Course Section: CMSC 103 0101 Title

SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING

Instructor: KATZ, HENRY S

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 369 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	equei	ncie	S		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1596/1669	3.00	4.28	4.23	4.02	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1548/1666	3.20	4.23	4.19	4.11	3.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1118/1421	3.80	4.27	4.24	4.11	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.24	4.15	3.99	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	1.75	1552/1555	1.75	3.39	4.00	3.92	1.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1410/1543	3.00	4.11	4.06	3.86	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1353/1647	3.60	4.26	4.12	4.06	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1542/1605	2.75	4.09	4.07	3.96	2.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1407/1514	3.40	4.40	4.39	4.32	3.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.55	4.66	4.55	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	1463/1503	2.60	4.16	4.24	4.17	2.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	3.00	1403/1506	3.00	4.11	4.26	4.17	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1296/1311	1.00	3.76	3.85	3.68	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	3.90	4.05	3.85	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1253/1502	3.67	4.06	4.26	4.06	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1474/1489	2.33	4.13	4.29	4.07	2.33
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	3.81	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				2	0						

PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR

Title Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M

Enrollment: 42

Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 370 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
	General														
	gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	22	4.74	281/1669	4.72	4.28	4.23	4.02	4.74
2. Did the	instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	21	4.70	306/1666	4.53	4.23	4.19	4.11	4.70
3. Did the	exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	392/1421	4.61	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.67
4. Did other	er evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	414/1617	4.39	4.24	4.15	3.99	4.58
5. Did ass:	igned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	3	1	4	2	7	3.53	1217/1555	3.17	3.39	4.00	3.92	3.53
6. Did writ	tten assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	390/1543	3.86	4.11	4.06	3.86	4.50
7. Was the	grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	123/1647	4.70	4.26	4.12	4.06	4.89
8. How many	y times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	23	4	4.15	1451/1668	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.15
9. How would	ld you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	9	17	4.65	249/1605	4.30	4.09	4.07	3.96	4.65
	Lecture														
1. Were the	e instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	291/1514	4.70	4.40	4.39	4.32	4.85
	instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	567/1551	4.90	4.55	4.66	4.55	4.88
	ture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	182/1503	4.55	4.16	4.24	4.17	4.85
	lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	21	4.69	433/1506	4.60		4.26	4.17	4.69
	iovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	5	4	13	4.36	365/1311			3.85	3.68	4.36
		_	_	-	-	-	_			,					
	Discussion		_			_		_							
	ss discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	7	5	5		1078/1490	3.67	3.90	4.05	3.85	3.68
	l students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	2	3	4	9		1075/1502	3.90	4.06	4.26	4.06	3.95
	instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	1	1	7	8		1006/1489	4.06	4.13	4.29	4.07	4.11
4. Were spe	ecial techniques successful	7	10	3	0	3	2	2	3.00	923/1006	3.15	3.40	4.00	3.81	3.00
	Laboratory														
1. Did the	lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	77/ 226	4.68	4.38	4.20	3.98	4.50
2. Were you	a provided with adequate background information	17	0	2	0	2	0	6	3.80	178/ 233	4.33	4.47	4.19	4.09	3.80
	cessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	75/ 225	4.90	4.83	4.50	4.42	4.80
4. Did the	lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	138/ 223	4.60	4.70	4.35	4.19	4.33
5. Were red	quirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 206	****	4.72	4.15	4.01	****
	Seminar														
1 Word 200	signed topics relevant to the announced theme	19	6	0	0	0	0	2	E 00	****/ 112	****	4.33	4.38	4.04	****
	instructor available for individual attention	19	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.33	4.36	4.19	****
	earch projects contribute to what you learned	19	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	3.79	****
	sentations contribute to what you learned	19	5	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 105	****	4.60	4.22	3.79	****
	iteria for grading made clear	18	6	0	0	0	2	1		****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.94	****
5. Wele Cl.	iteria for grading made crear	10	O	U	U	U	4		4.33	7 96		4.00	3.93	3.90	
	Field Work														
1. Did fie	ld experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you	clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the	instructor available for consultation	21	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what	degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	3	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
	Self Paced														
1. Did seli	f-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
	dy questions make clear the expected goal	23	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
	ur contacts with the instructor helpful	23	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
_	ere enough proctors for all the students	22	4	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR

Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M

Enrollment: 42
Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 370 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	6	 А	19	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	27	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR

Instructor: BURT, GARY

Enrollment: 43 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 371

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NT 70	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	E	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	_	UMBC		Sect Mean
										Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	2	13	4.53	567/1669	4.72		4.23	4.02	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	752/1666	4.53	4.23	4.19	4.11	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	,	4.61	4.27		4.11	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	4	1	9		1112/1617		4.24	4.15	3.99	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	2	1	3	2	3		1350/1555	3.17	3.39	4.00	3.92	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	1	4	3	2		1513/1543	3.86	4.11	4.06	3.86	2.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3 1	4	10	4.41		4.70	4.26	4.12	4.06	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1 4	0	0	0	4	0 9		4.88	750/1668 1187/1605	4.54 4.30	4.67 4.09	4.67 4.07	4.62 3.96	4.88 3.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	U	U	U	4	9	Τ	3.19	118//1605	4.30	4.09	4.07	3.90	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	1022/1514	4.70	4.40	4.39	4.32	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1		4.94	307/1551	4.90	4.55	4.66	4.55	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	5	9	4.24	896/1503	4.55	4.16	4.24	4.17	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	3	10	4.24	926/1506	4.60	4.11	4.26	4.17	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	284/1311	4.33	3.76	3.85	3.68	4.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	5	4	2	3.58	1124/1490	3.67	3.90	4.05	3.85	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	1106/1502	3.90	4.06	4.26	4.06	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	1116/1489	4.06	4.13	4.29	4.07	3.92
4. Were special techniques successful	6	9	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1006	3.15	3.40	4.00	3.81	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 233	4.33	4.47	4.19	4.09	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 223	4.60	4.70	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 206	****	4.72	4.15	4.01	****
									,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 112	****	4.33	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR

Instructor: BURT, GARY

Enrollment: 43
Questionnaires: 18

ollment: 43

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2006

Page 371

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate 0) Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	2					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	2	Under-grad 18	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means th	nere are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to be	significant	
				I	0	Other	9			
				?	0					

Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR

Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 372 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	64/1669	4.72	4.28	4.23	4.02	4.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	399/1666		4.23	4.19	4.11	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	255/1421	4.61	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	475/1617	4.39	4.24	4.15	3.99	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	5	5	2	4	3.06	1420/1555	3.17	3.39	4.00	3.92	3.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	562/1543	3.86	4.11	4.06	3.86	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	4	17	4.68	281/1647	4.70	4.26	4.12	4.06	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	-,	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	10	7	4.33	591/1605	4.30	4.09	4.07	3.96	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	95/1514	4.70	4.40	4.39	4.32	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	512/1551	4.90	4.55	4.66	4.55	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	425/1503	4.55	4.16	4.24	4.17	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	164/1506	4.60	4.11	4.26	4.17	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	538/1311	4.33	3.76	3.85	3.68	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	1	2	2	7	3.60	1117/1490	3.67	3.90	4.05	3.85	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	1013/1502	3.90	4.06	4.26	4.06	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	2	2	1	10	4.27	914/1489	4.06	4.13	4.29	4.07	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	2	1	1	2	3	3.33	841/1006	3.15	3.40	4.00	3.81	3.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	33/ 226	4.68	4.38	4.20	3.98	4.86
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	38/ 233	4.33	4.47	4.19	4.09	4.86
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 225	4.90	4.83	4.50	4.42	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	51/ 223	4.60	4.70	4.35	4.19	4.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 206	****	4.72	4.15	4.01	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	•	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	A :	 14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sid	qnificant	
				I	0	Other	18			-	

? 0

Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR

Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M

Enrollment: 42 Ouestionnaires: 26

Fall 2006

Page 373 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 26 Student Co	26 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire													
			Fre	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	20	4.65	404/1669	4.72	4.28	4.23	4.02	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	5	17	4.42	662/1666	4.53	4.23	4.19	4.11	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	267/1421	4.61	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.76

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	20	4.65	404/1669	4.72	4.28	4.23	4.02	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	5	17	4.42	662/1666	4.53	4.23	4.19	4.11	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	267/1421	4.61	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	0	5	13	4.53	475/1617	4.39	4.24	4.15	3.99	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	5	2	4	5	2			3.17	3.39		3.92	2.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	2	0	2	3	9		857/1543	3.86	4.11		3.86	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	167/1647		4.26	4.12	4.06	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	20			1394/1668	4.54	4.67	4.67		4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	8			486/1605	4.30	4.09	4.07		4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	6	19	4.65	600/1514	4.70	4.40	4.39	4.32	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	567/1551	4.90	4.55	4.66	4.55	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2			4.50	556/1503	4.55	4.16		4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	7	18	4.58		4.60	4.11	4.26		4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	1	6	15	4.38	357/1311			3.85		4.38
J. Did dudiovibual ecciniiques ciniance your dideistanding	O	2	_	_	_	O	13	1.50	337/1311	1.33	3.70	3.03	3.00	1.50
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	1	3	1	8	2 00	1003/1490	3.67	3.90	4.05	3.85	3.80
-			2											
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	4	3	6 5		1219/1502 1107/1489	3.90	4.06	4.26	4.06	3.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	7	3	1	1	6 3				4.06	4.13	4.29	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	/	3	U	1	3	۷	3.11	917/1006	3.15	3.40	4.00	3.81	3.11
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 226	4.68	4.38	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 233	4.33	4.47	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	2	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 225	4.90	4.83	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	****/ 223	4.60	4.70	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 206	****	4.72	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 112	****	4.33	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	2	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	1	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	2	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.33		****
J. Did conferences help you carry out freed activities	20		J	_	U	U	J	2.00	, 30			1.55	1.50	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR

Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M

Enrollment: 42
Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 373 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	15	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	26	Non-major	25
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course Section: CMSC 121 0101 University of Maryland Title (S'06) Baltimore County Instructor: STAFF Fall 2006

Enrollment:

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

Ρ

I

8

0

1

Questionnaires: 11

0

iversity of Maryland Page 374
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaire

								Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			 General																
1. [oid vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil		m this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	781/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.02	4.36
	_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1666	4.60	4.23	4.19	4.11	5.00
			uestions reflect			0	4	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	184/1421	4.26	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.86
		_	uations reflect		-	0	2	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	123/1617	4.32	4.24	4.15	3.99	4.89
5. D	oid as	signed re	eadings contribu	te to	what you learned	0	1	2	1	0	0	7	3.90	939/1555	3.78	3.39	4.00	3.92	3.90
		_	-		o what you learned	. 0	1	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	298/1543	4.10	4.11	4.06	3.86	4.60
7. W	las th	ne grading	g system clearly	expla	ined	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	435/1647	4.47	4.26	4.12	4.06	4.55
8. H	Iow ma	ny times	was class cance	lled		0	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. H	Iow wo	uld you	grade the overal	l teac	hing effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	830/1605	4.06	4.09	4.07	3.96	4.13
			Lecture																
1 W	Jere t	he instr	uctor's lectures		nrenared	0	0	0	0	Λ	1	10	4.91	189/1514	4.75	4.40	4.39	4.32	4.91
			ctor seem intere			1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	512/1551	4.65	4.55	4.66	4.55	4.90
					xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	637/1503	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.17	4.45
			es contribute to			0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	394/1506	4.26	4.11	4.26	4.17	4.73
					our understanding	0	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	204/1311		3.76	3.85		4.64
			Discuss			_			_		_	_							
					what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	0	3		1003/1490	3.90	3.90	4.05	3.85	3.80
			_	_	d to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	632/1502	4.00	4.06	4.26	4.06	4.50
			_		d open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	4.50	4.13	4.29	4.07	5.00 ***
4. W	ere s	special to	echniques succes	siul		-7	2	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	3.81	***
					Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	ution	n									
Cred	lita T	arned	Cum CDA		Evneated Grades				Po:	asons	,			Ту	26			Majors	
	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gr				Expedied Glades	, . – – – -					- 								,
00-		2	0.00-0.99	1	A 0		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	6
28-		1	1.00-1.99	0	В 1														
56-		0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nera	1				4	Under-g	rad 1	1	Non-	major	5
84-	-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														

Electives

Other

3

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course Section: CMSC 121 0201 University of Maryland Title (S'06)

Instructor:

STAFF

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 375

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 0 Questionnaires: 5 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
		 General																
l Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,skil		his course	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	734/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.02	4.40
_		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	957/1666		4.23	4.19	4.11	4.20
		uestions reflect			1	1	0	1	0	1			1166/1421		4.27	4.24	4.11	3.67
	_	uations reflect	_	-	0	1	0	1	1	0	2		1251/1617		4.24	4.15	3.99	3.75
		eadings contribu	_	-	0	2	0	0	2	0	1		1133/1555		3.39	4.00	3.92	3.6
	_	signments contri		-	0	0	0	1	2	0	2		1226/1543			4.06	3.86	3.60
		g system clearly		-	0	0	0	0	0	3	2		651/1647		4.26	4.12	4.06	4.4
		was class cance		eu	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668			4.67	4.62	5.0
	-	grade the overal		a offoatironoaa	0	0	0	1	0	2	2		918/1605				3.96	
o. now wo	uid you	grade the overal	I LEACHIN	ig effectiveness	U	U	U	1	U	۷	2	4.00	910/1005	4.00	4.09	4.07	3.90	4.0
		Lecture																
L. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures	well pre	epared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	679/1514	4.75	4.40	4.39	4.32	4.6
		ctor seem intere	_	-	0	0	0	0	0	3	2		1270/1551		4.55		4.55	4.4
		terial presented			0	0	0	0	1	2	2		932/1503		4.16	4.24		4.2
		es contribute to	_	_	0	0	1	0	0	2	2		1225/1506			4.26	4.17	3.8
		l techniques enh	_		0	0	0	0	2	1	2		587/1311			3.85		4.0
. Dia au	alovisua	i cecimiiques emi	ance your	understanding	U	U	U	U	2	_	2	1.00	307/1311	1.52	3.70	3.03	3.00	1.0
		Discuss	ion															
. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribu	te to wha	at you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	849/1490	3.90	3.90	4.05	3.85	4.0
. Were a	ll stude	nts actively enc	ouraged t	to participate	1	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1301/1502	4.00	4.06	4.26	4.06	3.5
		ctor encourage f			1	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1038/1489	4.50	4.13	4.29	4.07	4.0
		echniques succes			1	3	0	0	1	0	0		****/1006		3.40	4.00	3.81	***
		_																
. D;4 +p	o lob in	Laborat	-	-bo motowial	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 226	****	1 20	4 20	2 00	***
		crease understan			4	0	0	0	1	0	0				4.38	4.20	3.98	***
_	_	ded with adequat			4	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 233		4.47	4.19	4.09	***
	_	materials avail			4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 225		4.83	4.50	4.42	
		structor provide			4	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 223		4.70	4.35	4.19	***
. Were r	equireme:	nts for lab repo	rts clear	rly specified	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	4.72	4.15	4.01	***
		Seminar																
. Were a	ssigned	topics relevant		nounced theme	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.33	4.38	4.04	***
	_	ons contribute t			4	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 105		4.60	4.20	3.94	***
_		for grading made	_	ou rearried	4	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 98		4.00	3.95	3.90	***
. Were e	IICCIIA	ioi grading made	CICAL		-	Ü	J	Ü	_	J	Ü	3.00	, ,		1.00	3.75	3.70	
		Field W	ork															
		rience contribut			4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.00	* * *
. Did yo	u clearl	y understand you	r evaluat	tion criteria	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	***
. To wha	t degree	could you discu	ss your e	evaluations	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	***
		Self P																
Did ac	lf-naged	system contribu		at vou learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	***
	_	acts with the in		_	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	,		****	4.45	4.26	***
o. were y	our cont.	acts with the in	Structor	neipiui	4	U	U	1	U	U	U	2.00	/ 40			4.45	4.20	
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 0		Re	quir	ea I	or Ma	jor	ន	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1				_				_	_	_	_			_
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ge	nera	Τ				2	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	-major	2
84-150	-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0																	
Grad.						El	ecti	ves				3	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	ſh

P 3 responses to be significant I 0 Other 0 .

