	1433/1452	3.06	3.71	4.18	4.21	2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1244/1430	3.90	4.07	4.16	4.20	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	4	6	5	4	2.88	1495/1539	3.37	4.11	4.23	4.27	2.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	363/1560	4.90	4.68	4.64	4.66	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	11	11	4.32	652/1545	3.84	3.88	4.14	4.19	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	744/1496	4.11	4.34	4.49	4.54	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	615/1498	4.38	4.66	4.75	4.79	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	10	12	4.36	877/1496	3.97	4.08	4.37	4.43	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	6	13	4.24	1001/1494	3.84	4.05	4.37	4.43	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	3	11	7	4.19	688/1352	3.54	4.00	4.12	4.23	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/1248	4.00	3.81	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/1250	3.89	4.13	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1239	4.25	4.36	4.45	4.53	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 341 04			Term - Spring 2013		Enrollment:	40
Title:	Data Structures					Questionnaires:	25
Instructor:	Winner,Kevin A						

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	21	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/906	****	3.76	4.13	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 345 01		Term - Spring 2013			Enrollment: 30
Title:	Software Design/Develop					Questionnaires: 27
Instructor:	Gartner,Douglas					

| 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	17	4.44	750/1560	4.44	4.15	4.35	4.42	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	18	4.56	561/1559	4.45	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	5	17	4.58	537/1371	4.63	4.27	4.38	4.41	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	18	4.56	492/1519	4.57	4.13	4.27	4.33	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	202/1452	4.15	3.71	4.18	4.21	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	3	4	15	4.43	519/1430	4.44	4.07	4.16	4.20	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	364/1539	4.57	4.11	4.23	4.27	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	363/1560	4.92	4.68	4.64	4.66	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	14	7	4.27	711/1545	4.10	3.88	4.14	4.19	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	349/1496	4.72	4.34	4.49	4.54	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	920/1498	4.75	4.66	4.75	4.79	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	4	18	4.60	588/1496	4.69	4.08	4.37	4.43	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	5	17	4.48	750/1494	4.44	4.05	4.37	4.43	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	5	5	12	4.32	568/1352	4.43	4.00	4.12	4.23	4.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1248	3.88	3.81	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1250	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1239	4.75	4.36	4.45	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	23	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/906	4.50	3.76	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 345 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 30
Title: Software Design/Develop		Questionnaires: 27
Instructor: Gartner,Douglas		

			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	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/214	****	4.50	4.31	4.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	16	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	9
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 345 02
Title:	Software Design/Develop
Instructor:	Wilson,Michael

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 24

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	1	1	12	10	4.29	932/1560	4.44	4.15	4.35	4.42	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	13	10	4.38	810/1559	4.45	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	418/1371	4.63	4.27	4.38	4.41	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	10	13	4.46	621/1519	4.57	4.13	4.27	4.33	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	19	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1452	4.15	3.71	4.18	4.21	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	466/1430	4.44	4.07	4.16	4.20	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	7	17	4.71	293/1539	4.57	4.11	4.23	4.27	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	646/1560	4.92	4.68	4.64	4.66	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	12	7	4.37	599/1545	4.10	3.88	4.14	4.19	4.37
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	593/1496	4.72	4.34	4.49	4.54	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	278/1498	4.75	4.66	4.75	4.79	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	267/1496	4.69	4.08	4.37	4.43	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	655/1494	4.44	4.05	4.37	4.43	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	526/1352	4.43	4.00	4.12	4.23	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	5	2	3.88	926/1248	3.88	3.81	4.23	4.33	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	725/1250	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.47	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	458/1239	4.75	4.36	4.45	4.53	4.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 345 02	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 30
Title: Software Design/Develop		Questionnaires: 24
Instructor: Wilson,Michael		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	239/906	4.50	3.76	4.13	4.14	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	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 345 03
Title:	Software Design/Develop
Instructor:	Joshi,Karuna P

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	13

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	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	566/1560	4.44	4.15	4.35	4.42	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	760/1559	4.45	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1371	4.63	4.27	4.38	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	304/1519	4.57	4.13	4.27	4.33	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	5	2	3	3.55	1274/1452	4.15	3.71	4.18	4.21	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	545/1430	4.44	4.07	4.16	4.20	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	761/1539	4.57	4.11	4.23	4.27	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1560	4.92	4.68	4.64	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1264/1545	4.10	3.88	4.14	4.19	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	693/1496	4.72	4.34	4.49	4.54	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1207/1498	4.75	4.66	4.75	4.79	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	546/1496	4.69	4.08	4.37	4.43	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	0	8	4.27	977/1494	4.44	4.05	4.37	4.43	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	249/1352	4.43	4.00	4.12	4.23	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1248	3.88	3.81	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1250	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1239	4.75	4.36	4.45	4.53	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 345 03
Title: Software Design/Develop
Instructor: Joshi,Karuna P

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 13

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	10	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/906	4.50	3.76	4.13	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 46
Questionnaires: 23

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	3	4	13	2	3.52	1467/1560	3.74	4.15	4.35	4.45	3.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	4	14	4.30	892/1559	4.33	4.11	4.31	4.34	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	4	13	4.32	828/1371	4.48	4.27	4.38	4.46	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	779/1519	4.45	4.13	4.27	4.33	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	1	1	4	1	3	3.40	1331/1452	3.78	3.71	4.18	4.25	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1061/1430	4.11	4.07	4.16	4.25	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	1	19	4.70	307/1539	4.58	4.11	4.23	4.21	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	227/1560	4.91	4.68	4.64	4.68	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	6	11	2	3.70	1244/1545	3.88	3.88	4.14	4.21	3.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	1	5	15	4.39	1018/1496	4.46	4.34	4.49	4.50	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	1	21	4.83	792/1498	4.77	4.66	4.75	4.77	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	7	6	10	4.13	1096/1496	4.11	4.08	4.37	4.40	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	4	4	11	3.83	1271/1494	3.87	4.05	4.37	4.41	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	2	5	10	3	3.70	1084/1352	3.82	4.00	4.12	4.16	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/1248	****	3.81	4.23	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/1250	****	4.13	4.39	4.55	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 411 01		Term - Spring 2013								Enrollment:	46
Title:	Computer Architecture										Questionnaires:	23
Instructor:	Squire,Jon S											

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1239	****	4.36	4.45	4.61	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	9
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	9	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				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 411 02						Term - Spring 2013				Enrollment: 45
Title:	Computer Architecture										Questionnaires: 22
Instructor:	Squire,Jon S										