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Instructor: DESJARDINS, MAR (Instr. A)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 7

16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 376 Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

		Questions		NR	NA	Fr 1	eque 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mear
		 General															
. Did you	gain ne	ew insights,skills fi	om this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1052/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.1
. Did the	instru	ctor make clear the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	293/1666	4.47	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.7
. Did the	exam qu	uestions reflect the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	493/1421	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.5
. Did othe	er evalı	uations reflect the e	expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	323/1617	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.6
. Did assi	igned re	eadings contribute to	what you learned	0	1	2	0	3	1	0	2.50	1521/1555	2.95	3.39	4.00	3.96	2.5
. Did writ	ten ass	signments contribute	to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	895/1543	4.41	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.0
. Was the	grading	g system clearly expl	ained	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	617/1647	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.4
. How many	/ times	was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	807/1668	4.88	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.8
. How woul	ld you	grade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1312/1605	4.32	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.3
		Lecture															
. Were the	e instru	uctor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	274/1514	4.73	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.8
. Did the	instru	ctor seem interested	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	5		954/1551	4.62	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.7
. Was lect	ture mat	terial presented and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	491/1503	4.54	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.5
		es contribute to what	-	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	744/1506	4.31	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.4
. Did audi	lovisua	l techniques enhance	your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	389/1311	3.63	3.76	3.85	3.96	4.3
		Discussion															
		ussions contribute to	_	1	0	0	0	1	1			445/1490		3.90	4.05	4.11	4.5
		nts actively encourag		1	0	0	0	2	2	2		1013/1502		4.06	4.26	4.31	4.0
. Did the	instru	ctor encourage fair a	nd open discussion	1	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1379/1489	3.91	4.13	4.29	4.36	3.1
		Laboratory			_	_	_										
		crease understanding		3	0	1	0	0	1	2		172/ 226		4.38	4.20	4.42	3.7
_	_	ded with adequate bac	_	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	66/ 233		4.47		4.36	4.6
	_	materials available		3	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	102/ 225		4.83	4.50	4.74	4.6
		structor provide assi		4	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	109/ 223			4.35	4.71	4.5
. Were req	quiremen	nts for lab reports o	learly specified	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	4.50	4.72	4.15	4.59	***
D: 4 E: -1		Field Work		_	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ FO	4 00	4 00	4 00	4 00	***
		rience contribute to		6	0	0	0	1 1	0	0		****/ 58 ****/ 52		4.00	4.22	4.20	***
. Dia you	clearly	y understand your eva	luation criteria	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	***
היש ביוב		Self Paced		_	0	0	0	0	0	1	г оо	****/ 55	++++	++++	1 21	1 67	+++
	_	system contribute to tions make clear the	_	6 6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 55 ****/ 42		****	4.34	4.67 5.00	***
. Dia stud	iy quesi	cions make clear the	expected goal	O	U	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	/ 42			4.31	5.00	
			Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
redits Ear	rned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 4		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	 s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	 or	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	в 3														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0		E]	ecti	ves				0	#### -					gh
			P 0									respons	es to k	oe sign	nificar	nt	
			I 0		Ot	her					7						
			? 0														

University of Maryland Course Section: CMSC 201 0101 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 7

JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Page 377

_			
Ctudont	Courac	Prrolustion	Ouestionnaire
Scudent	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions					MD	NA	Fre	-	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Quescions	, 								. – – –							
		General	L															
		w insights,skil			0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1052/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.14
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	293/1666		4.23	4.19	4.29	4.71
	_	estions reflect	_	-	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	493/1421	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.57
		ations reflect	_	-	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	323/1617	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.67
	_	adings contribu		-	0	1	2	0	3	1	0		1521/1555	2.95	3.39	4.00	3.96	2.50
		signments contri			0	4 0	0	0	1 1	1 2	1	4.00	895/1543		4.11	4.06	4.10	4.00
		system clearly was class cance		L	0	0	0	0	U T	1	4 6	4.43		4.46 4.88	4.26 4.67	4.12	4.19 4.59	4.43 4.86
	_	rade the overal		offoatiwonoaa	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1605			4.07	4.15	4.30
9. HOW WOU	.ia you g	rade the overal	ii teaciiiig	effectiveness	5	U	U	U	U	U	۷	5.00	1/1003	4.32	4.09	4.07	4.13	4.30
		Discuss	sion															
		ıssions contribu			1	0	0	0	1	1	4		445/1490		3.90	4.05	4.11	4.50
		its actively end			1	0	0	0	2	2	2		1013/1502		4.06	4.26	4.31	4.00
3. Did the	instruc	tor encourage f	fair and or	en discussion	1	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1379/1489	3.91	4.13	4.29	4.36	3.17
		Laborat	orv															
1. Did the	lab inc	rease understar	-	e material	3	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	172/ 226	4.40	4.38	4.20	4.42	3.75
		led with adequat	_		4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	66/ 233	4.73	4.47	4.19	4.36	4.67
3. Were ne	cessary	materials avail	lable for l	ab activities	3	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	102/ 225	4.87	4.83	4.50	4.74	4.67
4. Did the	lab ins	structor provide	e assistano	e.	4	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	109/ 223	4.69	4.70	4.35	4.71	4.50
5. Were re	quiremer	its for lab repo	orts clearl	y specified	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	4.50	4.72	4.15	4.59	****
		Field V	Jork															
1 Did fie	ld exper	rience contribut		vou learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	Ο	3 00	****/ 58	4.00	4.00	4.22	4.20	****
	_	understand you		-	6	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 52		****	4.06	5.00	****
	2												, -					
		Self I			_								==					
	_	system contributions make clear		-	6 6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55 ****/ 42	****	****	4.34	4.67 5.00	****
2. DIG Stu	ay quest	lons make clear	r the exped	ted goal	О	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	***/ 42			4.31	5.00	
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	rnod	Cum. GPA	τ.	Expected Grades				Por	sons				Ту	20			Majors	
	ea	Culli. GPA								· 			ту.				Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Re	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 3														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		_						_			_			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - :				_	h
				P 0		O	h =					7	respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				5 0 I 0		Ut.	her					7						
				: U														

Course Section: CMSC 201 0102 University of Maryland Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I Baltimore County

Instructor: DESJARDINS, MAR Fall 2006

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 378 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

9

							Fre	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 General	 1															
1. Did vou	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	345/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.70
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	439/1666	4.47	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.60
		uestions reflect			0	0	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	932/1421	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.10
	_	uations reflect			0	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	717/1617	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.33
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	1	2	3	2	1	0	2.25	1542/1555	2.95	3.39	4.00	3.96	2.25
6. Did wri	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	390/1543	4.41	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.50
7. Was the	grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	651/1647	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.40
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1668	4.88	4.67	4.67	4.59	5.00
9. How wou	ıld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	851/1605	4.32	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.10
		Lecture	e															
1. Were th	ne instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1052/1514	4.73	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.30
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	1193/1551	4.62	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.50
3. Was lec	cture mat	terial presented	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	556/1503	4.54	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.50
4. Did the	electure	es contribute to	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	642/1506	4.31	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.50
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	0	1	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	846/1311	3.63	3.76	3.85	3.96	3.67
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	4	0	3.40	1215/1490	4.09	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.40
				d to participate	6	0	0	1	1	1	1		1301/1502	3.83	4.06	4.26	4.31	3.50
				d open discussion	7	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1398/1489	3.91	4.13	4.29	4.36	3.00
		echniques succes		-	6	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	178/1006	3.30	3.40	4.00	3.99	4.67
		Labora	torv															
1. Did the	lab in	crease understa	-	f the material	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 226	4.40	4.38	4.20	4.42	****
			_	ground information	9	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 233	4.73	4.47	4.19	4.36	****
_	_	_		or lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	4.87	4.83	4.50	4.74	****
4. Did the	lab in	structor provide	e assis	tance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	4.69	4.70	4.35	4.71	***
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Constitution To		C CDA		Towns of Goods				ъ.									N	
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 7		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В 2													_	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0		_						_			_			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh

Other

0

0

Ρ Ι

University of Maryland Course Section: CMSC 201 0103 COMPILTER SCIENCE I

Baltimore County Fall 2006

TILLE	COMPUTER SCIENCE I
Instructor:	DESJARDINS, MAR
Enrollmont:	9

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 7 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions			NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5		ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		General	 I															
1. Did vou	gain ne	w insights,skil		this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	705/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.43
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	662/1666	4.47	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.43
		estions reflect	_	-	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	789/1421	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.29
4. Did oth	er evalu	ations reflect	the expe	ected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	323/1617	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.67
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contribu	ite to wh	nat you learned	1	0	3	0	0	2	1	2.67	1505/1555	2.95	3.39	4.00	3.96	2.67
6. Did wri	tten ass	ignments contri	ibute to	what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	390/1543	4.41	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.50
7. Was the	grading	system clearly	y explair	ned	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	962/1647	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.14
	-	was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	807/1668	4.88	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.86
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overal	ll teach:	ing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	918/1605	4.32	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.00
		Lecture	9															
1. Were th	e instru	ctor's lectures	s well pi	repared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	505/1514	4.73	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.71
	Lecture Mere the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Mas lecture material presented and explained clearly Did the lectures contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1135/1551	4.62	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.57		
			0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	852/1503	4.54	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.29		
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to	what yo	ou learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	884/1506	4.31	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.29
5. Did aud	liovisual	techniques enh	nance you	ır understanding	0	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	731/1311	3.63	3.76	3.85	3.96	3.86
		Discuss	sion															
		ssions contribu			2	0	0	0	2	2	1		1003/1490	4.09	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.80
		its actively end	_		2	0	0	1	0	2	2		1013/1502	3.83	4.06	4.26	4.31	4.00
		_		open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	596/1489	3.91		4.29	4.36	4.60
4. Were sp	ecial te	chniques succes	ssful		2	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1006	3.30	3.40	4.00	3.99	****
		Laborat	-															
		rease understar			6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 226	4.40	4.38	4.20	4.42	****
				round information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 233	4.73	4.47	4.19	4.36	****
	_			lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 225	4.87	4.83	4.50	4.74	****
		structor provide			6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 223	4.69	4.70	4.35	4.71	****
5. Were re	equiremen	its for lab repo	orts clea	arly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	4.50	4.72	4.15	4.59	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	irned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2				 ed fo	or Ma	iors		0	Graduate		0	Majo		2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 2		100	2411	-a -t	J_ 110	, 01 6	-	•	or adda co	-	•	1100	-	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	nera:	1				1	Under-q	rad	7	Non-	-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		001		_				_	011401 9			2.011		_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoua	ah
	-	· · · · · · · · · ·		P 0									response				_	•
				I 0		O+1	ner					4					-	

Page 379

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Instructor: DESJARDINS, MAR (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 7

Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 380 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Questions	NR	NA	Fro	eque: 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1026/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	841/1666	4.47	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	886/1421	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	863/1617	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	1	1	3.00	1427/1555	2.95	3.39	4.00	3.96	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	895/1543	4.41	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	948/1647	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668	4.88	4.67	4.67	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	918/1605	4.32	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	799/1514	4.73	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1326/1551	4.62	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	932/1503	4.54	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	3			1069/1506		4.11			4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	890/1311	3.63	3.76	3.85	3.96	1.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1003/1490	4.09	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	3	1		1013/1502	3.83	4.06	4.26	4.31	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2		4.20	953/1489	3.91	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	967/1006	3.30	3.40	4.00	3.99	2.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	77/ 226	4.40	4.38	4.20	4.42	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 233	4.73	4.47	4.19	4.36	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 225	4.87	4.83	4.50	4.74	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	109/ 223	4.69	4.70	4.35	4.71	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	4.50	4.72	4.15	4.59	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	81/ 112	4.25		4.38	4.59	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.50	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	4.00	4.00	4.22	4.20	****
Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re:	asons				Туј	ne.			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 1		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	9	0	Majo	r	2
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 3		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	5
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0								1			1			1-
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1 respons				_	n
I 0		Otl	ner					5	10250118					
? 0														

Course Section: CMSC 201 0104 University of Maryland

Fall 2006

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I Baltimore County Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 19

Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 381

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Questions			NID	NT 70	Fro	equei 2	ncies	4	_		ructor		Dept		Level	Sect		
		Question	5 			NA			3 	- -		Mean	Rank 		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
_	_	w insights,ski			1	0	0	0	1	3	2		1026/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.17
		tor make clear		_	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	841/1666		4.23	4.19	4.29	4.29
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	886/1421	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.17
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	863/1617	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.20
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	1	1	3.00	1427/1555	2.95	3.39	4.00	3.96	3.00
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	895/1543	4.41	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.00
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	948/1647	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.17
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668	4.88	4.67	4.67	4.59	5.00
		Lectur	е															
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1551	4.62	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.29
					5	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1296/1311	3.63		3.85	3.96	1.87
	d audiovisual techniques enhance your understa Discussion d class discussions contribute to what you lea																	
1. Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1003/1490	4.09	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.80
				ed to participate	2	0	0	0	1	3	1		1013/1502		4.06	4.26	4.31	4.00
		-	_		2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	953/1489		4.13	4.29	4.36	4.20
		_		d open discussion	2	3	0	1	1	0	0	2.50			3.40	4.00		2.50
i. Mere pl	old the instructor encourage fair and open discuss: Were special techniques successful				2	3	O		1	U	U	2.50	J07/1000	3.30	3.40	1.00	3.99	2.50
		Labora	-															
1. Did the	e lab inc	rease understa	nding c	of the material	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	77/ 226	4.40	4.38	4.20	4.42	4.50
2. Were yo	ou provid	ed with adequa	te back	ground information	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 233	4.73	4.47	4.19	4.36	5.00
3. Were no	ecessary	materials avai	lable f	or lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 225	4.87	4.83	4.50	4.74	5.00
4. Did the	e lab ins	tructor provid	e assis	stance	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	109/ 223	4.69	4.70	4.35	4.71	4.50
5. Were re	equiremen	ts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	4.50	4.72	4.15	4.59	****
		Semina	r															
1. Were as	ssigned t	opics relevant	to the	announced theme	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	81/ 112	4.25	4.33	4.38	4.59	4.00
2. Was the	e instruc	tor available	for ind	lividual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	***	4.20	4.36	4.60	****
				what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.50	****
		Field	Work															
1. Did fie	eld exper	ience contribu	te to w	hat you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	4.00	4.00	4.22	4.20	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Τv	pe			Majors	5
				·														
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Re	quir	ea i	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 1		_		-						,	_			_
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 3		Ge	nera	Τ				0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### -				_	jh
				P 0									respons	es to k	oe sigr	nificar	nt	
						Ot]	her					5						
	3 O I O																	

Course Section: CMSC 201 0104 University of Maryland COMPUTER SCIENCE I Baltimore County

Title Instructor: (Instr. D) Fall 2006

Enrollment: 19

Ouestionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 382

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Ouestions Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 2 4.17 1026/1669 4.38 4.28 4.23 4.34 4.17 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 5 2 4.29 841/1666 4.47 4.23 4.19 4.29 4.29 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 0 2 1 3 4.17 886/1421 4.42 4.27 4.24 4.35 4.17 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 1 0 1 0 1 3 4.20 863/1617 4.50 4.24 4.15 4.24 4.205. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 3 1 1 1 3.00 1427/1555 2.95 3.39 4.00 3.96 3.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 4 0 0 4.00 895/1543 4.41 4.11 4.06 4.10 4.00 0 0 2 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 948/1647 4.46 4.26 4.12 4.19 4.17 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 1 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1668 4.88 4.67 4.67 4.59 5.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 0 0 2 2 3.80 1003/1490 4.09 3.90 4.05 4.11 3.80 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0 1 3 1 4.00 1013/1502 3.83 4.06 4.26 4.31 4.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 1 2 2 4.20 953/1489 3.91 4.13 4.29 4.36 4.20 4. Were special techniques successful 1 1 0 0 2.50 967/1006 3.30 3.40 4.00 3.99 2.50 Laboratory 0 0 1 1 4.50 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 5 0 0 77/ 226 4.40 4.38 4.20 4.42 4.50 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 233 4.73 4.47 4.19 4.36 5.00 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 225 4.87 4.83 4.50 4.74 5.00 5 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 109/ 223 4.69 4.70 4.35 4.71 4.50 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 0 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 206 4.50 4.72 4.15 4.59 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5 0 0 81/ 112 4.25 4.33 4.38 4.59 4.00 0 1 0 1 4.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 0 0 0 4.00 ****/ 97 **** 4.20 4.36 4.60 **** 0 0 1 6 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.80 4.22 4.50 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned Field Work 6 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 58 4.00 4.00 4.22 4.20 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: CMSC 201 0105 Title

COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Instructor: DESJARDINS, MAR (Instr. A)

Enrollment:

15

Questionnaires: 7

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 383 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	511/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57			4.23	4.19	4.29	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43			4.27	4.24	4.35	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	496/1617		4.24	4.15	4.24	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	1		1287/1555		3.39	4.00	3.96	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25			4.11		4.10	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	250/1647		4.26	4.12	4.19	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1144/1668	4.88	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1172/1605	4.32	4.09	4.07	4.15	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	274/1514	4.73	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	954/1551	4.62	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	686/1503	4.54	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	407/1506	4.31	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	426/1311	3.63	3.76	3.85	3.96	3.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	298/1490	4.09	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	3	2		1231/1502		4.06	4.26	4.31	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	2	1	3		1146/1489		4.13	4.29	4.36	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	479/1006	3.30	3.40	4.00	3.99	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	56/ 226	4.40	4.38	4.20	4.42	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33			4.47	4.19	4.36	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 225	4.87	4.83	4.50	4.74	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 223		4.70	4.35	4.71	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	117/ 206	4.50	4.72	4.15	4.59	4.00
Seminar	_						_			4 0=			4 = 0	
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 112		4.33	4.38	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	* * * *	4.00	3.95	4.20	
Field Work	_	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ FO	4 00	4 00	4 00	4 00	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0 0	0	0	0	1 1	0	4.00	****/ 58 ****/ 52	4.00	4.00	4.22 4.06	4.20	****
 Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria Was the instructor available for consultation 	6 6	0	0	0	0	0	1			****	****	4.06	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00 5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30		****	4.33	5.00	****
3. Did conferences help you early out field decivities	O	O	Ü	O	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	, 30			1.33	3.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	***	****	4.34	5.00	***

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Instructor: DESJARDINS, MAR (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2006

Frequency Distribution

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

Page 383

JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I Instructor:

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

Enrollment: 15 Ouestionnaires: 7 (Instr. D)

Fall 2006

Page 384 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 5.00 ****

6 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 5.00 ****

			Er/	~ ~	naier			Ingi	tructor	Courac	Dent	TIMDC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	ncies 3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	511/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	472/1666		4.23	4.19	4.29	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43			4.27	4.24	4.35	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1287/1555	2.95	3.39	4.00	3.96	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	659/1543	4.41	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	250/1647	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1144/1668	4.88	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1605	4.32	4.09	4.07	4.15	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1514	4.73	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1551	4.62	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1503	4.54	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1506	4.31	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1311	3.63	3.76	3.85	3.96	3.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	298/1490	4.09	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1231/1502	3.83	4.06	4.26	4.31	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1146/1489	3.91	4.13	4.29	4.36	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	479/1006	3.30	3.40	4.00	3.99	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	56/ 226	4.40	4.38	4.20	4.42	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	105/ 233	4.73	4.47	4.19	4.36	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 225	4.87	4.83	4.50	4.74	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 223		4.70	4.35	4.71	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	117/ 206	4.50	4.72	4.15	4.59	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	4.25	4.33	4.38	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	***	4.00	3.95	4.20	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	4.00	4.00	4.22	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40		****	3.97	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 55		****	4.34	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42		****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 46		****	4.45	5.00	****
4	_	^	^	^	^	^	- 1	F 00	4444/ 22	4444	ALL DE PLANTS	4 0 5	- 00	also also also also

6 0 0

Course Section: CMSC 201 0105 University of Maryland Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Page 384

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

Course Section: CMSC 201 0106 University of Maryland COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Title Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Instructor: DESJARDINS, MAR (Instr. A) Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 385

							Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera																
1. Did	you gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1026/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.17
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1094/1666	4.47	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.00
3. Did	the exam qu	uestions reflec	t the	expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	969/1421	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.00
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.50
5. Did	assigned re	eadings contrik	oute to	what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	2	0	2.67	1505/1555	2.95	3.39	4.00	3.96	2.67
6. Did	written as:	signments contr	ribute t	to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	390/1543	4.41	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.50
7. Was	the grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	481/1647	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.50
8. How	many times	was class cand	celled		0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1668	4.88	4.67	4.67	4.59	5.00
9. How	would you	grade the overa	all tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	690/1605	4.32	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.63
		Lectur																
1. Wer	e the instr	uctor's lecture	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	308/1514	4.73	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.83	
2. Did	the instru	ctor seem inter	rested :	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	705/1551	4.62	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.83
3. Was	lecture mat	terial presente	ed and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	800/1503	4.54	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.33
4. Did	the lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	1277/1506	4.31	4.11	4.26	4.33	3.67
5. Did	audiovisua	l techniques er	hance y	your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	501/1311	3.63	3.76	3.85	3.96	4.17
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did	class disc	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	849/1490	4.09	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.00
2. Wer	e all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1253/1502	3.83	4.06	4.26	4.31	3.67
3. Did	the instru	ctor encourage	fair an	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	865/1489	3.91	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.33
4. Wer	e special to	echniques succe	essful		0	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	3.30	3.40	4.00	3.99	****
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credit	s Earned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected Grades				P.e.	asons	=			Ту	ne			Majors	•
			<u>.</u> 							<i>-</i> 								,
00-27		0.00-0.99	1	A 5		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	5	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	4
28-55 56-83		1.00-1.99	0	B 1		~		,				0	TT		_	37		0
56-83	Λ	2 00-2 99	Ω	C 0		(+⊖.	nera	1				Λ	IInder-a	rad	6	Non-	-maior	- 7

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

Course Section: CMSC 201 0106 University of Maryland Page 386 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1026/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1094/1666	4.47	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	969/1421	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	2	0	2.67	1505/1555	2.95	3.39	4.00	3.96	2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	390/1543	4.41	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	481/1647	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1668	4.88	4.67	4.67	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1605	4.32	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	849/1490	4.09	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1253/1502	3.83	4.06	4.26	4.31	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	865/1489	3.91	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	3.30	3.40	4.00	3.99	****

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

Course Section: CMSC 201 0201 University of Maryland Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I Baltimore County Instructor:

EVANS, SUSAN A Fall 2006

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	143/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	218/1666	4.47	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	392/1421	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	370/1617	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	773/1555	2.95	3.39	4.00	3.96	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1543	4.41	4.11	4.06	4.10	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	302/1647	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1668	4.88	4.67	4.67	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	373/1605	4.32	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	Ο	0	0	0	Ο	0	9	5.00	1/1514	4.73	4.40	4.39	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	567/1551	4.62	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	254/1503	4.54	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	353/1506		4.11	4.26	4.33	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	189/1311		3.76	3.85	3.96	4.67
Discounter														
Discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4 22	600/1400	4 00	2 00	4 05	4.11	4.33
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3 2	0	0 1	0	2	1	3	4.33	622/1490 1231/1502	4.09 3.83	3.90 4.06	4.05 4.26	4.11	3.71
 Were all students actively encouraged to participate Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 	3	0	0	0	2	1 0	3		1038/1489	3.83	4.06	4.26	4.31	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	U	U	U	3	U	3	4.00	1038/1489	3.91	4.13	4.29	4.30	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	102/ 226	4.40	4.38	4.20	4.42	4.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	44/ 233	4.73	4.47	4.19	4.36	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 225	4.87	4.83	4.50	4.74	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 223	4.69	4.70	4.35	4.71	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 206	4.50	4.72	4.15	4.59	5.00
5. Here requirements for run reports creatif specifica	•	_	3	3	3	3	3	3.00	1, 200	1.50	,2	1.13	1.33	3.00

Page 387

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	 Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	_			
				?	0						

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 388

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Non-major 3

Course Section: CMSC 201 0202 University of Maryland Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A

С

D F

Ρ

Ι

?

1

0

0

0

Enrollment:

56-83

84-150

Grad.

1

0

0

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

2

Questionnaires: 6

19

								Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	5			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1																
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	om this cour	rse	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	183/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.83
		ctor make clear				0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1666		4.23	4.19	4.29	4.83
		estions reflec				0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1421	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.35	5.00
	_	ations reflect				0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	161/1617	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.80
		adings contrib				0	1	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1021/1555	2.95	3.39	4.00	3.96	3.80
		signments contr				0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1543	4.41	4.11	4.06	4.10	5.00
		g system clearl				0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1647	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.19	5.00
8. How max	ny times	was class cance	elled			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1668	4.88	4.67	4.67	4.59	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effect	tiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	127/1605	4.32	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.83
		Lectur	<u> </u>																
1. Were ti	he instru	ctor's lecture		prepared		0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1514	4.73	4.40	4.39	4.39	5.00
	id the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	4.62	4.55	4.66	4.72	5.00
		erial presente		-		0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	191/1503	4.54	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.83
		es contribute to		_	_	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	471/1506	4.31	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.67
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	nance y	your underst	tanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1311	3.63	3.76	3.85	3.96	5.00
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib		what you le	earned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	192/1490	4.09	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.83
		nts actively en		-		0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	818/1502	3.83	4.06	4.26	4.31	4.33
		ctor encourage				0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	684/1489	3.91	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.50
		echniques succe		of		0	2	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	479/1006		3.40	4.00		4.00
		Labora	tory																
1 Did th	e lah ind	rease understa		of the mate	rial	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	56/ 226	4.40	4.38	4.20	4.42	4.67
		led with adequa				3	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/ 233		4.47	4.19	4.36	5.00
_	_	materials avai		-		3	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/ 225		4.83	4.50	4.74	5.00
	_	structor provid			1,10100	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 223		4.70	4.35	4.71	
	<u>-</u>						Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gr								Rea	asons	5 			Туј	pe 			Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	3		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2				_					_				_	

General

Other

Electives

0

0

6

Under-grad 6

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 389 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				_	ncies		_		tructor		Dept		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	2	4.20	988/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	2		1094/1666		4.23	4.19	4.29	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	683/1421	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40			4.24	4.15	4.24	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	0	1	1		1514/1555		3.39	4.00	3.96	2.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	580/1543	4.41	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	651/1647	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	901/1668	4.88	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	690/1605	4.32	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	679/1514	4.73	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	788/1551	4.62	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	464/1503	4.54	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	909/1506	4.31	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	587/1311	3.63	3.76	3.85	3.96	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1490	4.09	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1371/1502	3.83	4.06	4.26	4.31	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	1441/1489	3.91	4.13	4.29	4.36	2.75
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	997/1006	3.30	3.40	4.00	3.99	2.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 226		4.38	4.20	4.42	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	83/ 233		4.47	4.19	4.36	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	1		127/ 225		4.83	4.50	4.74	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 223		4.70	4.35	4.71	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	4.50	4.72	4.15	4.59	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	***	4.80	4.22	4.50	****
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum GPA Expected Grades				Re.	agons	q			Tv	ne			Maiors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	4	_			
				?	0						

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 390 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	988/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	439/1666	4.47	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1421	4.42	4.27		4.35	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	219/1617	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	0	1		1533/1555	2.95	3.39	4.00	3.96	2.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1543	4.41	4.11	4.06	4.10	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	167/1647	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3		1125/1668	4.88	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	373/1605	4.32	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.50
Lecture	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4 00	260/1514	4 72	4 40	4 20	4 20	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1 2	4	4.80	360/1514 1111/1551	4.73	4.40 4.55	4.39 4.66	4.39 4.72	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	464/1503	4.62	4.55	4.00	4.72	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	3		1069/1506	4.31	4.10	4.24	4.29	4.60 4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	587/1311			3.85	3.96	4.00
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	U	U	1	Т	U	3	4.00	56//1311	3.03	3.70	3.05	3.90	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	389/1490	4.09	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	540/1502	3.83	4.06	4.26	4.31	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	434/1489	3.91	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	3.30	3.40	4.00	3.99	****
T albania banna														
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	140/ 226	4 40	4 20	4 20	4 40	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1 0	0	1 2	5.00	140/ 226 1/ 233	4.40 4.73	4.38 4.47	4.20 4.19	4.42 4.36	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 233	4.73	4.47	4.19		5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 223	4.87			4.74	5.00
-	3	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 206	4.69	4.70 4.72	4.35	4.71	5.00 ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	Τ	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 206	4.50	4.72	4.15	4.59	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 112	4.25	4.33	4.38	4.59	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	38/ 58	4.00	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	****	4.22	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.00	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	***	***	4.33	5.00	****
3. Did conferences help you carry out freid activities	7	U	U	U	U	U	_	5.00	, 30			1.55	5.00	
_														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	5	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	

I 0 Other 4 ? 1

Course Section: CMSC 201 0205 University of Maryland Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I Instructor:

5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified

Baltimore County EVANS, SUSAN A Fall 2006

Enrollment: 16 Ouestionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 391

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

76/ 206 4.50 4.72 4.15 4.59 4.50

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 4 4.50 590/1669 4.38 4.28 4.23 4.34 4.50 4.23 4.19 4.29 4.50 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 4 4.50 549/1666 4.47 0 0 0 0 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 1 4 4.50 557/1421 4.42 4.27 4.24 4.35 4.50 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 1 4 4.50 496/1617 4.50 4.24 4.15 4.24 4.50 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 01 1 0 3 4.00 773/1555 2.95 3.39 4.00 3.96 4.00 0 1 0 3 4.50 390/1543 4.41 4.11 4.06 4.10 4.50 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 2 1 3 4.17 948/1647 4.46 4.26 4.12 4.19 4.17 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 844/1668 4.88 4.67 4.67 4.59 4.83 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 3 1 4.25 690/1605 4.32 4.09 4.07 4.15 4.25 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Ω Ω Ω Ω 1 2 3 4.33 1022/1514 4.73 4.40 4.39 4.39 4.33 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 1304/1551 4.62 4.55 4.66 4.72 4.33 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 1 4 4.50 556/1503 4.54 4.16 4.24 4.29 4.50 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 1 0 4 4.00 1069/1506 4.31 4.11 4.26 4.33 4.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 1 3 4.00 587/1311 3.63 3.76 3.85 3.96 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 3 1 1 3.60 1117/1490 4.09 3.90 4.05 4.11 3.60 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 1 0 2 1 2 3.50 1301/1502 3.83 4.06 4.26 4.31 3.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 1 1 2 3.80 1168/1489 3.91 4.13 4.29 4.36 3.80 4. Were special techniques successful 1 3 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 759/1006 3.30 3.40 4.00 3.99 3.50 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 4 0 0 0 0 1 4.50 77/ 226 4.40 4.38 4.20 4.42 4.50 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 4 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 83/ 233 4.73 4.47 4.19 4.36 4.50 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 127/ 225 4.87 4.83 4.50 4.74 4.50 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 0 1 1 0 3.50 200/223 4.69 4.70 4.35 4.71 3.50 4 0 0

4 0 Frequency Distribution

0

0 0 1 1 4.50

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	1	Under-grad	6	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Ĺ
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-			
				2	^						

Course Section: CMSC 201 0206 University of Maryland COMPUTER SCIENCE I Baltimore County

Title EVANS, SUSAN A

Instructor: Enrollment: 17

Questionnaires: 7 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 392 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	_	0	0	1	0	1	_	4 42	705/1660	4.38	4.28	4 00	4 24	4 42
 Did you gain new insights, skills from this course Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 	0	0	0	0	0	1 1	5	4.43	705/1669 142/1666	4.38	4.28	4.23 4.19	4.34	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	184/1421	4.42	4.27	4.19	4.35	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	424/1617	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	1	1	0		1543/1555	2.95	3.39	4.00	3.96	2.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	250/1543	4.41	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	481/1647	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1668	4.88	4.67	4.67	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	654/1605	4.32	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.29
y. now would you grade one everall codoming erroceiveness	Ü	Ü	ŭ	ŭ	_			1.27	031,1003	1.52	1.05	1.07	1115	1.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1514	4.73	4.40	4.39	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	650/1551	4.62	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	173/1503	4.54	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	744/1506	4.31	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	232/1311	3.63	3.76	3.85	3.96	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	0	1	1		1456/1490	4.09	3.90	4.05	4.11	2.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	2	1	2		1301/1502	3.83	4.06	4.26	4.31	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	1	1	3		1155/1489	3.91	4.13	4.29	4.36	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	3.30	3.40	4.00	3.99	****
- 1														
Laboratory	4	0	0	0	0	_	-1	4 22	116/ 006	4 40	4 20	4 00	4 40	4 22
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	116/ 226 66/ 233	4.40	4.38	4.20	4.42	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67 5.00	1/ 225	4.73 4.87	4.47	4.19	4.36	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 223		4.83	4.50	4.74 4.71	5.00 5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 223	4.69 4.50	4.70 4.72	4.35 4.15	4.71	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	1/ 206	4.50	4./2	4.15	4.59	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 112	4.25	4.33	4.38	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****
	_	-	-	-	-	_	-		, 20					
_														

Fall 2006

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	•	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	_			
				2	1						

Course Section: CMSC 201H 0101 University of Maryland Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I Baltimore County

COMPUTER SCIENCE I Baltimore County EVANS, SUSAN A (Instr. A) Fall 2006

Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN
Enrollment: 5

Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 393 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

2									*										
								Fr	eque:	ncies	\$		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5]	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																	
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,skil	ls fro	om this course		0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	816/1669	4.33	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.33
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals		0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	777/1666	4.33	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.33
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflect	the e	expected goals		0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	746/1421	4.33	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.33
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals		0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.00
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learn	.ed	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1133/1555	3.67	3.39	4.00	3.96	3.67
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contri	.bute t	to what you lea	rned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.50
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearly	expla	ained		0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	302/1647	4.67	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.67
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.59	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overal	l tead	ching effective	ness	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.00
		Lecture	3																
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures	well	prepared		0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1199/1514	4.00	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.00
				0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1304/1551	3.67	4.55	4.66	4.72	3.67		
3. Was le							0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	386/1503	4.67	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.67
4. Did th	Was lecture material presented and explained clearing the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1277/1506	3.67	4.11	4.26	4.33	3.67
5. Did au	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understa						0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.76	3.85	3.96	4.00
		Discuss	sion																
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contribu	ite to	what you learn	.ed	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.00
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively end	courage	ed to participa	.te	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1475/1502	2.50	4.06	4.26	4.31	2.50
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage f	air ar	nd open discuss	ion	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1279/1489	3.50	4.13	4.29	4.36	3.50
4. Were s	special t	echniques succes	sful	-		1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	923/1006	3.00	3.40	4.00	3.99	3.00
		Laborat	ory																
1. Did th	ne lab in	crease understar	nding o	of the material		2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 226	5.00	4.38	4.20	4.42	5.00
2. Were y	ou provi	ded with adequat	e bacl	ground informa	tion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.47	4.19	4.36	5.00
3. Were n	necessary	materials avail	able i	or lab activit	ies	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 225	5.00	4.83	4.50	4.74	5.00
4. Did th	ne lab in	structor provide	assis	stance		2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 223	5.00	4.70	4.35	4.71	5.00
5. Were r	. Did the lab instructor provide assistance . Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified					2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 206	5.00	4.72	4.15	4.59	5.00
					Freque	ncy	Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits F	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected G								Re	asons	:			Ty	ne			Majors	3
	edits marned cum. GPA mapected G.																		
00-27 28-55								quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	1
56-83	-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1							nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	-major	2

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

Course Section: CMSC 201H 0101 University of Maryland Page 394
Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 5
Questionnaires: 3