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	6	9	3.95	1235/1560	3.74	4.15	4.35	4.45	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	11	4.36	821/1559	4.33	4.11	4.31	4.34	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	477/1371	4.48	4.27	4.38	4.46	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	480/1519	4.45	4.13	4.27	4.33	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	3	1	8	4.15	814/1452	3.78	3.71	4.18	4.25	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	2	1	10	4.43	532/1430	4.11	4.07	4.16	4.25	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	14	4.45	608/1539	4.58	4.11	4.23	4.21	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	21	4.86	550/1560	4.91	4.68	4.64	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	912/1545	3.88	3.88	4.14	4.21	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	845/1496	4.46	4.34	4.49	4.50	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	1005/1498	4.77	4.66	4.75	4.77	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	2	8	9	4.10	1128/1496	4.11	4.08	4.37	4.40	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	5	3	10	3.90	1232/1494	3.87	4.05	4.37	4.41	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	2	2	3	8	3.94	904/1352	3.82	4.00	4.12	4.16	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1248	****	3.81	4.23	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1250	****	4.13	4.39	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1239	****	4.36	4.45	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 411 02						Term - Spring 2013									Enrollment:	45
Title:	Computer Architecture															Questionnaires:	22
Instructor:	Squire,Jon S																

| | | | | 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	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/906	****	3.76	4.13	4.28	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	7
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	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 421 01		Term - Spring 2013		Enrollment: 45
Title:	Princ Of Oper Systems				Questionnaires: 24
Instructor:	Park,John				

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	1	6	12	5	3.88	1299/1560	4.09	4.15	4.35	4.45	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	9	8	5	3.67	1395/1559	3.89	4.11	4.31	4.34	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	9	9	4.04	1045/1371	4.20	4.27	4.38	4.46	4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	4	8	4	3	3.10	1489/1519	3.58	4.13	4.27	4.33	3.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	1	0	6	1	6	3.79	1134/1452	3.56	3.71	4.18	4.25	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	3	3	6	3	4	3.11	1366/1430	3.43	4.07	4.16	4.25	3.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	6	6	7	2	1	2.36	1527/1539	3.55	4.11	4.23	4.21	2.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1560	4.97	4.68	4.64	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	2	2	13	2	3.52	1332/1545	3.83	3.88	4.14	4.21	3.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	10	9	4.27	1128/1496	4.29	4.34	4.49	4.50	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	556/1498	4.91	4.66	4.75	4.77	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	8	10	4.23	1017/1496	4.18	4.08	4.37	4.40	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	10	8	4.09	1110/1494	4.14	4.05	4.37	4.41	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	629/1352	4.03	4.00	4.12	4.16	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1248	3.44	3.81	4.23	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1250	3.56	4.13	4.39	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1239	3.78	4.36	4.45	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 421 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 45
Title: Princ Of Oper Systems		Questionnaires: 24
Instructor: Park,John		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/906	****	3.76	4.13	4.28	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	6
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 421 02
Title:	Princ Of Oper Systems
Instructor:	Sebald,Lawrence

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	33

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	2	0	1	0	3	10	17	4.35	864/1560	4.09	4.15	4.35	4.45	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	8	8	13	4.10	1087/1559	3.89	4.11	4.31	4.34	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	1	8	20	4.48	656/1371	4.20	4.27	4.38	4.46	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	2	3	9	13	4.22	897/1519	3.58	4.13	4.27	4.33	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	4	5	10	12	3.97	991/1452	3.56	3.71	4.18	4.25	3.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	10	2	1	7	5	6	3.57	1206/1430	3.43	4.07	4.16	4.25	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	4	7	20	4.52	529/1539	3.55	4.11	4.23	4.21	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	182/1560	4.97	4.68	4.64	4.68	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	6	16	4	3.85	1140/1545	3.83	3.88	4.14	4.21	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	2	3	9	14	4.14	1230/1496	4.29	4.34	4.49	4.50	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	585/1498	4.91	4.66	4.75	4.77	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	6	12	10	4.07	1143/1496	4.18	4.08	4.37	4.40	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	2	1	0	2	8	16	4.41	850/1494	4.14	4.05	4.37	4.41	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	3	1	3	8	12	3.93	916/1352	4.03	4.00	4.12	4.16	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1103/1248	3.44	3.81	4.23	4.39	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	1	2	0	3	3	3.56	1143/1250	3.56	4.13	4.39	4.55	3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	1098/1239	3.78	4.36	4.45	4.61	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	24	7	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/906	****	3.76	4.13	4.28	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 421 02		Term - Spring 2013			Enrollment: 42
Title:	Princ Of Oper Systems					Questionnaires: 33
Instructor:	Sebald,Lawrence					

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/206	****	4.85	4.25	4.48	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/214	****	4.50	4.31	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/204	****	4.38	4.52	4.39	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/207	****	4.93	4.44	4.49	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/199	****	4.89	4.27	4.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.64	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	26	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	6	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	33	Non-major	9
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 421 03	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 44
Title: Princ Of Oper Systems		Questionnaires: 29
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	1	2	5	8	13	4.03	1175/1560	4.09	4.15	4.35	4.45	4.03
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	3	6	14	3.90	1270/1559	3.89	4.11	4.31	4.34	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	5	5	15	4.07	1034/1371	4.20	4.27	4.38	4.46	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	3	5	2	5	8	3.43	1434/1519	3.58	4.13	4.27	4.33	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	16	2	3	3	2	2	2.92	1416/1452	3.56	3.71	4.18	4.25	2.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	18	1	3	0	1	5	3.60	1190/1430	3.43	4.07	4.16	4.25	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	5	6	12	3.76	1278/1539	3.55	4.11	4.23	4.21	3.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	363/1560	4.97	4.68	4.64	4.68	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	1	2	7	13	4.12	866/1545	3.83	3.88	4.14	4.21	4.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	6	19	4.46	926/1496	4.29	4.34	4.49	4.50	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	27	4.93	445/1498	4.91	4.66	4.75	4.77	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	3	6	16	4.25	990/1496	4.18	4.08	4.37	4.40	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	2	3	5	14	3.93	1215/1494	4.14	4.05	4.37	4.41	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	0	6	8	10	3.92	916/1352	4.03	4.00	4.12	4.16	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1248	3.44	3.81	4.23	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1250	3.56	4.13	4.39	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1239	3.78	4.36	4.45	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 421 03	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 44
Title: Princ Of Oper Systems		Questionnaires: 29
Instructor: Park,John		

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	27	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/906	****	3.76	4.13	4.28	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	5
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	1	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 433 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 70
Title:	Scripting Languages		Questionnaires: 58
Instructor:	Hood,Daniel J		

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	1	0	1	1	1	7	47	4.72	389/1560	4.72	4.15	4.35	4.45	4.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	15	40	4.70	370/1559	4.70	4.11	4.31	4.34	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	3	11	40	4.69	418/1371	4.69	4.27	4.38	4.46	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	2	8	34	4.73	284/1519	4.73	4.13	4.27	4.33	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	30	0	0	3	3	21	4.67	272/1452	4.67	3.71	4.18	4.25	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	22	0	0	0	5	29	4.85	118/1430	4.85	4.07	4.16	4.25	4.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	11	41	4.63	392/1539	4.63	4.11	4.23	4.21	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	0	35	20	4.36	1203/1560	4.36	4.68	4.64	4.68	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	3	17	29	4.53	378/1545	4.53	3.88	4.14	4.21	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	4	49	4.89	262/1496	4.89	4.34	4.49	4.50	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	5	49	4.91	556/1498	4.91	4.66	4.75	4.77	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	9	45	4.83	253/1496	4.83	4.08	4.37	4.40	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	1	6	5	41	4.62	583/1494	4.62	4.05	4.37	4.41	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	0	3	9	39	4.71	182/1352	4.71	4.00	4.12	4.16	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	52	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	****/1248	****	3.81	4.23	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	52	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/1250	****	4.13	4.39	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	52	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/1239	****	4.36	4.45	4.61	****
4. Were special techniques successful	52	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/906	****	3.76	4.13	4.28	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 433 01		Term - Spring 2013					Enrollment: 70
Title:	Scripting Languages							Questionnaires: 58
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
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/206	****	4.85	4.25	4.48	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/214	****	4.50	4.31	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/204	****	4.38	4.52	4.39	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.93	4.44	4.49	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.89	4.27	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.65	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.40	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.57	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.18	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	4.50	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.35	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	4.40	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	4.34	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.64	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	3.97	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.52	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 433 01		Term - Spring 2013		Enrollment: 70
Title: Scripting Languages				Questionnaires: 58
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
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	28	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	46
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	3	Under-grad	58	Non-major	12
84-150	30	3.00-3.49	15	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	24	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	1			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 435 01
Title:	Computer Graphics
Instructor:	Barczak,Joshua

Term - Spring 2013

| Enrollment: 39 |
| Questionnaires: 22 |

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	0	4	5	12	4.23	1021/1560	4.23	4.15	4.35	4.45	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	12	4.32	880/1559	4.32	4.11	4.31	4.34	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	5	12	4.32	828/1371	4.32	4.27	4.38	4.46	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	693/1519	4.40	4.13	4.27	4.33	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	948/1452	4.00	3.71	4.18	4.25	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	343/1430	4.58	4.07	4.16	4.25	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	540/1539	4.50	4.11	4.23	4.21	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	454/1560	4.90	4.68	4.64	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	4	9	4	3.89	1115/1545	3.89	3.88	4.14	4.21	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	5	4	10	4.26	1136/1496	4.26	4.34	4.49	4.50	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	733/1498	4.84	4.66	4.75	4.77	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	5	5	8	4.00	1175/1496	4.00	4.08	4.37	4.40	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	7	2	8	3.84	1261/1494	3.84	4.05	4.37	4.41	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	589/1352	4.29	4.00	4.12	4.16	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1248	****	3.81	4.23	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1250	****	4.13	4.39	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1239	****	4.36	4.45	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 435 01
Title:	Computer Graphics
Instructor:	Barczak,Joshua

Term - Spring 2013

| Enrollment: | 39 |
| Questionnaires: | 22 |

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	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/906	****	3.76	4.13	4.28	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	2
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 441 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 48
Title: Algorithms		Questionnaires: 38
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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	5	14	16	4.16	1082/1560	4.16	4.15	4.35	4.45	4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	5	15	14	4.08	1101/1559	4.08	4.11	4.31	4.34	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	4	13	17	4.22	917/1371	4.22	4.27	4.38	4.46	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	1	0	5	9	10	4.08	1016/1519	4.08	4.13	4.27	4.33	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	16	0	3	2	8	8	4.00	948/1452	4.00	3.71	4.18	4.25	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	1	0	5	9	9	4.04	864/1430	4.04	4.07	4.16	4.25	4.04
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	12	19	4.36	725/1539	4.36	4.11	4.23	4.21	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	33	4.89	478/1560	4.89	4.68	4.64	4.68	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	3	10	14	4	3.61	1289/1545	3.61	3.88	4.14	4.21	3.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	7	12	18	4.30	1112/1496	4.30	4.34	4.49	4.50	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	34	4.86	674/1498	4.86	4.66	4.75	4.77	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	12	8	14	3.86	1269/1496	3.86	4.08	4.37	4.40	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	7	9	15	3.94	1198/1494	3.94	4.05	4.37	4.41	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	0	1	6	8	13	4.18	707/1352	4.18	4.00	4.12	4.16	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1248	****	3.81	4.23	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	36	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1250	****	4.13	4.39	4.55	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 441 01	Term - Spring 2013		Enrollment:	48
Title:	Algorithms			Questionnaires:	38
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
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	36	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1239	****	4.36	4.45	4.61	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	31	Graduate	0	Major	31
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	38	Non-major	7
84-150	20	3.00-3.49	8	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 443 01		Term - Spring 2013		Enrollment:	30
Title:	Cryptology				Questionnaires:	17
Instructor:	Sherman,Alan T					

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	1	3	10	4.31	908/1560	4.31	4.15	4.35	4.45	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	9	4	3.94	1231/1559	3.94	4.11	4.31	4.34	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	4	8	4.13	998/1371	4.13	4.27	4.38	4.46	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	1254/1519	3.82	4.13	4.27	4.33	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	5	3	6	3.81	1114/1452	3.81	3.71	4.18	4.25	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	727/1430	4.22	4.07	4.16	4.25	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	855/1539	4.25	4.11	4.23	4.21	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.68	4.64	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	8	3	3.93	1069/1545	3.93	3.88	4.14	4.21	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	871/1496	4.50	4.34	4.49	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.66	4.75	4.77	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	6	5	4.00	1175/1496	4.00	4.08	4.37	4.40	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	922/1494	4.33	4.05	4.37	4.41	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 443 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment:	30
Title:	Cryptology		Questionnaires:	17
Instructor:	Sherman,Alan T			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Lecture														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	547/1352	4.33	4.00	4.12	4.16	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	17	Non-major	2
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	9	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 445 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 37
Title:	Software Engineering		Questionnaires: 28
Instructor:	Sidhu,Deepinder		