B) Fall 2000

Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	816/1669	4.33	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	777/1666	4.33	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	746/1421	4.33	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1133/1555	3.67	3.39	4.00	3.96	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	302/1647	4.67	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.59	5.00
Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1525/1551	3.67	4.55	4.66	4.72	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1475/1502	2.50	4.06	4.26	4.31	2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1279/1489	3.50	4.13	4.29	4.36	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	923/1006	3.00	3.40	4.00	3.99	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 226	5.00	4.38	4.20	4.42	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.47	4.19	4.36	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 225	5.00	4.83	4.50	4.74	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 223	5.00	4.70	4.35	4.71	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 206	5.00	4.72	4.15	4.59	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sid	nificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-	-	•	
				2	Λ						

COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Title Instructor: WORTMAN, DANA T

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 7

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 395 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General		_	_	_		_								
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	705/1669	4.63	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4		472/1666	4.52	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	789/1421	4.30	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	717/1617	4.57	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	1	1	0		1490/1555	3.50	3.39	4.00	3.96	2.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	1	1		1260/1543	4.13	4.11	4.06	4.10	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	828/1647	4.48	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	1		1451/1668	4.43	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	918/1605	4.31	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.00
Lecture														
	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	274/1514	4.46	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.86
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	-	0	1	6	4.86	650/1551	4.46	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.86
	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.86	852/1503	4.46	4.55	4.00	4.72	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3 4	4.43	744/1506	4.28	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.43
<u>-</u>	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 6	4.43	,					
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	U	U	U	Τ	U	ь	4./1	163/1311	4.35	3.76	3.85	3.96	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1154/1490	4.22	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	632/1502	4.43	4.06	4.26	4.31	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	684/1489	4.25	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	997/1006	3.28	3.40	4.00	3.99	2.00
	_	-	_	-	_	-			,					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	140/ 226	4.15	4.38	4.20	4.42	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	121/ 233	4.01	4.47	4.19	4.36	4.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 225	4.70	4.83	4.50	4.74	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 223	4.68	4.70	4.35	4.71	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	117/ 206	4.79	4.72	4.15	4.59	4.00
-1.33														
Field Work	_	0	-	•	•	0	0	1 00		ate ate ate at	4 00	4 00	4 00	als als als als
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	U	Τ	0	0	U	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.20	***

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	6	-			
				2	1						

COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Title

Instructor: WORTMAN, DANA T

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 396 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	463/1669	4.63	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	715/1666	4.52	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	831/1421	4.30	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	821/1617	4.57	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	2	3	2		1326/1555	3.50	3.39		3.96	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	2		4.50	390/1543	4.13	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	8		446/1647	4.48	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	4		1353/1668	4.43	4.67	4.67		4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	1172/1605	4.31	4.09	4.07	4.15	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0			4.85	291/1514	4.46	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	986/1551	4.46	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6		4.54		4.28	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	534/1506	4.21	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	349/1311	4.35	3.76	3.85	3.96	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	800/1490	4.22	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	1	5	1		1270/1502	4.43	4.06	4.26	4.31	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	4	2		1038/1489	4.25	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/1006	3.28	3.40	4.00	3.99	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	37/ 226	4.15	4.38	4.20	4.42	4.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	83/ 233	4.01	4.47	4.19	4.36	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	102/ 225	4.70	4.83	4.50		4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	2		4.67	85/ 223	4.68	4.70	4.35		4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	56/ 206	4.79	4.72	4.15	4.59	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 112	****	4.33	4.38	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.60	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1 1	0		****/ 105 ****/ 98	****	4.60	4.20	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	U	U	U	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	* * * * *	4.00	3.95	4.20	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Instructor: WORTMAN, DANA T

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 396 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	6
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	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Instructor: WORTMAN, DANA T

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 397 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.29	876/1669	4.63	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	662/1666	4.52	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	789/1421	4.30	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	612/1617	4.57	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	1	1	1		1359/1555	3.50	3.39	4.00	3.96	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	0	1	1		1322/1543	4.13	4.11	4.06	4.10	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	139/1647	4.48	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	3		1257/1668	4.43	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	759/1605	4.31	4.09	4.07		4.20
. 3														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	274/1514	4.46	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1135/1551	4.46	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	978/1503	4.28	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	995/1506	4.21	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	731/1311	4.35	3.76	3.85	3.96	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	Λ	2	1 22	622/1490	4.22	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	0	2		1013/1502	4.43	4.06	4.26	4.31	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	2		865/1489	4.25	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	1	0	0	0		1003/1006	3.28	3.40	4.00		1.50
4. Were special techniques successium	3	2	_		U	U	U	1.50	1003/1000	3.20	3.40	4.00	3.99	1.30
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 226	4.15	4.38	4.20	4.42	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	83/ 233	4.01	4.47	4.19	4.36	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 225	4.70	4.83	4.50	4.74	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	69/ 223	4.68	4.70	4.35	4.71	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	56/ 206	4.79	4.72	4.15	4.59	4.67

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	_			
				2	0						

Course Section: CMSC 202 0104 University of Maryland COMPUTER SCIENCE II Baltimore County

Page 398 Title JAN 18, 2007 Instructor: WORTMAN, DANA T (Instr. A) Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	10
	_

Questionnaires: 3 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

										ructor	Course	_						
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did voi	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	n this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	389/1669	4.63	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.67
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	359/1666	4.52	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.67
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1421	4.30	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.67
	_	ations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1617	4.57	4.24	4.15	4.24	5.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	, .	3.50	3.39	4.00	3.96	4.33
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	250/1543		4.11	4.06	4.10	4.67
		g system clearl			0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1647	4.48	4.26	4.12	4.19	5.00
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1329/1668	4.43	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.33
	-			ning effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	591/1605	4.31	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.33
1 Wara +h	oo inatm	Lectur actor's lecture		-wanawad	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1514	4.46	4.40	4.39	4.39	5.00
		ctor seem inter	_	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1514		4.55	4.66	4.72	4.50	
				plained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1503	4.28	4.16	4.24	4.72	5.00
		es contribute t		-	0	0	0	0	0	1	2		471/1506		4.11	4.24		4.67
				our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1311			3.85	3.96	
5. Did auc	IIOVISUAI	r techniques en	nance y	our understanding	U	U	U	U	U	U	3	5.00	1/1311	4.33	3.70	3.03	3.90	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	assions contrib	ute to 1	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	4.22	3.90	4.05	4.11	5.00
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	4.43	4.06	4.26	4.31	5.00
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair and	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	4.25	4.13	4.29	4.36	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	479/1006	3.28	3.40	4.00	3.99	4.00
				Frequ	ency	7 Dist	trib	ıtio	n									
				1-					_									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1						quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	 5	0	Graduate	 e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1			-			-						3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General							0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0												-		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives						0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	Jh	
				P 0				response	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt						
				I 0		Otl	her					3						
				? 1														

Course Section: CMSC 202 0104 University of Maryland Page 399 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies		3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	389/1669	4.63	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	359/1666	4.52	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1421	4.30	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1617	4.57	4.24	4.15	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	492/1555	3.50	3.39	4.00	3.96	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	250/1543	4.13	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1647	4.48	4.26	4.12	4.19	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1329/1668	4.43	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	4.22	3.90	4.05	4.11	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	4.43	4.06	4.26	4.31	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	4.25	4.13	4.29	4.36	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	479/1006	3.28	3.40	4.00	3.99	4.00

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

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 400 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	448/1669	4.63	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	549/1666	4.52	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	710/1421	4.30	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	161/1617	4.57	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1312/1555	3.50	3.39	4.00	3.96	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	180/1543	4.13	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	862/1647	4.48	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1106/1668	4.43	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	810/1605	4.31	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	4 00	1199/1514	4.46	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	5		1083/1551	4.46	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	3	2		1255/1503	4.28	4.16	4.24	4.29	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	884/1506	4.21	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	389/1311	4.35	3.76	3.85	3.96	4.33
	_	_	-	-	_	_	_							
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	622/1490	4.22	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1160/1502	4.43	4.06	4.26	4.31	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1038/1489	4.25	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	759/1006	3.28	3.40	4.00	3.99	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	Λ	1	Λ	Ο	3 00	****/ 226	4.15	4.38	4.20	4.42	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 233	4.13	4.47	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 225	4.70	4.47	4.19	4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	n	0	1	0		****/ 223	4.68	4.70	4.35	4.71	****
1. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	,	U	U	U	U	_	U	1.00	/ 223	1.00	1.70	1.33	1./1	

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

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 9

Fall 2006

Page 401 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	anier	ncies			Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
~ 														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	448/1669	4.63	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1334/1666	4.52	4.23	4.19	4.29	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	0	4	2	3.75	1135/1421	4.30	4.27	4.24	4.35	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	0	3	3.38	1435/1617	4.57	4.24	4.15	4.24	3.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	2	0	1	2.67	1505/1555	3.50	3.39	4.00	3.96	2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1260/1543	4.13	4.11	4.06	4.10	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	1	1	3	3.50	1393/1647	4.48	4.26	4.12	4.19	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1190/1668	4.43	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1357/1605	4.31	4.09	4.07	4.15	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	1082/1514	4.46	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1551	4.46	4.55	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	2	4		1066/1503	4.28	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	799/1506		4.11	4.26	4.33	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	3	2	-	3.67				3.85	3.96	3.67
	_	_	Ü	Ü	J	_	_	3.07	010,1011	1.55	3.70	3.03	3.70	3.07
Discussion	2	0	0	1	1	2	2	4 00	040/1400	4 22	2 00	4 05	4 11	4 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	-	1	1 2	2	3	4.00	849/1490	4.22	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	-	0	_	_	1	3		1148/1502	4.43	4.06	4.26	4.31	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	2			1038/1489	4.25	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	891/1006	3.28	3.40	4.00	3.99	3.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	116/ 226	4.15	4.38	4.20	4.42	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	193/ 233	4.01	4.47	4.19	4.36	3.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	102/ 225	4.70	4.83	4.50	4.74	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	85/ 223	4.68	4.70	4.35	4.71	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 206	4.79	4.72	4.15	4.59	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.33	4.38	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****
									,					
Self Paced					_	_								
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 401 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course Section: CMSC 202 0203 University of Maryland Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD (Instr. A) Enrollment: 14

Questionnaires: 4

Page 402 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
Deadcire	COULDC	HVAIAACIOII	Queberonnarie

	Frequencies I						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	Ω	0	Λ	0	1	2	4.75	269/1669	4.63	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	549/1666	4.52	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	557/1421	4.30	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	323/1617		4.24	4.15	4.24	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	659/1543	4.13	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	481/1647	4.48	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1190/1668	4.43	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	239/1605	4.31	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1082/1514	4.46	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1551	4.46	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	277/1503		4.16	4.24	4.29	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	642/1506		4.11	4.26	4.33	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	389/1311	4.35	3.76	3.85	3.96	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1490	4.22	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502		4.06	4.26	4.31	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	1		1038/1489		4.13	4.29		4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	140/ 226	4.15	4.38	4.20	4.42	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	203/ 233	4.01	4.47	4.19	4.36	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 225	4.70	4.83	4.50	4.74	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	109/ 223	4.68	4.70	4.35	4.71	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 206	4.79	4.72	4.15	4.59	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	_			
				2	Λ						

Course Section: CMSC 202 0203 University of Maryland Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: (Instr. C)

Enrollment:

Fall 2006

14 Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 403

			Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	269/1669	4.63	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	549/1666	4.52	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	557/1421	4.30	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	323/1617	4.57	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	659/1543	4.13	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	481/1647	4.48	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1190/1668	4.43	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1490	4.22	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	4.43	4.06	4.26	4.31	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1038/1489	4.25	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	140/ 226	4.15	4.38	4.20	4.42	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	203/ 233	4.01	4.47	4.19	4.36	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 225	4.70	4.83	4.50	4.74	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	109/ 223	4.68	4.70	4.35	4.71	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 206	4.79	4.72	4.15	4.59	5.00

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

Course Section: CMSC 202 0204 University of Maryland COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Title Baltimore County Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD (Instr. A) Fall 2006

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 404

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	Ο	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	269/1669	4.63	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	243/1666	4.52	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	814/1421	4.30	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	323/1617	4.57	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	773/1555	3.50	3.39	4.00	3.96	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	895/1543	4.13	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	862/1647	4.48	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1382/1668	4.43	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	239/1605	4.31	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	Λ	0	0	0	Λ	1	2	4.75	441/1514	4.46	4.40	4.39	4.39	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1551	4.46	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	277/1503	4.28	4.16	4.24	4.29	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	909/1506	4.21	4.11	4.26	4.33	3.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	n	n	0	1	0	3	4.50	264/1311	4.35	3.76	3.85	3.96	4.50
J. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding	U	U	U	U		U	J	4.50	204/1311	4.33	3.70	3.03	3.90	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	622/1490	4.22	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	486/1502	4.43	4.06	4.26	4.31	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	865/1489	4.25	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	479/1006	3.28	3.40	4.00	3.99	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	140/ 226	4.15	4.38	4.20	4.42	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	146/ 233	4.01	4.47	4.19	4.36	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	187/ 225	4.70	4.83	4.50	4.74	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 223	4.68	4.70	4.35	4.71	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 206	4.79	4.72	4.15	4.59	5.00

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

Course Section: CMSC 202 0204 University of Maryland

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II Baltimore County Instructor: (Instr. B) Fall 2006

Page 405

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Enrollment:	9	
Questionnaires:	4	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								-	ncies				ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	269/1669	4.63	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.7
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	243/1666	4.52	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.7
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	814/1421	4.30	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.2
. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	323/1617	4.57	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.6
. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	773/1555	3.50	3.39	4.00	3.96	4.0
. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	895/1543	4.13	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.0
. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	862/1647	4.48	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.2
. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1382/1668	4.43	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.2
. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	4.31	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.8
		Lectur	e															
. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1457/1514	4.46	4.40	4.39	4.39	3.8
. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1525/1551	4.46	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.0
. Was le	cture ma	explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1423/1503	4.28	4.16	4.24	4.29	3.8		
. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	you learned	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1490/1506	4.21	4.11	4.26	4.33	3.1	
		Discus																
L. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	622/1490	4.22	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.3
				ed to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	486/1502	4.43	4.06	4.26	4.31	4.6
. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	865/1489	4.25	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.3
. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssful	_	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	479/1006	3.28	3.40	4.00	3.99	4.0
		Labora	tory															
l. Did th	ne lab in	crease understa	nding o	of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	140/ 226	4.15	4.38	4.20	4.42	4.0
2. Were y	ou provi	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	146/ 233	4.01	4.47	4.19	4.36	4.0
. Were n	necessary	materials avai	lable f	for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	187/ 225	4.70	4.83	4.50	4.74	4.0
. Did th	ne lab in	structor provid	e assis	stance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 223	4.68	4.70	4.35	4.71	5.0
. Were r	requireme	nts for lab rep	orts cl	learly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 206	4.79	4.72	4.15	4.59	5.0
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 1 A 1									jors		0	Cwadaat		0	Majo		 2
						ке	quire	eu I	J⊥ IVIč	FJOES		U	Graduat	=	U	Ma JC) <u>T</u>	2
28-55 56-83						00.	nera:	1				0	IIndox	rad	1	N™o∽	maiar	_
							nera.	L				U	Under-g	Lau	4	NON-	major	2
84-150		3.00-3.49	-	D 0 F 0		m 2						0	ишии ,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	h			lo
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F U		EL	ecti	ves				U	#### - 1	means t	mere a	ire not	. enoug	111

Other

I 0

4

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 406 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	^	^	1	^	4	4 60	470 /1660	4 62	4 00	4 02	4 24	4 60
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	Τ	1	4	4.60 4.80	478/1669			4.23	4.34	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	4		181/1666		4.23	4.19	4.29	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	•	•	_	Τ	1	2		1118/1421	4.30	4.27	4.24	4.35	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1617		4.24	4.15	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	Ţ	0	Ţ	0		1427/1555	3.50	3.39	4.00	3.96	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	Τ.		****/1543		4.11	4.06	4.10	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	Ι	4		167/1647		4.26	4.12	4.19	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668		4.67	4.67	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	170/1605	4.31	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	360/1514	4.46	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	788/1551		4.55	4.66	4.72	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	464/1503	4.28	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	286/1506	4.21	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	389/1311	4.35	3.76	3.85	3.96	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1417/1490	4.22	3.90	4.05	4.11	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1013/1502	4.43	4.06	4.26	4.31	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1279/1489	4.25	4.13	4.29	4.36	3.50
T alassa kassa														
Laboratory	0	0	^	1	2	^	1	2 00	206/ 226	4 1 5	4 20	4 00	4 40	2 00
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	U	0	0	Τ	3	0	Ţ	3.20	206/ 226		4.38	4.20	4.42	3.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	Τ	2	2	4.20	121/ 233	4.01	4.47	4.19	4.36	4.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 225	4.70	4.83	4.50	4.74	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	Τ	U	2	2	4.00	164/ 223	4.68	4.70	4.35	4.71	4.00