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	1	0	6	3	12	5	1	2.70	1551/1560	2.70	4.15	4.35	4.45	2.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	5	9	7	3	3.07	1521/1559	3.07	4.11	4.31	4.34	3.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	6	10	7	3.70	1239/1371	3.70	4.27	4.38	4.46	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	5	9	8	3	3.27	1469/1519	3.27	4.13	4.27	4.33	3.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	3	5	6	5	1	2.80	1425/1452	2.80	3.71	4.18	4.25	2.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	3	8	6	4	3.41	1293/1430	3.41	4.07	4.16	4.25	3.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	8	6	7	4	3.11	1463/1539	3.11	4.11	4.23	4.21	3.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	2	22	2	4.00	1445/1560	4.00	4.68	4.64	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	3	6	11	5	0	2.72	1511/1545	2.72	3.88	4.14	4.21	2.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	7	12	6	3.81	1371/1496	3.81	4.34	4.49	4.50	3.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	8	9	8	3.85	1468/1498	3.85	4.66	4.75	4.77	3.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	5	8	9	4	3.37	1415/1496	3.37	4.08	4.37	4.40	3.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	11	7	4	3.30	1422/1494	3.30	4.05	4.37	4.41	3.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	2	4	5	5	6	3.41	1203/1352	3.41	4.00	4.12	4.16	3.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1248	****	3.81	4.23	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1250	****	4.13	4.39	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1239	****	4.36	4.45	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 445 01　　**Term - Spring 2013**　　**Enrollment:** 37

Title: Software Engineering　　**Questionnaires:** 28

Instructor: Sidhu,Deepinder

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 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	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/906	****	3.76	4.13	4.28	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	28	Non-major	5
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	14	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 461 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 39
Title: Database Mangmt Systems		Questionnaires: 22
Instructor: Yesha,Yaacov		

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	3	3	10	4	1	2.86	1545/1560	2.86	4.15	4.35	4.45	2.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	7	5	7	2	3.19	1510/1559	3.19	4.11	4.31	4.34	3.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	6	7	3	4	3.14	1343/1371	3.14	4.27	4.38	4.46	3.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	3	6	3	4	3.50	1411/1519	3.50	4.13	4.27	4.33	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	5	1	3	7	1	2.88	1420/1452	2.88	3.71	4.18	4.25	2.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	4	2	2	2	3	2.85	1401/1430	2.85	4.07	4.16	4.25	2.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	4	2	11	3.90	1181/1539	3.90	4.11	4.23	4.21	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	227/1560	4.95	4.68	4.64	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	3	11	2	0	2.72	1511/1545	2.72	3.88	4.14	4.21	2.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	2	4	6	7	3.67	1408/1496	3.67	4.34	4.49	4.50	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	2	3	5	9	3.81	1474/1498	3.81	4.66	4.75	4.77	3.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	1	8	3	6	3.38	1414/1496	3.38	4.08	4.37	4.40	3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	6	2	5	4	3	2.80	1469/1494	2.80	4.05	4.37	4.41	2.80

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 461 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 39
Title: Database Mangmt Systems		Questionnaires: 22
Instructor: Yesha,Yaacov		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Lecture														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	3	2	4	3	4	3.19	1258/1352	3.19	4.00	4.12	4.16	3.19

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	9
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 478 01
Title:	Machine Learning
Instructor:	Oates,James T

| Term - Spring 2013 |

| Enrollment: 41 |
| Questionnaires: 24 |

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	5	16	4.68	430/1560	4.68	4.15	4.35	4.45	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	332/1559	4.73	4.11	4.31	4.34	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	368/1371	4.73	4.27	4.38	4.46	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	356/1519	4.67	4.13	4.27	4.33	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	738/1452	4.22	3.71	4.18	4.25	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	228/1430	4.70	4.07	4.16	4.25	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	321/1539	4.68	4.11	4.23	4.21	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	15	7	4.32	1245/1560	4.32	4.68	4.64	4.68	4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	131/1545	4.83	3.88	4.14	4.21	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	384/1496	4.82	4.34	4.49	4.50	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.66	4.75	4.77	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	355/1496	4.76	4.08	4.37	4.40	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	391/1494	4.76	4.05	4.37	4.41	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	579/1352	4.30	4.00	4.12	4.16	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	656/1248	4.29	3.81	4.23	4.39	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	275/1250	4.86	4.13	4.39	4.55	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	320/1239	4.86	4.36	4.45	4.61	4.86

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | CMSC 478 01 | Term - Spring 2013 | | | | | | | | Enrollment: | 41 |

| Title: | Machine Learning | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: | 24 |

| 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	17	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/906	****	3.76	4.13	4.28	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	5	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	6
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	11	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	1			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 481 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 40
Title: Computer Networks		Questionnaires: 32
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	3	5	9	8	7	3.34	1510/1560	3.34	4.15	4.35	4.45	3.34
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	5	8	11	3	3.06	1522/1559	3.06	4.11	4.31	4.34	3.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	12	6	8	3.41	1313/1371	3.41	4.27	4.38	4.46	3.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	8	8	6	6	3.28	1468/1519	3.28	4.13	4.27	4.33	3.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	4	5	8	7	3.64	1227/1452	3.64	3.71	4.18	4.25	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	5	1	7	5	7	3.32	1324/1430	3.32	4.07	4.16	4.25	3.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	8	8	10	3	3.06	1469/1539	3.06	4.11	4.23	4.21	3.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	4	21	6	4.06	1422/1560	4.06	4.68	4.64	4.68	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	4	5	11	6	2	2.89	1500/1545	2.89	3.88	4.14	4.21	2.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	6	10	13	4.00	1281/1496	4.00	4.34	4.49	4.50	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	4	7	19	4.39	1328/1498	4.39	4.66	4.75	4.77	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	6	8	9	7	3.41	1411/1496	3.41	4.08	4.37	4.40	3.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	5	5	8	9	3.34	1415/1494	3.34	4.05	4.37	4.41	3.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	2	2	4	9	7	3.71	1084/1352	3.71	4.00	4.12	4.16	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	****/1248	****	3.81	4.23	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	****/1250	****	4.13	4.39	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/1239	****	4.36	4.45	4.61	****
4. Were special techniques successful	26	2	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/906	****	3.76	4.13	4.28	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 481 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 40
Title:	Computer Networks		Questionnaires: 32
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
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.65	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.40	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.57	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.18	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.64	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	3.97	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	32	Non-major	9
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	16	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 483 01		Term - Spring 2013		Enrollment: 32
Title:	Parallel & Distr Process				Questionnaires: 24
Instructor:	Dorband,John E				