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

DISCRETE STRUCTURES

Title Instructor: ARTOLA, PAUL

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 13

Fall 2006

Page 407 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Frequencies				Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General	0	0	0	0	4	3	6	A 1E	1039/1669	4.00	1 20	4.23	4.34	4.15
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.15	715/1666	4.00	4.28 4.23	4.23	4.34	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	453/1421	4.16	4.27	4.19	4.25	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	641/1617	3.92	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5 6	1	0	2	2	2		1192/1555	3.29	3.39	4.15	3.96	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	690/1543	4.02	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	446/1647	4.02	4.11	4.12	4.10	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	9		1039/1668	4.81	4.67	4.12	4.19	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22		3.81		4.07		4.22
y. Now would you grade one overall beauting errecorveness	-	Ü	Ü	Ü	_		-		, 23, 1003	3.01	1.05	1.07	1.15	
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	424/1514		4.40	4.39	4.39	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	862/1551	4.54	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	482/1503	4.06	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	10	4.58	566/1506	4.21	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	1027/1311	3.18	3.76	3.85	3.96	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	849/1490	3.61	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1148/1502	3.84	4.06	4.26	4.31	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1038/1489	3.88	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	447/1006	3.76	3.40	4.00	3.99	4.13
T . N														
Laboratory	11	0	^	_	^	^	^	2 00	**** / 000	****	4 20	4 00	4 40	
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 226	****	4.38	4.20	4.42	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 233	****	4.47	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11 12	1 0	0	0	1 1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	4.83	4.50	4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223 ****/ 206	****	4.70 4.72	4.35 4.15	4.71 4.59	****
5. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified	12	U	U	U		U	U	3.00	/ 200		4.72	4.13	4.32	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.33	4.38	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	***	***	4.45	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****
1 Shore shough proceed for all the beautiful		J	,	_	,	,	•	2.00	, 2)				2.00	

Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES

Instructor: ARTOLA, PAUL

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 407 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course Section: CMSC 203 0201 Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES Instructor: CHANG, RICHARD

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 30

37

University of Maryland Page 408 Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

St	udent (ourse 1	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

						Fr	eane	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
		General															
1. Did v	vou gain n	ew insights, skills for	com this course	0	0	1	0	2	11	16	4.37	781/1669	4.00	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.37
		ctor make clear the		0	0	0	3	3	9	15	4.20	957/1666		4.23	4.19	4.29	4.20
		muestions reflect the		1	0	0	0	6	5	18	4.41	670/1421	4.16	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.41
	_	uations reflect the ϵ	_	1	16	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	1029/1617	3.92	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.00
		eadings contribute to		2	9	6	3	6	2	2	2.53	1519/1555	3.29	3.39	4.00	3.96	2.53
6. Did v	written as	signments contribute	to what you learned	1	11	0	1	4	7	6	4.00	895/1543	4.02	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.00
7. Was t	the gradin	g system clearly expl	ained	1	0	0	0	5	7	17	4.41	634/1647	4.38	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.41
8. How r	many times	was class cancelled		1	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1668	4.81	4.67	4.67	4.59	5.00
9. How v	would you	grade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	1	1	0	2	8	17	1	3.61	1312/1605	3.81	4.09	4.07	4.15	3.61
		Lecture															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	0	0	5	5	20	4.50	799/1514	4.40	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.50
2. Did t	the instru	ctor seem interested	in the subject	0	0	0	0	5	4	21	4.53	1168/1551	4.54	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.53
3. Was	lecture ma	terial presented and	explained clearly	0	0	1	2	10	10	7	3.67	1277/1503	4.06	4.16	4.24	4.29	3.67
4. Did t	the lectur	es contribute to what	you learned	0	0	1	1	4	11	13		1002/1506	4.21	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.13
5. Did a	audiovisua	l techniques enhance	your understanding	1	16	3	3	5	2	0	2.46	1234/1311	3.18	3.76	3.85	3.96	2.46
		Discussion															
1. Did	class disc	ussions contribute to	what you learned	20	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1003/1490	3.61	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.80
2. Were	all stude	nts actively encourag	ged to participate	19	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1013/1502	3.84	4.06	4.26	4.31	4.00
3. Did t	the instru	ctor encourage fair a	and open discussion	20	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	953/1489	3.88	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.20
4. Were	special t	echniques successful		19	6	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/1006	3.76	3.40	4.00	3.99	****
		Self Paced															
2. Did	study ques	tions make clear the	expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
			Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utic	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Ty	ne			Majors	:
											ту.				a joi s	, 	
00-27							ed f	or M	Ia jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	12
28-55 56-83	11 3	1.00-1.99 0 2.00-2.99 1	B 6 C 8		0	0.020.5	1				2	IIndox	mad 7	2.0	Moss	ma i a	18
56-83 84-150	3 0	2.00-2.99 1 3.00-3.49 5		Gei	nera	Т				3	Under-g	rau 3	30	NON-	-major	TΩ	
Grad.	0	3.50-3.49 5	D 1 F 1		וים	ecti [.]					1	#### - :	Moona t	horo a	ro not	onoue	•h

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	1	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	4	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	3	Under-grad	30	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	2						

Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES

Instructor: YESHA, YAACOV

Enrollment:

23 Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 409 Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eanei	ncies			Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	3	4	4	0	3.09	1589/1669	4.00	4.28	4.23	4.34	3.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	3	4	1	3.27	1538/1666	4.04	4.23	4.19	4.29	3.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	6	2		1112/1421	4.16	4.27	4.24	4.35	3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1497/1617	3.92	4.24	4.15	4.24	3.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	4	2	2		1272/1555	3.29	3.39	4.00	3.96	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	6	0	3.60	1226/1543	4.02	4.11	4.06	4.10	3.60
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	2	0	1	0	1	4	4		1043/1647	4.38	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	0		4.80	901/1668	4.81	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	6	2	0	3.11	1493/1605	3.81	4.09	4.07	4.15	3.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	1	6	2	3.73	1334/1514	4.40	4.40	4.39	4.39	3.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	4	4		1392/1551	4.54	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.09
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	6	0		1374/1503	4.06	4.16		4.29	3.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	4	4	0		1361/1506	4.21	4.11	4.26	4.33	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	5	3	1	3.56		3.18	3.76	3.85		3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	2	0	2 75	1404/1490	3.61	3.90	4.05	4.11	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4 4	0	1	0	4	3	0		1388/1502	3.84	4.06	4.05	4.11	3.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	1	3	2	0		1459/1489	3.88	4.13	4.29	4.36	2.63
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	810/1006	3.76	3.40			3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	U	U	3	2	U	3.40	810/1000	3.70	3.40	4.00	3.99	3.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 226	****	4.38	4.20	4.42	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 233	****	4.47	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 225	****	4.83	4.50	4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.70	4.35	4.71	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	***	4.72	4.15	4.59	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.33	4.38	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****
		ŭ	ŭ	ŭ	_	•	ŭ	3.00	, 30			1.00	3.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****

Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES

Instructor: YESHA, YAACOV

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 409 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

DISCRETE STRUCTURES

Title Instructor: FREY, DENNIS

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 32

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2006

Page 410 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

	Questions					NA	Fro	eque 2	ncie 3	s 1	5	Ins Mean	tructor Ranl	,	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Quescion				INA						Mean	Raiir	` 	Mean	Mean		Mean	Mean
		Genera	1																
1. Did you	a gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	1	4	9	18	4.38	769/16	569	4.00	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.38
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	16	13	4.31	801/16	566	4.04	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.31
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	2	3	5	11	11	3.81	1112/14	121	4.16	4.27	4.24	4.35	3.81
4. Did oth	ner evalı	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	12	0	2	1	9	8	4.15	911/16	517	3.92	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.15
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to i	what you learned	1	4	0	2	10	11	4	3.63	1163/15	555	3.29	3.39	4.00	3.96	3.63
	_	_		o what you learned	1	11	0	0	3	9	8	4.25	659/15	543	4.02	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.25
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y expla:	ined	1	0	0	0	1	12	18	4.55	435/16	547	4.38	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.55
8. How mar	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	8	23	4.74	978/16	568	4.81	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.74
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	1	0	1	2	11	12	4.31	631/16	505	3.81	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.31
		Lectur	е																
1. Were th	ne instru	actor's lecture	s well]	prepared	1	0	0	0	3	6	22	4.61	663/15	514	4.40	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.61
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested in	n the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	25	4.77	843/15	551	4.54	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.77
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	10	20	4.61	451/15	503	4.06	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.61
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what :	you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	25	4.77	326/15	506	4.21	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.77
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	13	2	1	7	3	4	3.35	1018/13	311	3.18	3.76	3.85	3.96	3.35
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	22	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	956/14	190	3.61	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.90
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	21	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	790/15	502	3.84	4.06	4.26	4.31	4.36
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair and	d open discussion	22	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	500/14	189	3.88	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.70
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		22	5	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/10	006	3.76	3.40	4.00	3.99	****
		Labora	tory																
2. Were yo	ou provid	led with adequa	te back	ground information	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 2	233	****	4.47	4.19	4.36	****
		Field	Work																
1. Did fie	eld exper	rience contribu	te to w	hat you learned	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	58	****	4.00	4.22	4.20	***
		Self	Paced																
1. Did sel	lf-paced	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****
2. Did stu	udy quest	cions make clea	r the e	xpected goal	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n										
Credits Ea	arnod	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				D.O.	ason	a				Ттт				Majors	
										ь 				Тур				Majors	,
00-27						Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	2	Gradu	ıate	2	0	Majo	or	18
28-55						~		,				1							1.4
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5			Gei	nera	T				1	Under	r-gr	ad 3	32	Non-	-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 1								1	допо		· · · · · ·	la a se e			.la
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		E⊥€	ecti	ves				1						enoug	111
				P 0		0+1	L				_		respo	onse	s to r	e sign	ııııcar	16	

Other

25

I

0

1

Title COMP ORGAN & ASSEMB LA

Instructor: BURT, GARY

Enrollment: 31

Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 411 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				equer		s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	6	3	7	2	3.16	1582/1669	2.81	4.28	4.23	4.28	3.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	7	6	0		1602/1666	2.61	4.23	4.19	4.20	2.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	6	5	6	1		1357/1421	3.00	4.27	4.24	4.25	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	3	5	3	2	3.14	1494/1617	3.24	4.24	4.15	4.22	3.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	4	3	2	3	2	2.71	1497/1555	2.52	3.39	4.00	4.03	2.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	1	2	7	2	3.43	1294/1543	3.10	4.11	4.06	4.14	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	6	5	7	1		1512/1647		4.26	4.12	4.14	3.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	1	0	12	5		1530/1668	3.88	4.67	4.67	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	5	1	9	3	0	2.56	1558/1605	2.44	4.09	4.07	4.09	2.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	8	4	3	2	2.74	1481/1514	2.60	4.40	4.39	4.46	2.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	6	6	5	3.68	1475/1551	3.34	4.55	4.66	4.70	3.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	7	5	5	2	0	2.11	1488/1503	2.05	4.16	4.24	4.28	2.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	8	2	2	3		1450/1506	2.37	4.11	4.26	4.30	2.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	3	5	6	0	1	2.40	1245/1311	2.37	3.76	3.85	3.97	2.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	4	0	1	0	2.00	1473/1490	1.86	3.90	4.05	4.11	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	4	0	1	0	2	2.43	1482/1502	2.64	4.06	4.26	4.28	2.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	2	1	1	2	3.14	1384/1489	3.43	4.13	4.29	4.35	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1006	***	3.40	4.00	4.10	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.47	4.19	4.13	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****
Frequ	.ency	Dist	tribu	ıtior	ı									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Title COMP ORGAN & ASSEMB LA

Instructor: BURT, GARY

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 13

Fall 2006

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 412 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
G1														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	1	3	4	0	2 46	1651/1669	2 91	4 28	4.23	4.28	2.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	2	5	2	0		1643/1666		4.23	4.19	4.20	2.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	2	4	2		1357/1421		4.27	4.24	4.25	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	2	1	1	2	3		1448/1617		4.24	4.15	4.22	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	1	3	3	0		1539/1555		3.39	4.00	4.03	2.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	2	3	0	2		1485/1543		4.11	4.06	4.14	2.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	2	3	1	1	2.25	1607/1647	2.70	4.26	4.12	4.14	2.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	11	0	3.77	1613/1668	3.88	4.67	4.67	4.68	3.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	3	3	5	1	0	2.33	1573/1605	2.44	4.09	4.07	4.09	2.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	5	1	4	2	1	2.46	1488/1514	2.60	4.40	4.39	4.46	2.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	4	1	2	3	3		1525/1551		4.55	4.66	4.70	3.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	7	1	3	2	0	2.00	1492/1503	2.05	4.16	4.24	4.28	2.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	2	5	1	0	2.15	1487/1506	2.37	4.11	4.26	4.30	2.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	5	1	4	1	1	2.33	1253/1311	2.37	3.76	3.85	3.97	2.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	3	1	0	0	1 71	1485/1490	1.86	3.90	4.05	4.11	1.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	1	1	2	1		1431/1502		4.06	4.26	4.28	2.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	3	2		1209/1489		4.13	4.29	4.35	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	0	1	0		****/1006		3.40	4.00	4.10	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.47	4.19	4.13	****
2. Here for provided with adequate background information		Ü	Ü	Ü	-	Ü	Ü	3.00	, 255		1.17	1.10	1.13	
Seminar			_	_										
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	***	4.80	4.22	4.47	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	,	****	4.00	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 52		****	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	,	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****
Frequ	encv	n Dist	trib	utio	n									

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

PRIN OF PROG LANGUAGES

Title

Instructor: MCSHANE, MARGE

Enrollment: 46 Questionnaires: 34 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 413 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General			_		_									
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	5	13	11		1320/1669	3.93	4.28	4.23	4.28	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	8	11	11		1273/1666		4.23	4.19	4.20	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	5	17	9		1072/1421		4.27	4.24	4.25	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	5	5	14	5		1349/1617		4.24	4.15	4.22	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0 1	2 12	2	2	9 6	13	6 7	4.05	1182/1555	3.59	3.39	4.00 4.06	4.03	3.59 4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	12	2	2	7	8 12	11		869/1543 1232/1647	4.02	4.11	4.12	$4.14 \\ 4.14$	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	713/1668	3.75	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	3	1	7	3 14			1352/1605	3.75	4.07	4.07	4.00	3.52
7. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	Τ.	3		,	14	4	3.32	1332/1003	3.70	4.03	4.07	4.09	3.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	6	23	4.55	751/1514	4.27	4.40	4.39	4.46	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	6	11	15		1354/1551	4.23	4.55	4.66	4.70	4.21
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	3	15	10		1137/1503	3.97	4.16	4.24	4.28	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	8	11	14	4.18	965/1506	4.34	4.11	4.26	4.30	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	2	4	8	6	10	3.60	890/1311	3.93	3.76	3.85	3.97	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	2	4	5	3	3.64	1097/1490	4.32	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	1241/1502	4.35	4.06	4.26	4.28	3.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	893/1489	4.65	4.13	4.29	4.35	4.31
4. Were special techniques successful	19	8	1	0	4	2	0	3.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.10	****
_ ,														
Laboratory	2.2	0	-	•	0	•	_	1 00	***** (000	als als als als	4 45	4 10	4 10	ate ate ate ate
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	1	0	0	0	U	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.47	4.19	4.13	^ ^ ^ ^
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.33	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.15	****
		-	_	-	-	-			,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.29	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 29	***	****	4.34	4.13	****

Title PRIN OF PROG LANGUAGES

Instructor:

MCSHANE, MARGE

Instructor Mcs

Enrollment: 46
Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 413 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	 А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	17
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	15						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	5	С	5	General	2	Under-grad	33	Non-major	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	1						

Course Section: CMSC 331 0201 University of Maryland Page 414 Title PRIN OF PROG LANGUAGES Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007

Instructor: VICK, SHON

Enrollment: 12

Questionnaires: 5

Fall 2006
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

						Frequencies					Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	- lls fro	m this course	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1173/1669	3.93	4.28	4.23	4.28	4.00
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1094/1666	3.93	4.23	4.19	4.20	4.00
		uestions reflec		_	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	969/1421	3.94	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1301/1617	3.62	4.24	4.15	4.22	3.67
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	895/1543	4.02	4.11	4.06	4.14	4.00
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1393/1647	3.66	4.26	4.12	4.14	3.50
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	3	1	1	0	2.60	1662/1668	3.75	4.67	4.67	4.68	2.60
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	918/1605	3.76	4.09	4.07	4.09	4.00
		Lectur	٩															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	-	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1199/1514	4.27	4.40	4.39	4.46	4.00
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject							0	1	1			1338/1551	4.23	4.55	4.66	4.70	4.25
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly							0	1	_			1066/1503	3.97		4.24	4.28	4.00
		es contribute t		1	1	0	0	0	1	0			642/1506		4.11		4.30	4.50
				our understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1			445/1311				3.97	4.25
		Discus	gion															
1 Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	4 32	3.90	4 05	4.11	5.00
				d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1502	4.35		4.26	4.28	5.00
		_	_	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1489		4.13			5.00
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
					_			_					_					
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	; 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Re	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		General						0	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	-major	2
84-150																		
Grad.						El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
	I 0				Ot	her					4							
				3 0														

DATA STRUCTURES Baltimore County Fall 2006

Course Section: CMSC 341 0101

35

FREY, DENNIS

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Page 415 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire	
---------	--------	------------	---------------	--

	Frequencies					Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
g1														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	6	13	4.30	852/1669	4.45	4.28	4.23	4.28	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	6	12	4.36	740/1666		4.23	4.19	4.20	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	4	14	4.41	683/1421	4.41	4.23	4.24	4.25	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	1	2	2	11	4.22			4.24	4.15	4.22	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	0	7	4	4		1249/1555		3.39	4.13	4.03	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	638/1543		4.11	4.06	4.14	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	9	10	4.17	940/1647		4.26	4.12	4.14	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1668		4.67	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	0	1	9	4		918/1605		4.09	4.07	4.09	
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	,	_	_	U	_		-	1.00	J10/1003	1.10	1.00	1.07	1.05	1.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	600/1514	4.61	4.40	4.39	4.46	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	20	4.78	825/1551	4.82	4.55	4.66	4.70	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	0	7	14	4.39	730/1503		4.16	4.24	4.28	4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	6	14	4.30	868/1506		4.11	4.26	4.30	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	2	3	5	8	4.06	562/1311				3.97	
1														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/1490	3.75	3.90	4.05	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1502	3.78	4.06	4.26	4.28	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1489	3.38	4.13	4.29	4.35	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.10	****
Frequ	ıency	Dis	tribu	ıtior	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	ne ne			Majors	
						, . – – –				,. 				
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 4		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	10
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 7														
56-83 5 2.00-2.99 3 C 7		Gei	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 2	3	Non-	major	13
84-150 5 3.00-3.49 8 D 1														
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1				_	h
P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
I 1		Otl	her				1	.8						
? 1														

Course Section: CMSC 341 0201 University of Maryland Title DATA STRUCTURES

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: EDELMAN, MITCHE

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 25

Page 416 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions				equer			-		tructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA 	1	2	3	-4 	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	16	4.48	618/1669	4.45	4.28	4.23	4.28	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	7	9	3.96	1150/1666	4.25	4.23	4.19	4.20	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	10	11	4.20	863/1421	4.41	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	612/1617	4.33	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	2	8	1	8	3.65	1141/1555	3.53	3.39	4.00	4.03	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	1	3	4	7	3.94	981/1543	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.14	3.94
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	0	0	0	2	4	2		4.36	-, -	4.43	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2		4.91		4.97	4.67	4.67	4.68	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	5	8	4	3.94	1022/1605	4.10	4.09	4.07	4.09	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	10	13	4.44	892/1514	4.61	4.40	4.39	4.46	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	806/1551	4.82	4.55	4.66	4.70	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	9	2	12	4.13	987/1503	4.36	4.16	4.24	4.28	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	4	15	4.38	799/1506	4.50	4.11	4.26	4.30	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	4	8	11	4.30	414/1311	4.15	3.76	3.85	3.97	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	3	1	3		1036/1490	3.75	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	0	2	3	3		1196/1502	3.78	4.06	4.26	4.28	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	3	2	0	3		1328/1489	3.38	4.13	4.29	4.35	3.38
4. Were special techniques successful	17	5	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.10	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	4.38	4.20	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.47	4.19	4.13	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	4.83	4.50	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 223	****	4.70	4.35	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 206	****	4.72	4.15	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.33	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****

Course Section: CMSC 341 0201
Title DATA STRUCTURES
Instructor: EDELMAN, MITCHE
Enrollment: 41

Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 416 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Credits Earned Cum.			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	12
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	0						

Title DATA STRUCTURES

Instructor: FREY, DENNIS

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 417 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	522/1669	4.45	4.28	4.23	4.28	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	648/1666	4.25	4.23	4.19	4.20	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	441/1421	4.41	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	717/1617	4.33	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	2	3	4	3		1257/1555	3.53	3.39	4.00	4.03	3.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	325/1543	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.14	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	213/1647	4.43	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1668	4.97	4.67	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	565/1605	4.10	4.09	4.07	4.09	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	441/1514	4.61	4.40	4.39	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	594/1551	4.82	4.55	4.66	4.70	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	500/1503	4.36	4.16	4.24	4.28	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	273/1506	4.50	4.11	4.26	4.30	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	547/1311	4.15	3.76	3.85	3.97	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1490	3.75	3.90	4.05	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/1502	3.78	4.06	4.26	4.28	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1489	3.38	4.13	4.29	4.35	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 226	****	4.38	4.20	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 233	****	4.47	4.19	4.13	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 225	****	4.83	4.50	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 223	****	4.70	4.35	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.72	4.15	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 112	****	4.33	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16 16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****
. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****

Course Section: CMSC 341 0301
Title DATA STRUCTURES
Instructor: FREY, DENNIS

33

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 417 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Course Section: CMSC 341H 0101

Title

Instructor: OATES, TIMOTHY

Enrollment: 12
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 418 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
	NR 													
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	306/1669	4.73	4.28	4.23	4.28	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	281/1666	4.73	4.23	4.19	4.20	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	356/1421	4.70	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	288/1617	4.70	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	3	0	3	3.10	1413/1555	3.10	3.39	4.00	4.03	3.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	759/1543	4.17	4.11	4.06	4.14	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	241/1647	4.73	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	882/1668	4.82	4.67	4.67	4.68	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	210/1605	4.70	4.09	4.07	4.09	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	751/1514	4.55	4.40	4.39	4.46	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	512/1551	4.91	4.55	4.66	4.70	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	210/1503	4.82	4.16	4.24	4.28	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	394/1506	4.73	4.11	4.26	4.30	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	298/1311	4.45	3.76	3.85	3.97	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	389/1490	4.60	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	754/1502	4.40	4.06	4.26	4.28	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	800/1489	4.40	4.13	4.29	4.35	4.40
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.47	4.19	4.13	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.33	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
Self Paced	10													
. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	0	1	0.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
. Did study questions make clear the expected goal		0	0	0	0	0	1	0.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****

Course Section: CMSC 341H 0101

Title

Instructor: OATES, TIMOTHY

Enrollment: 12
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 418 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course Section: CMSC 345 0101 University of Maryland Title SOFTWARE DESIGN/DEVELO

? 0

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: MITCHELL, SUSAN Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 419

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Mean 	Mean
4.28	
4.28	
	4.26
4.20	4.28
4.25	4.20
4.22	4.1
4.03	3.69
4.14	4.0
4.14	3.7
4.68	4.9
4.09	4.2
4 46	4.63
	4.4
	4.7
	4.86
4.10	4.42
Majors	3
r	17
	_
	2
-major	2
-	
enoug	
	4.03 4.14 4.14 4.68 4.09 4.46 4.70 4.28 4.30 3.97 4.11 4.28 4.35 4.10

Course Section: CMSC 345 0201 University of Maryland Title SOFTWARE DESIGN/DEVELO Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: MITCHELL, SUSAN

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 420

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	8	8	4.20	988/1669	4.23	4.28	4.23	4.28	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	5	9	4.05	1065/1666	4.16	4.23	4.19	4.20	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	2	1	6	5	3.80	1118/1421	4.00	4.27	4.24	4.25	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	8	8	4.10	970/1617	4.10	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	5	8	3	3.53	1217/1555	3.61	3.39	4.00	4.03	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	6	4	5	3.56	1243/1543	3.80	4.11	4.06	4.14	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	4	4	9	3.95	1102/1647	3.84	4.26	4.12	4.14	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1668	4.97	4.67	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	11	5	4.11	851/1605	4.19	4.09	4.07	4.09	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	1003/1514	4.49	4.40	4.39	4.46	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	1111/1551	4.69	4.55	4.66	4.70	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	10	7	4.20	932/1503	4.34	4.16	4.24	4.28	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	8	6	3.95	1121/1506	4.05	4.11	4.26	4.30	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	8	2	7	3.74	801/1311	3.74	3.76	3.85	3.97	3.74
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	4	6	6	3.89	965/1490	4.16	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	3	4	10	4.22	900/1502		4.06	4.26	4.28	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	684/1489	4.68	4.13	4.29	4.35	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	447/1006	4.27	3.40	4.00	4.10	4.13
-														

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	19	_			
				?	0						

Course Section: CMSC 411 0101

COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE

Title

Instructor: SQUIRE, JON S

Enrollment: 55 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 421 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Frequencies					Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect	
	Questions		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	8	9	10	4.00	1173/1669	4.18	4.28	4.23	4.39	4.00	
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	8	14	4.14	1001/1666	4.40	4.23	4.19	4.22	4.14	
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	6	16	4.41	683/1421	4.50	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.41	
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	3	2	8	8	4.00	1029/1617	4.26	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.00	
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	6	7	5	3	3.24	1368/1555	3.26	3.39	4.00	4.08	3.24	
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	5	4	8	4.18	747/1543	4.17	4.11	4.06	4.18	4.18	
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	9	14	4.42	617/1647	4.54	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.42	
8.	How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	570/1668	4.66	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.93	
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	6	10	6	4.00	918/1605	4.25	4.09	4.07	4.16	4.00	
	Lecture															
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	7	17	4.48	830/1514	4.62	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.48	
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	1014/1551	4.84	4.55	4.66	4.73	4.68	
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	9	13	4.30	843/1503	4.37	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.30	
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	6	8	12	4.15	995/1506	4.35	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.15	
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	1	3	7	12	4.17	501/1311	4.21	3.76	3.85	3.88	4.17	
	Discussion															
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1490	****	3.90	4.05	4.26	****	
2.	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1502	****	4.06	4.26	4.46	****	
3.	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1489	****	4.13	4.29	4.52	****	
4.	Were special techniques successful	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.21	****	
	Laboratory															
	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 226	****	4.38	4.20	4.61	****	
	Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 233	****	4.47	4.19	4.40	****	
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.83	4.50	4.39	****	
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.70	4.35	4.56	****	
5.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.72	4.15	4.20	****	
_	Seminar					_	_	_								
	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 112	****		4.38	4.74	****	
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.69		
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.48	****	
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.27	****	
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.86	****	
	Riold Words															
1	Field Work	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	г оо	++++/ [0	****	4 00	4 00	2 04	****	
	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	-	0	1		****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	3.94	****	
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52			4.06	3.80		
	Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****	
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.81	****	
5.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****	
	Self Paced															
1	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	
		27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	****			****	
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27 27	0	0	0	0	-	_	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00 4.92	****	
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1 1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.45	3.00	****	
	Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	0	_		****/ 29	****	****	4.25	2.00	****	
٥.	mere energy proceers for all the students	۱ ۵	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 29			7.34	2.00		

Course Section: CMSC 411 0101

Title COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE

Instructor: SQUIRE, JON S

Enrollment:

55 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 421 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	-	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	9
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	2						

Course Section: CMSC 411 0201 University of Maryland Page 422 Title COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007

Instructor: SQUIRE, JON S

Enrollment: 50 Questionnaires: 20

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies					s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	Dept UMBC 1		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	793/1669	4.18	4.28	4.23	4.39	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	372/1666	4.40	4.23	4.19	4.22	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	466/1421	4.50	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	475/1617	4.26	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	2	4	5	4	3.28	1350/1555	3.26	3.39	4.00	4.08	3.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	759/1543	4.17	4.11	4.06	4.18	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	313/1647	4.54	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	8	4.40	1274/1668	4.66	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	4.50	373/1605	4.25	4.09	4.07	4.16	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	441/1514	4.62	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1551		4.55	4.66	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	-	10		653/1503		4.16	4.24	4.27	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3		14		594/1506		4.11	4.26	4.29	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	4	3	11	4.26	439/1311		3.76		3.88	
Discussion	10	^	^	0	0	^	1	F 00	++++ /1 400	****	2 00	4 05	1 00	****
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0 1	0	0	1		****/1490		3.90 4.06	4.05		****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	0	0	0	2		****/1502 ****/1489		4.13	4.26	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	18 17	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/1006		3.40	4.29	4.52 4.21	****
4. Were special techniques successful	1 /	۷	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	***/1006	***	3.40	4.00	4.21	
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	Expected Grades							Type				Majors		

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	8
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	18	-			
				2	Λ						

Course Section: CMSC 421 0101 University of Maryland Title

PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS Baltimore County Instructor: KALPAKIS, KONST Fall 2006

Enrollment: 34 Questionnaires: 20 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Frequencies					Inst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions				NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General																		
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course						0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	345/1669	4.05	4.28	4.23	4.39	4.70
	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals						0	1	3	8	8	4.15	993/1666	3.74	4.23	4.19	4.22	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals							0	2	3	9	6		1015/1421		4.27	4.24	4.38	3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						0 2	0	3	2	7	6		1179/1617		4.24	4.15	4.22	3.89
			-	what you learned	0	2	1	3	1	7	6		1045/1555	3.50	3.39	4.00	4.08	3.78
	_	_		what you learned	2	9	1	1	0	5	2		1195/1543		4.11	4.06	4.18	3.67
		g system clearly		-	0	0	0	5	4	3	8		1300/1647		4.26	4.12	4.14	3.70
		was class cance		incu	1	0	0	0	0	1		4.95	428/1668	4.65	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.95
	-			ning effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	9	7	4.35			4.09		4.16	
3. 110W W	ouru you	grade the overa	ii ccaci	iiig circceiveness	3	Ü	Ü	Ü	_		,	1.33	303/1003	3.71	1.05	1.07	1.10	1.33
		Lecture	9															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lectures	well :	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	715/1514	3.85	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.58
		ctor seem intere			1	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	825/1551	4.26	4.55	4.66	4.73	4.79
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	823/1503	3.69	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	942/1506	3.38	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.21
5. Did a	udiovisua	l techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	1	2	1	0	6	6	4	3.71	818/1311	3.25	3.76	3.85	3.88	3.71
		-	-	3														
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contribu	ite to v	what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1490	3.40	3.90	4.05	4.26	****
2. Were	all stude	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	16	0	0	2	0	2	0	3.00	****/1502	4.30	4.06	4.26	4.46	****
3. Did t	he instru	ctor encourage i	air and	d open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1489	4.40	4.13	4.29	4.52	****
4. Were	special t	echniques succes	ssful		17	1	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.21	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dist	tribu	ution	ı									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	ре			Majors	1
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А б		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ijor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 7														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 5		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 2	10	Non-	-major	8
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1				_	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Other					1	.9						
				? 1														

Page 423

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Course Section: CMSC 421 0201 University of Maryland
Title PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS Baltimore County

PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS

Burt, Gary

Burt, Gary

Baltimore County

Fall 2006

Instructor: BURT, GARY

Enrollment: 39
Ouestionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 424

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 5 5 3.88 1307/1669 4.05 4.28 4.23 4.39 3.88 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 2 0 6 4 4 3.50 1466/1666 3.74 4.23 4.19 4.22 3.50 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 2 2 4 8 4.13 916/1421 4.00 4.27 4.24 4.38 4.13 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 3 1 4 3 1 4 3.23 1478/1617 3.37 4.24 4.15 4.22 3.23 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 2 2 2 4 3 3 3.21 1378/1555 3.50 3.39 4.00 4.08 3.21 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 0 3 2 2 6 3.85 1068/1543 3.55 4.11 4.06 4.18 3.85 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 2 6 5 2 3.31 1484/1647 3.60 4.26 4.12 4.14 3.31 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 1 5 10 4.56 1151/1668 4.65 4.67 4.67 4.70 4.56 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 1 7 6 2 3.56 1330/1605 3.74 4.09 4.07 4.16 3.56 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 1 0 7 4 4 3.63 1363/1514 3.85 4.40 4.39 4.45 3.63 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 4 6 6 4.13 1384/1551 4.26 4.55 4.66 4.73 4.13 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 0 5 8 2 3.63 1293/1503 3.69 4.16 4.24 4.27 3.63 2 6 3 3 3.19 1386/1506 3.38 4.11 4.26 4.29 3.19 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 2 2 1 2 5 3 3.46 961/1311 3.25 3.76 3.85 3.88 3.46 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 3 1 1 3.60 1117/1490 3.40 3.90 4.05 4.26 3.60 0 3 2 4.40 754/1502 4.30 4.06 4.26 4.46 4.40 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 0 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0 0 0 3 2 4.40 800/1489 4.40 4.13 4.29 4.52 4.40 4. Were special techniques successful 11 3 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/1006 **** 3.40 4.00 4.21 ****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	3
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	16	_			
				_	_						

Course Section: CMSC 421 0301

University of Maryland PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS Baltimore County

Title Instructor: YESHA, YELENA

Enrollment: 43 Questionnaires: 16 Fall 2006

Page 425 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
----------------	------------	---------------

			Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	4	6	3	3.56	1454/1669	4.05	4.28	4.23	4.39	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	8	7	1	3.56	1445/1666	3.74	4.23	4.19	4.22	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	4	3.94	1033/1421	4.00	4.27	4.24	4.38	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	0	7	4	1	3.00	1516/1617	3.37	4.24	4.15	4.22	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	6	6	1	3.50	1227/1555	3.50	3.39	4.00	4.08	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	4	3	4	2	3.14	1379/1543	3.55	4.11	4.06	4.18	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	7	3	3.80	1250/1647	3.60	4.26	4.12	4.14	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	1248/1668	4.65	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	3	4	5	1	3.31	1441/1605	3.74	4.09	4.07	4.16	3.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	5	3	4	3	2 22	1418/1514	2 0 5	4.40	4.39	4.45	3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	6	5	4		1450/1551	4.26	4.55	4.66	4.43	3.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	4	6	1		1412/1503	3.69	4.16	4.24	4.73	3.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	1	4	3	2		1412/1503	3.38	4.11	4.24	4.27	2.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	4	4	1	1		1215/1311		3.76	3.85	3.88	2.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	۷	2	4	4	1	1	2.50	1215/1311	3.25	3.70	3.05	3.00	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1288/1490	3.40	3.90	4.05	4.26	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	920/1502	4.30	4.06	4.26	4.46	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	800/1489	4.40	4.13	4.29	4.52	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.21	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2 00	****/ 226	****	4.38	4.20	4.61	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.47	4.19	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 225	****	4.47	4.19	4.39	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 223	****	4.70	4.35	4.56	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 206	****	4.70	4.15	4.20	****
J. Were requirements for rap reports crearry specified	13	U	U	1	U	U	U	2.00	/ 200		1./2	4.13	1.20	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0			****	4.33	4.38	4.74	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.86	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.80	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****
5. Dia conferences help you carry out fred attivities	13	U	U	U	_	U	J	3.00	, 30			1.55	1.50	
Self Paced	_		_											
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****