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	2	0	2	3	6	6	5	3.41	1497/1560	3.41	4.15	4.35	4.45	3.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	3	9	5	2	2.91	1535/1559	2.91	4.11	4.31	4.34	2.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	5	4	9	2	3.09	1346/1371	3.09	4.27	4.38	4.46	3.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	3	4	10	3	3.52	1403/1519	3.52	4.13	4.27	4.33	3.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	4	5	4	2	3.00	1397/1452	3.00	3.71	4.18	4.25	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	4	6	7	2	3.05	1370/1430	3.05	4.07	4.16	4.25	3.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	6	7	3	5	3.13	1458/1539	3.13	4.11	4.23	4.21	3.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.68	4.64	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	4	2	7	5	1	2.84	1503/1545	2.84	3.88	4.14	4.21	2.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	4	5	4	6	5	3.13	1469/1496	3.13	4.34	4.49	4.50	3.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	4	4	14	4.25	1391/1498	4.25	4.66	4.75	4.77	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	5	3	8	4	3.13	1446/1496	3.13	4.08	4.37	4.40	3.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	7	3	6	1	7	2.92	1462/1494	2.92	4.05	4.37	4.41	2.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	4	3	2	5	7	3.38	1209/1352	3.38	4.00	4.12	4.16	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	3	0	3	1	1	2.63	1227/1248	2.63	3.81	4.23	4.39	2.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	2	1	1	3	3.38	1181/1250	3.38	4.13	4.39	4.55	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	933/1239	4.13	4.36	4.45	4.61	4.13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 483 01
Title:	Parallel & Distr Process
Instructor:	Dorband,John E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	24

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	16	1	1	2	1	0	3	3.29	825/906	3.29	3.76	4.13	4.28	3.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	6	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	18	Non-major	10
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	14	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 491 02
Title:	Spec Topics In Comp Sci
Instructor:	Grasso,Michael

Term - Spring 2013

| Enrollment: | 25 |
| Questionnaires: | 14 |

Questions	NR	NA	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	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	779/1560	4.57	4.15	4.35	4.45	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	534/1559	4.64	4.11	4.31	4.34	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	549/1371	4.79	4.27	4.38	4.46	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	514/1519	4.50	4.13	4.27	4.33	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	670/1452	4.30	3.71	4.18	4.25	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	736/1430	4.30	4.07	4.16	4.25	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	378/1539	4.32	4.11	4.23	4.21	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	1270/1560	4.61	4.68	4.64	4.68	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	378/1545	4.47	3.88	4.14	4.21	4.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	332/1496	4.60	4.34	4.49	4.50	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1498	4.89	4.66	4.75	4.77	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	666/1496	4.59	4.08	4.37	4.40	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	493/1494	4.63	4.05	4.37	4.41	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	1098/1352	4.10	4.00	4.12	4.16	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1248	4.33	3.81	4.23	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1250	4.67	4.13	4.39	4.55	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 491 02
Title:	Spec Topics In Comp Sci
Instructor:	Grasso,Michael

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1239	5.00	4.36	4.45	4.61	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	1	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	3
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	10	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 491 04	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 45
Title: Spec Topics In Comp Sci		Questionnaires: 14
Instructor: Finin,Timothy W		

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	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	389/1560	4.57	4.15	4.35	4.45	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	344/1559	4.64	4.11	4.31	4.34	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1371	4.79	4.27	4.38	4.46	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	606/1519	4.50	4.13	4.27	4.33	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	648/1452	4.30	3.71	4.18	4.25	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	578/1430	4.30	4.07	4.16	4.25	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	4	5	4.00	1077/1539	4.32	4.11	4.23	4.21	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	363/1560	4.61	4.68	4.64	4.68	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	546/1545	4.47	3.88	4.14	4.21	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	1	10	4.36	1056/1496	4.60	4.34	4.49	4.50	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	886/1498	4.89	4.66	4.75	4.77	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	532/1496	4.59	4.08	4.37	4.40	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	644/1494	4.63	4.05	4.37	4.41	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	326/1352	4.10	4.00	4.12	4.16	4.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	618/1248	4.33	3.81	4.23	4.39	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	479/1250	4.67	4.13	4.39	4.55	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1239	5.00	4.36	4.45	4.61	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	188/906	4.60	3.76	4.13	4.28	4.60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 491 04	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 45
Title: Spec Topics In Comp Sci		Questionnaires: 14
Instructor: Finin,Timothy W		

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	12	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/206	****	4.85	4.25	4.48	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	4.50	****
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 493 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 34
Title: Games Group Project		Questionnaires: 30
Instructor: Olano,Thomas M		

Questions	NR	NA	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	0	0	2	6	22	4.67	458/1560	4.67	4.15	4.35	4.45	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	10	14	4.17	1030/1559	4.17	4.11	4.31	4.34	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	24	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/1371	****	4.27	4.38	4.46	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	4	2	4	15	4.20	917/1519	4.20	4.13	4.27	4.33	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	24	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/1452	****	3.71	4.18	4.25	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	22	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1096/1430	3.75	4.07	4.16	4.25	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	11	15	4.33	761/1539	4.33	4.11	4.23	4.21	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	318/1560	4.93	4.68	4.64	4.68	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	6	8	13	4.10	886/1545	4.10	3.88	4.14	4.21	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	4	8	16	4.27	1136/1496	4.27	4.34	4.49	4.50	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	556/1498	4.90	4.66	4.75	4.77	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	10	17	4.43	792/1496	4.43	4.08	4.37	4.40	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	10	13	4.10	1106/1494	4.10	4.05	4.37	4.41	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	1	4	6	17	4.17	716/1352	4.17	4.00	4.12	4.16	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	****/1248	****	3.81	4.23	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	****/1250	****	4.13	4.39	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/1239	****	4.36	4.45	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 493 01	Term - Spring 2013		Enrollment:	34
Title:	Games Group Project			Questionnaires:	30
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															
4. Were special techniques successful	23	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/906	****	3.76	4.13	4.28	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	30	Non-major	14
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 611 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 46
Title: Adv Computer Architectre		Questionnaires: 27
Instructor: Younis,Mohamed		