Course Section: CMSC 421 0301

Title PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS

Instructor:

Enrollment: 43 Questionnaires: 16

Baltimore County YESHA, YELENA Fall 2006

Page 425 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	8
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	1			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course Section: CMSC 426 0101

PRINC COMPUTER SECURIT

Title Instructor: SIVALINGAM, KRI

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 426 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	13	5		1103/1669		4.28	4.23	4.39	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	11	4		1273/1666	3.85	4.23	4.19	4.22	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	12	5	4.10	932/1421	4.10	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	10	5		1168/1617	3.90	4.24	4.15	4.22	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	3	9	4		1118/1555		3.39	4.00	4.08	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1 0	1	1 1	2 7	10	4		1076/1543		4.11	4.06	4.18	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	6 1	6 17		1205/1647 1039/1668	3.85 4.70	4.26 4.67	4.12 4.67	4.14	3.85 4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	5	8	4		1148/1605			4.07		3.83
9. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	U	1	5	0	4	3.03	1140/1005	3.03	4.09	4.07	4.10	3.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	775/1514	4.53	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	1216/1551	4.47	4.55	4.66	4.73	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	9	6		1015/1503	4.11	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	7	8	4.05	1047/1506	4.05	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	1	4	4	5	3.73	801/1311	3.73	3.76	3.85	3.88	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	956/1490	3.91	3.90	4.05	4.26	3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	693/1502	4.45	4.06	4.26	4.46	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	909/1489	4.27	4.13	4.29	4.52	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	9	8	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.21	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	1	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 226	****	4.38	4.20	4.61	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.47	4.19	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 225	****	4.83	4.50	4.39	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	1 1	0	0	0		****/ 223	****	4.70	4.35	4.56	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	U	U	Т	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 206	***	4.72	4.15	4.20	* * * *
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.33	4.38	4.74	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.86	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.80	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****
Self Paced		_				_	_							
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	***	****	4.45	4.92	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33 ****/ 29	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 29	^^^	****	4.34	2.00	* * * * *

Course Section: CMSC 426 0101

Title PRINC COMPUTER SECURIT

Instructor: SIVALINGAM, KRI

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 426 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	14	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course Section: CMSC 432 0101 University of Maryland Page 427 Title OBJECT-ORIENT PROGRAM Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007

Instructor: VICK, SHON

Enrollment: 18

Questionnaires: 12

Fall 2006
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	4	4	2	3.55	1462/1669	3.55	4.28	4.23	4.39	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	3	2	3.42	1507/1666	3.42	4.23	4.19	4.22	3.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	4	1	3.18	1325/1421	3.18	4.27	4.24	4.38	3.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	5	2	3.55	1356/1617	3.55	4.24	4.15	4.22	3.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1326/1555	3.33	3.39	4.00	4.08	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1101/1543	3.80	4.11	4.06	4.18	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	6	1	3.55	1377/1647	3.55	4.26	4.12	4.14	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	1	1	0	6	2	3.70	1622/1668	3.70	4.67	4.67	4.70	3.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	7	0	3.78	1195/1605	3.78	4.09	4.07	4.16	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1199/1514	4.00	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	936/1551	4.73	4.55	4.66	4.73	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	9	1	3.91	1168/1503	3.91	4.16	4.24	4.27	3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	965/1506	4.18	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	3	2	3	3.50	939/1311	3.50	3.76	3.85	3.88	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	3.90	4.05	4.26	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	1	1		1208/1502		4.06	4.26	4.46	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	1	1		1191/1489		4.13	4.29	4.52	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	1	0	0	1	0		****/1006		3.40	4.00	4.21	****
Freq	uency	7 Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Chadita Barrad Chin CD3	_			D -		_			m.				Madaria	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				ке:	asons	. 			Ту	pe 			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3				ed f	or Ma	ajor	5	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	11

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	3	Under-grad	12	Non-major	1
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-			
				2	1						

Course Section: CMSC 433 0101 University of Maryland SCRIPTING LANGUAGES Baltimore County

Title HOOD, DANIEL J Fall 2006 Instructor:

Page 428

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	59			
Questionnaires:	34	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

				Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NF	1 5	ΝA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	()	0	0	0	2	4	28	4.76	256/1669	4.76	4.28	4.23	4.39	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	C)	0	0	0	4	5	25	4.62	425/1666	4.62	4.23	4.19	4.22	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	_	2	0	0	3	9	19	4.52	547/1421	4.52	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	. 1	10	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	288/1617	4.70	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learn	ned () 1	11	5	3	3	5	7	3.26	1354/1555	3.26	3.39	4.00	4.08	3.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you lea	rned () 1	17	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	562/1543	4.35	4.11	4.06	4.18	4.3
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	C)	0	0	0	1	8	25	4.71	260/1647	4.71	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	C)	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	214/1668	4.97	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effective	eness 4	ł	0	0	0	2	13	15	4.43	461/1605	4.43	4.09	4.07	4.16	4.43
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1		0	0	0	1	3	29	4.85	291/1514	4.85	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1		0	0	0	0	4	29	4.88	594/1551	4.88	4.55	4.66	4.73	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clear	rly 1		0	0	0	0	9	24	4.73	312/1503	4.73	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1		0	0	2	5	9	17	4.24	917/1506	4.24	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand	ling 1	_	6	0	0	3	4	20	4.63	209/1311	4.63	3.76	3.85	3.88	4.63
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learn	ned 27	7	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	****/1490	****	3.90	4.05	4.26	***
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participa	ate 27	7	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	****/1502	****	4.06	4.26	4.46	***
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discuss	sion 27	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/1489	****	4.13	4.29	4.52	***
4. Were special techniques successful	28	3	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.21	***
	Frequenc	су І	Dist	ribu	ıtior	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gr	ades				Rea	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00_27						 M			1	Craduat		n	 Maio		30

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	15	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	30
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	12	Under-grad	34	Non-major	4
84-150	21	3.00-3.49	12	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course Section: CMSC 435 0101 University of Maryland COMPUTER GRAPHICS

Page 429 Title Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Instructor: OLANO, MARC Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 28

	_ ~				
Questionnaires:	14	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Fre	-	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	102/1669	4.93	4.28	4.23	4.39	4.93
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	293/1666		4.23	4.19	4.22	4.71
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	728/1421	4.36	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.36
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.24	4.15	4.22	5.00
				what you learned	0	5	1	0	2	0	6	4.11	698/1555	4.11	3.39	4.00	4.08	4.11
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	180/1543	4.75	4.11	4.06	4.18	4.75
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	139/1647	4.86	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.86
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	79/1605	4.92	4.09	4.07	4.16	4.92
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture		prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	151/1514	4.92	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.92
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.55	4.66	4.73	5.00
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	451/1503	4.62	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.62
		es contribute t			1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69				4.26	4.29	4.69
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	1	1	0	0	1	11	4.62	214/1311	4.62	3.76	3.85	3.88	4.62
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	558/1490	4.40	3.90	4.05	4.26	4.40
				d to participate	9	0	1	0	0	1	3		1013/1502		4.06	4.26	4.46	4.00
				d open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1038/1489	4.00	4.13	4.29	4.52	4.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	-	8	5	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	***	3.40	4.00	4.21	****
				Frequ	.ency	, Dis	trib	utio	n									
Constitution T		G GDA		Former wheel Governor				ъ.									M	
Credits E	arnea 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				e	asons	3 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	1	Majo	r	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 5														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 3		Ge	nera	l				8	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D 1														
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	ſh
				P 0								_	respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot!	her					8						

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 33

45

Course Section: CMSC 441 0101 University of Maryland Page 430 ALGORITHMS JAN 18, 2007 CHANG, RICHARD Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
	General															
1. Did you gain new	insights,skills f	rom this course	0	0	0	0	1	11	21	4.61	478/1669	4.61	4.28	4.23	4.39	4.61
2. Did the instruct	or make clear the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	28	4.82	173/1666	4.82	4.23	4.19	4.22	4.82
3. Did the exam que	stions reflect the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	27	4.79	242/1421	4.79	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.79
4. Did other evalua	tions reflect the	expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	265/1617	4.71	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.7
5. Did assigned rea	dings contribute t	o what you learned	0	5	2	2	5	8	11	3.86	980/1555	3.86	3.39	4.00	4.08	3.86
6. Did written assi	gnments contribute	to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	134/1543	4.83	4.11	4.06	4.18	4.83
7. Was the grading	system clearly exp	lained	0	0	0	0	2	6	25	4.70	270/1647	4.70	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.70
8. How many times w	as class cancelled		0	1	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How would you gr	ade the overall te	aching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	131/1605	4.82	4.09	4.07	4.16	4.82
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruc	tor's lectures wel	l prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	27	4.84	308/1514	4.84	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.84
2. Did the instruct			2	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	512/1551	4.90	4.55	4.66	4.73	4.90
3. Was lecture mate		_	2	0	1	0	0	8	22	4.61	451/1503	4.61	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.6
4. Did the lectures	contribute to wha	t you learned	2	0	0	0	2	11	18	4.52	632/1506	4.52	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.52
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	4	10	1	1	2	7	8	4.05	562/1311	4.05	3.76	3.85	3.88	4.05
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	sions contribute t	o what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1490	****	3.90	4.05	4.26	***
2. Were all student	s actively encoura	ged to participate	27	0	1	4	0	1	0	2.17	****/1502	****	4.06	4.26	4.46	***
3. Did the instruct	or encourage fair	and open discussion	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1489	****	4.13	4.29	4.52	***
4. Were special tec	hniques successful	-	31	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.21	***
	Laboratory															
2. Were you provide	d with adequate ba	ckground information	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.47	4.19	4.40	***
		Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Ту	oe			Majors	3

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	32
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	33	Non-major	1
84-150	21	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	

Other

32

I

0

0

University of Maryland
RY Baltimore County

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2006

Title	INFO & CODING THEORY
Instructor:	LOMONACO JR, SA
T	0.1

Course Section: CMSC 442 0101

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 14

Page 431 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	318/1669	4.71	4.28	4.23	4.39	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	206/1666	4.79	4.23	4.19	4.22	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	184/1421	4.86	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	114/1617	4.91	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	389/1555	4.45	3.39	4.00	4.08	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	202/1543	4.73	4.11	4.06	4.18	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	324/1647	4.64	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	631/1605	4.30	4.09	4.07	4.16	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	392/1514	4.79	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	650/1551	4.86	4.55	4.66	4.73	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	243/1503	4.79	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	225/1506	4.86	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	174/1311	4.70	3.76	3.85	3.88	4.70
Discussion														
	10	Ο	Ω	1	0	1	2	4 00	849/1490	4 00	3 90	4 05	4 26	4 00
-			-	0		2	2		/					
	10	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	684/1489			4.29	4.52	4.50
			-	-		_	_		, =	,				
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0 2 4 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1 0 3 3 2 3 2 3 2 3	11 12 6 11 12 11 12 7	4.64 5.00 4.30 4.79 4.86 4.79 4.86 4.70	324/1647 1/1668 631/1605 392/1514 650/1551 243/1503 225/1506 174/1311 849/1490 632/1502	4.64 5.00 4.30 4.79 4.86 4.79 4.86 4.70	4.26 4.67 4.09 4.40 4.55 4.16 4.11	4.12 4.67 4.07 4.39 4.66 4.24 4.26 3.85	4.14 4.70 4.16 4.45 4.73 4.27 4.29 3.88	4.64 5.00 4.30 4.79 4.86 4.79 4.86 4.70

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	10	Under-grad	12	Non-major	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				2	0						

Course Section: CMSC 443 0101 University of Maryland Page 432
Title CRYPTOLOGY Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Instructor: STEPHENS, ARTHU Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 23

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questionnaires: 9

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	676/1669	4.44	4.28	4.23	4.39	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	359/1666	4.67	4.23	4.19	4.22	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	511/1421	4.56	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	370/1617	4.63	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	0	4	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.39	4.00	4.08	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	783/1543	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.18	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	424/1647	4.56	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1382/1668	4.25	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	840/1605	4.11	4.09	4.07	4.16	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	739/1514	4.56	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	1350/1551	4.22	4.55	4.66	4.73	4.22
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1005/1503	4.11	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	934/1506	4.22	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	483/1311	4.20	3.76	3.85	3.88	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1490	****	3.90	4.05	4.26	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/1502	****	4.06	4.26	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1489	****	4.13	4.29	4.52	****
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	0	0	1		****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.21	****
	-	_	-	-		•	_		, =					

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

Course Section: CMSC 444 0101 University of Maryland
Title INFORMATION ASSURANCE Baltimore County

Baltimore County
Fall 2006

Page 433

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Title	INFORMATI	ION ASSU	RANCE	
Instructor:	SHERMAN,	ALAN	(Instr.	A)

Enrollment: 5
Questionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 3 4.60 478/1669 4.60 4.28 4.23 4.39 4.60 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 1 3 0 3.40 1512/1666 3.40 4.23 4.19 4.22 3.40 0 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 394/1617 4.60 4.24 4.15 4.22 4.60 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.40 438/1555 4.40 3.39 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 298/1543 4.60 4.11 4.06 4.18 4.60 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 1 0 1 3.75 1275/1647 3.75 4.26 4.12 4.14 3.75 0 2 1 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 901/1668 4.80 4.67 4.67 4.70 4.80 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 5 0 4.00 918/1605 4.50 4.09 4.07 4.16 4.50 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 1199/1514 4.00 4.40 4.39 4.45 4.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 Ω 0 0 2 5.00 1/1551 5.00 4.55 4.66 4.73 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 1330/1503 3.50 4.16 4.24 4.27 3.50 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 1403/1506 3.00 4.11 4.26 4.29 3.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 939/1311 3.50 3.76 3.85 3.88 3.50 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 2 5.00 1/1490 5.00 3.90 4.05 4.26 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1502 5.00 4.06 4.26 4.46 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.13 4.29 4.52 5.00 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1006 **** 3.40 4.00 4.21 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 3 1 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 65/ 112 4.50 4.33 4.38 4.74 4.50 0 1 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 0 0 0 0 1 2 2 4.20 62/ 97 4.20 4.20 4.36 4.69 4.20 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 33/ 92 4.80 4.80 4.22 4.48 4.80 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 45/ 105 4.60 4.60 4.20 4.27 4.60 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 0 0 0 0 1 3 1 4.00 46/ 98 4.00 4.00 3.95 3.86 4.00 Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	А	 5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	4	Under-grad	4	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-	_		
					0						

Course Section: CMSC 444 0101 University of Maryland
Title INFORMATION ASSURANCE Baltimore County

Title INFORMATION ASSURANCE Baltimore Count Instructor: (Instr. B) Fall 2006

Enrollment: 5
Questionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 434

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

							Fr	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	nı gain n	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	478/1669	4.60	4.28	4.23	4.39	4.60
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	1	3	0		1512/1666		4.23	4.19	4.22	3.40
		uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	394/1617		4.24	4.15	4.22	4.60
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40			3.39	4.00	4.08	4.40
				to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60			4.11	4.06	4.18	4.60
		g system clearl			0	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1275/1647		4.26	4.12	4.14	3.75
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80			4.67	4.67	4.70	4.80
	_			ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1605			4.07	4.16	4.50
		Lectur	۵															
5. Did au	diovisua			your understanding	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1311	3.50	3.76	3.85	3.88	3.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	5.00	3.90	4.05	4.26	5.00
2. Were a	ıll stude:	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.06	4.26	4.46	5.00
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.13	4.29	4.52	5.00
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful		3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.21	****
		Semina	r															
1. Were a	ssigned	topics relevant	to the	e announced theme	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	65/ 112	4.50	4.33	4.38	4.74	4.50
2. Was th	e instru	ctor available	for in	dividual attention	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	62/ 97	4.20	4.20	4.36	4.69	4.20
3. Did re	search p	rojects contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	33/ 92	4.80	4.80	4.22	4.48	4.80
4. Did pr	esentati	ons contribute	to wha	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	45/ 105	4.60	4.60	4.20	4.27	4.60
5. Were c	riteria	for grading mad	e clea	c	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	46/ 98	4.00	4.00	3.95	3.86	4.00
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	ı									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	⁄pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 5					or Ma			0	 Graduat		 1	Majo		3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0		re(4urr,	eu I	J⊥ I*lc	a JOE	o	U	Graduat	-6	_	Ma JC) <u>T</u>	3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Cer	nera	1				4	Under-c	rad	4	Non-	-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		061	c.a	-				•	onaci -g	,	•	14011		2
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		E14	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here =	re not	enous	rh
craa.	_	3.30 1.00	_	p O		11.1		v CD				•	respons				_	111
				1 0									I Capona	co co i	oc sign	ııı Cai	10	

Other

1

0

0

Course Section: CMSC 445 0101 University of Maryland SOFTWARE ENGINEERING Baltimore County Instructor: SIDHU, DEEPINDE