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	0	0	3	9	14	4.42	779/1560	4.34	4.15	4.35	4.37	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	5	17	4.46	686/1559	4.29	4.11	4.31	4.29	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	16	4.54	597/1371	4.46	4.27	4.38	4.37	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	3	5	14	4.39	705/1519	4.32	4.13	4.27	4.29	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	3	3	6	8	3.81	1121/1452	3.90	3.71	4.18	4.23	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	1	1	5	16	4.57	364/1430	4.50	4.07	4.16	4.28	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	321/1539	4.63	4.11	4.23	4.26	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	182/1560	4.69	4.68	4.64	4.72	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	9	12	4.38	585/1545	4.47	3.88	4.14	4.11	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	10	15	4.60	744/1496	4.74	4.34	4.49	4.47	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	988/1498	4.86	4.66	4.75	4.76	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	11	12	4.40	832/1496	4.39	4.08	4.37	4.29	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	5	16	4.44	800/1494	4.41	4.05	4.37	4.31	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	2	5	6	10	4.04	803/1352	3.90	4.00	4.12	3.99	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	3	3	4	6	3.65	1027/1248	3.70	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	787/1250	4.27	4.13	4.39	4.49	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	703/1239	4.61	4.36	4.45	4.57	4.47
4. Were special techniques successful	10	8	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	417/906	3.36	3.76	4.13	4.08	4.22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 611 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 46
Title: Adv Computer Architectre		Questionnaires: 27
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
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/206	****	4.85	4.25	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	****/214	****	4.50	4.31	3.86	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/204	****	4.38	4.52	4.15	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/207	****	4.93	4.44	3.84	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/199	****	4.89	4.27	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.23	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.34	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.37	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.28	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	****/29	****	****	4.11	3.89	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	4.06	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	1	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/26	****	****	3.89	3.54	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	3.69	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/31	****	****	4.35	3.98	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/22	****	****	4.13	3.66	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/29	****	****	4.41	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 611 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 46
Title:	Adv Computer Architectre		Questionnaires: 27
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
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/14	****	****	4.03	3.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	3.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	21	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	7	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	13
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 611 02	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 8
Title:	Adv Computer Architectre		Questionnaires: 8
Instructor:	Younis,Mohamed		

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	0	6	2	4.25	983/1560	4.34	4.15	4.35	4.37	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	1068/1559	4.29	4.11	4.31	4.29	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	774/1371	4.46	4.27	4.38	4.37	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	867/1519	4.32	4.13	4.27	4.29	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	948/1452	3.90	3.71	4.18	4.23	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	532/1430	4.50	4.07	4.16	4.28	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	466/1539	4.63	4.11	4.23	4.26	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1146/1560	4.69	4.68	4.64	4.72	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	341/1545	4.47	3.88	4.14	4.11	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	280/1496	4.74	4.34	4.49	4.47	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1498	4.86	4.66	4.75	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	866/1496	4.39	4.08	4.37	4.29	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	880/1494	4.41	4.05	4.37	4.31	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1051/1352	3.90	4.00	4.12	3.99	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	980/1248	3.70	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	815/1250	4.27	4.13	4.39	4.49	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	458/1239	4.61	4.36	4.45	4.57	4.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 611 02 **Term - Spring 2013** **Enrollment:** 8

Title: Adv Computer Architectre **Questionnaires:** 8

Instructor: Younis,Mohamed

Questions	NR	NA	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	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	893/906	3.36	3.76	4.13	4.08	2.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	3	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	2	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 628 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 25
Title:	Intro Mobile Comput		Questionnaires: 16
Instructor:	Banerjee,Nilanj		

Questions	NR	NA	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	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	339/1560	4.50	4.15	4.35	4.37	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	296/1559	4.13	4.11	4.31	4.29	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	12	4.56	561/1371	3.66	4.27	4.38	4.37	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	317/1519	4.35	4.13	4.27	4.29	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	884/1452	4.04	3.71	4.18	4.23	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	597/1430	4.18	4.07	4.16	4.28	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	635/1539	3.47	4.11	4.23	4.26	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	318/1560	4.84	4.68	4.64	4.72	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	255/1545	4.33	3.88	4.14	4.11	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	159/1496	4.59	4.34	4.49	4.47	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1498	4.75	4.66	4.75	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	280/1496	4.53	4.08	4.37	4.29	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	506/1494	4.34	4.05	4.37	4.31	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	401/1352	4.48	4.00	4.12	3.99	4.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	822/1248	3.88	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	667/1250	4.35	4.13	4.39	4.49	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	646/1239	4.53	4.36	4.45	4.57	4.56

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 628 01	**Term - Spring 2013**
Title: Intro Mobile Comput	**Enrollment:** 25
Instructor: Banerjee,Nilanj	**Questionnaires:** 16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	660/906	3.67	3.76	4.13	4.08	3.83

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	15	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	4	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	12	Non-major	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	8				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 628 02
Title:	Intro Mobile Comput
Instructor:	Banerjee,Nilanj

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 5
Questionnaires: 4

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	1	0	0	3	4.25	983/1560	4.50	4.15	4.35	4.37	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1448/1559	4.13	4.11	4.31	4.29	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1366/1371	3.66	4.27	4.38	4.37	2.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1060/1519	4.35	4.13	4.27	4.29	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	948/1452	4.04	3.71	4.18	4.23	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	889/1430	4.18	4.07	4.16	4.28	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	1515/1539	3.47	4.11	4.23	4.26	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	776/1560	4.84	4.68	4.64	4.72	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	952/1545	4.33	3.88	4.14	4.11	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1144/1496	4.59	4.34	4.49	4.47	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1239/1498	4.75	4.66	4.75	4.76	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	990/1496	4.53	4.08	4.37	4.29	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1147/1494	4.34	4.05	4.37	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	353/1352	4.48	4.00	4.12	3.99	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	980/1248	3.88	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	815/1250	4.35	4.13	4.39	4.49	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	677/1239	4.53	4.36	4.45	4.57	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 628 02	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment:	5
Title:	Intro Mobile Comput		Questionnaires:	4
Instructor:	Banerjee,Nilanj			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	778/906	3.67	3.76	4.13	4.08	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 635 01
Title:	Adv Comp Graphics
Instructor:	Chen,Jian

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 7
Questionnaires: 5

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	1	4	0	0	2.80	1549/1560	2.40	4.15	4.35	4.37	2.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	2.60	1549/1559	2.80	4.11	4.31	4.29	2.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1508/1519	2.83	4.13	4.27	4.29	2.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1446/1452	3.67	3.71	4.18	4.23	2.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	0	1	0	2.00	1427/1430	2.00	4.07	4.16	4.28	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	1530/1539	3.10	4.11	4.23	4.26	2.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1552/1560	3.20	4.68	4.64	4.72	3.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	1518/1545	1.75	3.88	4.14	4.11	2.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1447/1496	3.70	4.34	4.49	4.47	3.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1484/1498	4.30	4.66	4.75	4.76	3.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	2.60	1482/1496	2.30	4.08	4.37	4.29	2.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	1.60	1494/1494	1.80	4.05	4.37	4.31	1.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	1313/1352	2.75	4.00	4.12	3.99	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	470/1248	4.50	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	616/1250	4.50	4.13	4.39	4.49	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 635 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 7
Title: Adv Comp Graphics		Questionnaires: 5
Instructor: Chen,Jian		

Questions	NR	NA	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	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1239	5.00	4.36	4.45	4.57	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 635 02
Title:	Adv Comp Graphics
Instructor:	Chen,Jian

Term - Spring 2013

| Enrollment: | 1 |
| Questionnaires: | 1 |

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	1	0	0	0	2.00	1558/1560	2.40	4.15	4.35	4.37	2.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1526/1559	2.80	4.11	4.31	4.29	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1494/1519	2.83	4.13	4.27	4.29	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1452	3.67	3.71	4.18	4.23	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1077/1539	3.10	4.11	4.23	4.26	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1558/1560	3.20	4.68	4.64	4.72	3.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1544/1545	1.75	3.88	4.14	4.11	1.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1281/1496	3.70	4.34	4.49	4.47	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1498	4.30	4.66	4.75	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1493/1496	2.30	4.08	4.37	4.29	2.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 635 02	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 1
Title:	Adv Comp Graphics		Questionnaires: 1
Instructor:	Chen,Jian		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
Lecture														
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1490/1494	1.80	4.05	4.37	4.31	2.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 641 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 45
Title:	Design & Analy Algorthms		Questionnaires: 22
Instructor:	Sherman,Alan T		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	3	4	7	6	3.67	1424/1560	3.67	4.15	4.35	4.37	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	4	7	7	3.81	1341/1559	3.81	4.11	4.31	4.29	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	2	7	8	3.95	1109/1371	3.95	4.27	4.38	4.37	3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	4	7	6	3.50	1411/1519	3.50	4.13	4.27	4.29	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	4	6	7	3.71	1183/1452	3.71	3.71	4.18	4.23	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	2	5	10	3.86	1034/1430	3.86	4.07	4.16	4.28	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	6	12	4.23	890/1539	4.23	4.11	4.23	4.26	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	12	8	4.27	1278/1560	4.27	4.68	4.64	4.72	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	3	3	4	2	3.23	1449/1545	3.23	3.88	4.14	4.11	3.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	6	7	5	3.62	1418/1496	3.62	4.34	4.49	4.47	3.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	4	16	4.67	1077/1498	4.67	4.66	4.75	4.76	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	7	5	3	4	3.00	1454/1496	3.00	4.08	4.37	4.29	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	5	1	4	5	2.95	1456/1494	2.95	4.05	4.37	4.31	2.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	4	4	6	3	3	2.85	1304/1352	2.85	4.00	4.12	3.99	2.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	4	6	5	3.61	1037/1248	3.61	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	717/1250	4.39	4.13	4.39	4.49	4.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	664/1239	4.53	4.36	4.45	4.57	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	2	0	2	4	3	3.55	763/906	3.55	3.76	4.13	4.08	3.55

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 641 01				**Term - Spring 2013**							**Enrollment: 45**			
Title: Design & Analy Algorthms											**Questionnaires: 22**			
Instructor: Sherman,Alan T														

| Questions | NR | NA | **Frequencies** | | | | | **Instructor** | | **Course** | **Org** | **UMBC** | **Level** | **Sect** |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/206	****	4.85	4.25	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/214	****	4.50	4.31	3.86	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/204	****	4.38	4.52	4.15	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/207	****	4.93	4.44	3.84	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/199	****	4.89	4.27	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.23	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.34	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.37	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.28	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	3.89	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	4.06	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	3.54	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	3.69	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/31	****	****	4.35	3.98	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	3.66	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/29	****	****	4.41	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 641 01	Term - Spring 2013		Enrollment:	45
Title:	Design & Analy Algorthms			Questionnaires:	22
Instructor:	Sherman,Alan T				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	3.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	3.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	9	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	9	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 661 01							Term - Spring 2013						Enrollment: 25	
Title:	Prin Of Database Sys													Questionnaires: 16	
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	3	1	4	8	4.06	1158/1560	4.53	4.15	4.35	4.37	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	3	9	4.00	1158/1559	4.50	4.11	4.31	4.29	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	5	3.88	1167/1371	4.44	4.27	4.38	4.37	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	1027/1519	4.53	4.13	4.27	4.29	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	704/1452	4.63	3.71	4.18	4.23	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	852/1430	4.53	4.07	4.16	4.28	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	1077/1539	4.50	4.11	4.23	4.26	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	1134/1560	4.47	4.68	4.64	4.72	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	827/1545	4.58	3.88	4.14	4.11	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	3	4	7	3.94	1323/1496	4.47	4.34	4.49	4.47	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	1050/1498	4.84	4.66	4.75	4.76	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	5	3	6	3.75	1312/1496	4.38	4.08	4.37	4.29	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	3	7	3.75	1306/1494	4.38	4.05	4.37	4.31	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	3	5	1	4	3.46	1175/1352	4.23	4.00	4.12	3.99	3.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	798/1248	4.54	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	692/1250	4.71	4.13	4.39	4.49	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	628/1239	4.79	4.36	4.45	4.57	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	839/906	3.17	3.76	4.13	4.08	3.17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 661 01	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 25
Title: Prin Of Database Sys		Questionnaires: 16
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
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/214	****	4.50	4.31	3.86	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/204	****	4.38	4.52	4.15	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.93	4.44	3.84	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.23	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.34	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.37	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.28	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	3.89	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	4.06	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	3.54	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	3.69	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	3.98	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	3.66	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	3.99	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	3.29	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 661 01
Title:	Prin Of Database Sys
Instructor:	Kalpakis,Konsta

Term - Spring 2013

| Enrollment: | 25 |
| Questionnaires: | 16 |

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														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	3.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	12	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	4	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 661 03
Title:	Prin Of Database Sys
Instructor:	Kalpakis,Konsta

Term - Spring 2013

| Enrollment: | 3 |
| Questionnaires: | 2 |

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	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	4.53	4.15	4.35	4.37	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	4.50	4.11	4.31	4.29	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1371	4.44	4.27	4.38	4.37	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1519	4.53	4.13	4.27	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1452	4.63	3.71	4.18	4.23	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1430	4.53	4.07	4.16	4.28	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1539	4.50	4.11	4.23	4.26	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1051/1560	4.47	4.68	4.64	4.72	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1545	4.58	3.88	4.14	4.11	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1496	4.47	4.34	4.49	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1498	4.84	4.66	4.75	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1496	4.38	4.08	4.37	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1494	4.38	4.05	4.37	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	4.23	4.00	4.12	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1248	4.54	3.81	4.23	4.28	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1250	4.71	4.13	4.39	4.49	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 661 03	
Title: Prin Of Database Sys	
Instructor: Kalpakis,Konsta	

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 3

Questionnaires: 2

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1239	4.79	4.36	4.45	4.57	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	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 678 02
Title:	Intro Machine Learning
Instructor:	Oates,James T

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	6
Questionnaires:	5

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.15	4.35	4.37	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	993/1559	4.20	4.11	4.31	4.29	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	937/1371	4.20	4.27	4.38	4.37	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	693/1519	4.40	4.13	4.27	4.29	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	1375/1452	3.20	3.71	4.18	4.23	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	559/1430	4.40	4.07	4.16	4.28	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1077/1539	4.00	4.11	4.23	4.26	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1336/1560	4.20	4.68	4.64	4.72	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	546/1545	4.40	3.88	4.14	4.11	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1009/1496	4.40	4.34	4.49	4.47	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	852/1498	4.80	4.66	4.75	4.76	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1175/1496	4.00	4.08	4.37	4.29	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	609/1494	4.60	4.05	4.37	4.31	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	629/1352	4.25	4.00	4.12	3.99	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	565/1248	4.40	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	325/1250	4.80	4.13	4.39	4.49	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	388/1239	4.80	4.36	4.45	4.57	4.80

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 678 02	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 6
Title: Intro Machine Learning		Questionnaires: 5
Instructor: Oates,James T		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	675/906	3.80	3.76	4.13	4.08	3.80

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 691 05
Title:	Spec Topics In Comp Sci
Instructor:	Finin,Timothy W

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 1
Questionnaires: 1

Questions	NR	NA	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	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	4.60	4.15	4.35	4.37	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1158/1559	4.18	4.11	4.31	4.29	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1060/1519	4.39	4.13	4.27	4.29	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1397/1452	4.08	3.71	4.18	4.23	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	889/1430	4.19	4.07	4.16	4.28	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1474/1539	4.18	4.11	4.23	4.26	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	4.76	4.68	4.64	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	952/1545	4.07	3.88	4.14	4.11	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1281/1496	4.31	4.34	4.49	4.47	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1498	4.88	4.66	4.75	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1175/1496	4.18	4.08	4.37	4.29	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1147/1494	4.46	4.05	4.37	4.31	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1243/1248	3.64	3.81	4.23	4.28	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1221/1250	3.91	4.13	4.39	4.49	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 691 05
Title:	Spec Topics In Comp Sci
Instructor:	Finin,Timothy W

Term - Spring 2013

| Enrollment: | 1 |
| Questionnaires: | 1 |

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1239	4.82	4.36	4.45	4.57	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 691 06
Title:	Spec Topics In Comp Sci
Instructor:	Grasso,Michael

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	8

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	2	3	3	4.13	1118/1560	4.60	4.15	4.35	4.37	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	3	3	3.88	1286/1559	4.18	4.11	4.31	4.29	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	887/1371	4.63	4.27	4.38	4.37	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	549/1519	4.39	4.13	4.27	4.29	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	704/1452	4.08	3.71	4.18	4.23	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	700/1430	4.19	4.07	4.16	4.28	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	137/1539	4.18	4.11	4.23	4.26	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1270/1560	4.76	4.68	4.64	4.72	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1123/1545	4.07	3.88	4.14	4.11	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	1144/1496	4.31	4.34	4.49	4.47	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1132/1498	4.88	4.66	4.75	4.76	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1265/1496	4.18	4.08	4.37	4.29	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	880/1494	4.46	4.05	4.37	4.31	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1323/1352	3.47	4.00	4.12	3.99	2.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	398/1248	3.64	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	701/1250	3.91	4.13	4.39	4.49	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	388/1239	4.82	4.36	4.45	4.57	4.80

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 691 06 | **Term - Spring 2013** | **Enrollment: 8**

Title: Spec Topics In Comp Sci | **Questionnaires: 8**

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
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	904/906	3.00	3.76	4.13	4.08	2.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	5	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	2	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 691 07	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment: 4
Title: Spec Topics In Comp Sci		Questionnaires: 4
Instructor: Dorband,John E		

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	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	458/1560	4.60	4.15	4.35	4.37	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	412/1559	4.18	4.11	4.31	4.29	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1371	4.63	4.27	4.38	4.37	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	356/1519	4.39	4.13	4.27	4.29	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1452	4.08	3.71	4.18	4.23	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	626/1430	4.19	4.07	4.16	4.28	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	349/1539	4.18	4.11	4.23	4.26	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	4.76	4.68	4.64	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	639/1545	4.07	3.88	4.14	4.11	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	643/1496	4.31	4.34	4.49	4.47	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1498	4.88	4.66	4.75	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	504/1496	4.18	4.08	4.37	4.29	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1494	4.46	4.05	4.37	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	547/1352	3.47	4.00	4.12	3.99	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	618/1248	3.64	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	757/1250	3.91	4.13	4.39	4.49	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	563/1239	4.82	4.36	4.45	4.57	4.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 691 07	Term - Spring 2013	Enrollment:	4

Title:	Spec Topics In Comp Sci		Questionnaires:	4

Instructor:	Dorband,John E

									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	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	519/906	3.00	3.76	4.13	4.08	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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