Title

Page 435 JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	22				
Questionnaires:	13	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	4	4	2	2	1	2.38	1658/1669	2.38	4.28	4.23	4.39	2.38
		ctor make clear			0	0	5	3	2	2	1	2.31	1652/1666	2.31	4.23	4.19	4.22	2.31
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	2	6	1	3	1	2.62	1400/1421	2.62	4.27	4.24	4.38	2.62
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	6	1	2	2	2	2.46	1594/1617	2.46	4.24	4.15	4.22	2.46
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	3	1	2	4	3	3.23	1368/1555	3.23	3.39	4.00	4.08	3.23
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	1	7	3	1	0	1	1.75	1539/1543	1.75	4.11	4.06	4.18	1.75
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	7	3	1	0	2	2.00	1619/1647	2.00	4.26	4.12	4.14	2.00
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	6	7	0	0	2.54	1663/1668	2.54	4.67	4.67	4.70	2.54
				hing effectiveness	1	0	4	5	3	0	0	1.92	1594/1605	1.92	4.09	4.07	4.16	1.92
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	the instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	4	3	3	1	2	2.54	1485/1514	2.54	4.40	4.39	4.45	2.54
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	1	1	3	5	3	3.62	1483/1551	3.62	4.55	4.66	4.73	3.62
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	2	5	2	2	2	2.77	1451/1503	2.77	4.16	4.24	4.27	2.77
4. Did th	ne lecture	you learned	0	0	4	3	4	0	2	2.46	1462/1506	2.46	4.11	4.26	4.29	2.46		
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	2	6	2	0	1	2	2.18	1265/1311	2.18	3.76	3.85	3.88	2.18
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1490	****	3.90	4.05	4.26	****
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1502	****	4.06	4.26	4.46	****
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1489	****	4.13	4.29	4.52	****
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.21	****
				Freq	uency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Farnod	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Po:	asons	,			Ty	no			Majors	
credits E										5 			ту.	 be			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Re	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors		1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	11
28-55														_				
56-83							nera	l				7	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	2
84-150												_			_			_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1					ŗh
				P 0								_	respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot]	her					5						

Course Section: CMSC 451 0101 University of Maryland Page 436 Title AUTOMATA THRY& FORM LA Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007

Instructor: YESHA, YAACOV

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 14

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u qain ne	w insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	1	4	6	3	3.79	1359/1669	3.79	4.28	4.23	4.39	3.79
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	841/1666	4.29	4.23	4.19	4.22	4.29
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	493/1421	4.57	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.57
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	6	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	946/1617	4.13	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.13
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	3	4	0	1	3	3	3.09	1414/1555	3.09	3.39	4.00	4.08	3.09
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	543/1543	4.38	4.11	4.06	4.18	4.38
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	728/1647	4.36	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.36
8. How mar	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	631/1605	4.30	4.09	4.07	4.16	4.30
11		Lectur			0	0	0	0		_	_	4 26	1000/1514	4 26	4 40	4 20	4 45	4 26
1. Were th			0	0	0	0	Τ	./	6		1003/1514		4.40	4.39	4.45	4.36		
		tor seem inter	3	0	0 0	0	0	0	3	11		825/1551	4.79	4.55	4.66	4.73	4.79	
		-	al presented and explained clear contribute to what you learned					1	3	4	6		1030/1503		4.16	4.24	4.27	4.07
				-	0	0	1	0	2	3	8	4.21		4.21	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.21
5. Did aud	diovisual	. techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	8	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.76	3.85	3.88	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1490	****	3.90	4.05	4.26	****
				d to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/1502	****	4.06	4.26	4.46	****
				d open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1489	****	4.13	4.29	4.52	****
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful	-	11	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.21	****
				Frequ	ıency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	рe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 9		Pe	anir		or Ma	ior		1	Graduat		0	Majo		11
28-55						1/6/	datt.	-u 1	J_ 1'10	בטנ.	_	_	Graduati	_	0	1.10.10		
56-83						Gei	nera	1				7	Under-q	rad 1	4	Non-	major	3
84-150								_					011001 9			2.011		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoua	rh	
	-			P 0								-	respons				_	•
				I O		Ot1	her					6			5			

?

1

Course Section: CMSC 455 0101 University of Maryland NUMERICAL COMPUTATIONS Baltimore County

Title Instructor: STEPHENS, ARTHU Fall 2006

0

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 6 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	816/1669	4.33	4.28	4.23	4.39	4.33
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	777/1666	4.33	4.23	4.19	4.22	4.33
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	557/1421	4.50	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.50
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	899/1617	4.17	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.17
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1427/1555	3.00	3.39	4.00	4.08	3.00
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	759/1543	4.17	4.11	4.06	4.18	4.17
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	759/1647	4.33	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.33
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1438/1668	4.17	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.17
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	789/1605	4.17	4.09	4.07	4.16	4.17
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1295/1514	3.83	4.40	4.39	4.45	3.83
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1456/1551	3.83	4.55	4.66	4.73	3.83
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1380/1503	3.33	4.16	4.24	4.27	3.33
4. Did th	as lecture material presented and explained cle id the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1209/1506	3.83	4.11	4.26	4.29	3.83
5. Did au	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					2	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1227/1311	2.50	3.76	3.85	3.88	2.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1490	****	3.90	4.05	4.26	****
2. Were a	ill stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1502	***	4.06	4.26	4.46	****
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1489	***	4.13	4.29	4.52	****
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful		4	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.21	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	tribu	ıtioı	ı									
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5			 quire		 or Ma			0	Graduat		0	Majo		3
28-55	-	1.00-1.99	0	А 5 В 1		r.e.	darre	=u 1(J⊥ I*lc	JOTS		U	Graduati	=	U	Ma JC) _	3
56-83						Go:	nera	ı				4	Under-q	rad	6	Non	-major	3
84-150						GE.	nera.	L				T	onder -g.	Lau	U	MOII-	iia jui	٥
Grad.						₽ 1.	ectiv	700				0	#### - 1	Maana t	hore :	re not	enouio	h
grau.	U	3.30-4.00	4	P 0		Tu	CCCI	(CD				J	respons				_	11
				I 0		0+	her					2	T Cabolla	LD LU L	c argi.	ııııcaı	10	
				I 0		UL.	TICT					4						

Page 437

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Course Section: CMSC 461 0101 University of Maryland Title DATABASE MANGMT SYSTEM Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: KARGUPTA, HILLO

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 438

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	676/1669	4.44	4.28	4.23	4.39	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	922/1666	4.22	4.23	4.19	4.22	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	746/1421	4.33	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	770/1617	4.29	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	698/1555	4.11	3.39	4.00	4.08	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	490/1543	4.43	4.11	4.06	4.18	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	583/1647	4.44	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	4		1240/1668	4.44	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	373/1605	4.50	4.09	4.07	4.16	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	892/1514	4.44	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1152/1551	4.56	4.55	4.66	4.73	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	905/1503	4.22	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	326/1506	4.78	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	791/1311	3.75	3.76	3.85	3.88	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	Λ	1	1	1	2	4.00	849/1490	4.00	3.90	4.05	4.26	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	486/1502		4.06	4.26	4.46	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	865/1489		4.13	4.29	4.52	4.33
5. Dia the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	,	0	5	5	3	1	2	1.33	555, 1105	1.33	1.13	1.27	1.52	1.33

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	9	Non-major	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	_			
				2	0						

Course Section: CMSC 471 0101

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENC

Title

Instructor: FININ, TIMOTHY

Enrollment: 65 Questionnaires: 46 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 439 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	5	11	11	18		1313/1669	3.87	4.28	4.23	4.39	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	8	19	16		1071/1666	4.04	4.23	4.19	4.22	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	12	12	22	4.22		4.22	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	1	0	7	9	15	4.16	911/1617		4.24	4.15	4.22	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	4	4	10	12	13		1178/1555	3.60	3.39	4.00	4.08	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	8	17	18	4.16	771/1543	4.16	4.11	4.06	4.18	4.16
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	4	20	19	4.20	926/1647	4.20	4.26			4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1	43	4.93		4.93	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	15	18	6	3.68	1261/1605	3.68	4.09	4.07	4.16	3.68
Lecture	0	0	0	1	_	1.0	0.77	4 27	002/1514	4 27	4 40	4 20	4 45	4 27
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0 1	1	8	10 7	27		993/1514		4.40	4.39	4.45	4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	-	_	-	3	-	35		1069/1551	4.63	4.55	4.66	4.73	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	10	18	17		1015/1503	4.11	4.16		4.27	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	6	9	11	19		1179/1506	3.89	4.11	4.26	4.29	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	4	3	11	6	16	3.67	839/1311	3.68	3.76	3.85	3.88	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	6	0	6	7	5	2 21	1288/1490	3.21	3.90	4.05	4.26	3.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	3	2	5	3	12		1202/1502	3.76	4.06	4.26	4.46	3.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	2	0	4	5	13	4.13	999/1489	4.13	4.13	4.29	4.52	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	23	17	1	1	0	3	1		****/1006	****	3.40	4.29	4.32	****
4. Were special techniques successful	23	1/		1	U	3		3.33	/1000		3.40	4.00	4.21	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 226	****	4.38	4.20	4.61	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	0	0	1	0	0		,	****	4.47	4.19	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 225	****	4.83	4.50	4.39	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 223	****	4.70	4.35	4.56	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 206	****	4.72	4.15	4.20	****
J. Note requirements for tab reports creatly specified	13	O	Ü	O	Ü	_	O	1.00	, 200		1.,2	1.15	1.20	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.33	4.38	4.74	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.00		3.86	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.80	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****

Course Section: CMSC 471 0101

Title ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENC

Instructor: FIN

FININ, TIMOTHY

Enrollment: 65
Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 439 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	23	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	10	Major	30
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	С	3	General	22	Under-grad	36	Non-major	16
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	2						

Course Section: CMSC 473 0101 University of Maryland Title NATURAL LANG PROCESSIN Baltimore County

NIRENBURG, SERG

Instructor:

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 13

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 440

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	647/1669	4.46	4.28	4.23	4.39	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	993/1666	4.15	4.23	4.19	4.22	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	3	6	3.85	1095/1421	3.85	4.27	4.24	4.38	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	455/1617	4.55	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	558/1555	4.25	3.39	4.00	4.08	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.11	4.06	4.18	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	2	6	3.77	1270/1647	3.77	4.26	4.12	4.14	3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.09	4.07	4.16	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	939/1514	4.42	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	460/1551	4.92	4.55	4.66	4.73	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	702/1503	4.42	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	757/1506	4.42	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	764/1311	3.80	3.76	3.85	3.88	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	667/1490	4.29	3.90	4.05	4.26	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.06	4.26	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.13	4.29	4.52	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	4	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	9	Non-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				2	Λ						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2006

Page 441 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	32				
Questionnaires:	15	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Course Section: CMSC 481 0101

COMPUTER NETWORKS

PATWARDHAN, ANA

Title

Instructor:

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	7	3	3.73	1379/1669	3.73	4.28	4.23	4.39	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	5	4		1343/1666	3.73	4.23	4.19	4.22	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	946/1421	4.07	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	3	7	2	3.64	1312/1617	3.64	4.24	4.15	4.22	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	5	3	3	3.58	1187/1555	3.58	3.39	4.00	4.08	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	7	2	3.40	1303/1543	3.40	4.11	4.06	4.18	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	728/1647	4.36	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	2	6	6	1	3.40	1400/1605	3.40	4.09	4.07	4.16	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	7	5		1148/1514			4.39	4.45	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	8	6		1254/1551	4.43	4.55	4.66	4.73	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	4	4	4		1285/1503	3.64	4.16	4.24	4.27	3.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	1	5	3	3.36	1357/1506	3.36	4.11	4.26	4.29	3.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	5	3	2	1	2.91	1160/1311	2.91	3.76	3.85	3.88	2.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	2	1	Λ	Λ	1 20	1482/1490	1.80	3.90	4.05	4.26	1.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	1	2	2		1160/1502	3.83	4.06	4.26	4.46	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	1	2		1038/1489	4.00	4.13	4.29	4.52	4.00
J. Did the instructor encourage rair and open discussion	10	U	U	J	4	1		1.00	1030/1409	4.00	T.13	7.43	7.34	4.00

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	8	Under-grad	15	Non-major	2
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there a	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				2	0						

Baltimore County Fall 2006

University of Maryland JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Page 442

Questionnaires:	11	Student Cour	se Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------------	----	--------------	---------------	---------------

?

0

Course Section: CMSC 486 0101

40

MOBILE RADIO COMM

GREEN, FRANK E.

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

							Fre	eque:	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did you	u qain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	1110/1669	4.09	4.28	4.23	4.39	4.09
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	854/1666	4.27	4.23	4.19	4.22	4.27
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	466/1421	4.60	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.60
4. Did otl	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	4	2	0	2	0	2	3.00	1516/1617	3.00	4.24	4.15	4.22	3.00
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	1	2	1	0	3	3	3.44	1272/1555	3.44	3.39	4.00	4.08	3.44
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	2	1	1	3	0	3	3.38	1311/1543	3.38	4.11	4.06	4.18	3.38
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	933/1647	4.18	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.18
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	1477/1668	4.10	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.10
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	1092/1605	3.90	4.09	4.07	4.16	3.90
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	actor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	751/1514	4.55	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.55
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70			4.55	4.66	4.73	4.70
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30			4.16	4.24	4.27	4.30
		es contribute t			1	0	1	0	1	4	4		1069/1506		4.11	4.26	4.29	4.00
				our understanding	1	1	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	587/1311		3.76	3.85	3.88	4.00
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al:	acc dica			what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	Λ	2	5 00	****/1490	****	3.90	4.05	4.26	****
				d to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1502		4.06	4.05	4.46	****
				d open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1489		4.13	4.29	4.52	****
		echniques succe		a open arbeabbion	9	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/1006		3.40	4.00	4.21	***
													,					
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	•	Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	1	A 5		 Red	anir		or Ma	ior	 z	1	 Graduat		0	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5		1,00	datt.	Ju I	OT 1.10	، ۲۰۰۰	_	_	Graduat	_	J	1.10) (-	U
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Gei	nera	1				7	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	major	11
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D 0		00.		_					011001 9		_	2.011		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enous	ιh
	-	2.22 2.00	=	P 0								-	respons				_	,
				I O		Ot.1	her					4					-	
				2 0		0.01						-						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland
Baltimore County Course Section: CMSC 491A 0101 ARTISTIC RENDERING

Title	ARTISTIC RENDER
Instructor:	RHEINGANS, PENN
Enrollment:	12

Questionnaires: 10

Baltimore	County	JAN	18,	2007
Fall	2006	Job	IRBR	3029

Page 443

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	345/1669	4.70	4.28	4.23	4.39	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	319/1666	4.70	4.23	4.19	4.22	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	280/1421	4.75	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	161/1617	4.80	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	141/1555	4.80	3.39	4.00	4.08	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	298/1543	4.60	4.11	4.06	4.18	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	367/1647	4.60	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	239/1605	4.67	4.09	4.07	4.16	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	189/1514	4.90	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	512/1551	4.90	4.55	4.66	4.73	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	220/1503	4.80	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	286/1506	4.80	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	142/1311	4.75	3.76	3.85	3.88	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	192/1490	4.83	3.90	4.05	4.26	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	306/1502	4.83	4.06	4.26	4.46	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	348/1489	4.83	4.13	4.29	4.52	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	479/1006	4.00	3.40	4.00	4.21	4.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	6	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	4	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course Section: CMSC 491S 0101

Title WEB SERV ORIEN COMPUTI

Instructor: HALEM, MILTON

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 444 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncie	3		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	4	2	3 45	1502/1669	3.45	4 28	4.23	4.39	3.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	9	1	0		1591/1666		4.23	4.19	4.22	2.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	0	0		****/1421	****	4.27	4.24	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	3	3		1398/1617	3.45	4.24	4.15	4.22	3.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	2	2	1	1		1395/1555		3.39	4.00	4.08	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	1	3	2		1060/1543		4.11	4.06	4.18	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	4	2	1	2.91	1548/1647	2.91	4.26	4.12	4.14	2.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	713/1668	4.91	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	4	1	2	0	2.71	1544/1605	2.71	4.09	4.07	4.16	2.71
Lecture				_	_	_	_							
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	3	3	2		1413/1514		4.40	4.39	4.45	3.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	8		936/1551		4.55	4.66	4.73	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	5	5	0	0		1478/1503		4.16	4.24	4.27	2.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	3	Τ	Τ		1464/1506		4.11	4.26	4.29	2.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	2	3	1	0	2.57	1217/1311	2.57	3.76	3.85	3.88	2.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1088/1490	3.67	3.90	4.05	4.26	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	818/1502	4.33	4.06	4.26	4.46	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	973/1489	4.17	4.13	4.29	4.52	4.17
Seminar	1.0	0	0	^	0	_	1	F 00	****/ 07		4 00	1 26	4 60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97		4.20	4.36	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92		4.80	4.22	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	Τ	0		****/ 105 ****/ 98		4.60	4.20	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	Τ	U	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	* * * *	4.00	3.95	3.86	^ ^ * *
From	onat	Dia	-rih		n									

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

Course Section: CMSC 611 0101 University of Maryland Title ADV COMPUTER ARCHITECT Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007

Instructor: YOUNIS, MOHAMED

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 31

	I	Fall	2006	
Student	Course	Evalua	ation	Questionnaire

Page 445

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	1	1	2	13	14	4.23	951/1669	4.23	4.28	4.23	4.35	4.23
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	3	7	20	4.48	577/1666		4.23	4.19		4.48
		uestions reflect			0	0	1	0	3	6	21	4.48	582/1421		4.27	4.24	4.33	4.48
	_	uations reflect		_	0	4	1	0	5	6	15	4.26	801/1617		4.24	4.15	4.24	4.26
				what you learned	1	4	1	4	4	4	13	3.92			3.39	4.00	4.07	3.92
				what you learned	1	1	1	0	5	8	15	4.24	669/1543	4.24	4.11	4.06	4.27	4.24
		g system clearly			1	0	0	1	1	9	19	4.53	446/1647	4.53	4.26	4.12	4.15	4.53
		was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.83	5.00
				ning effectiveness	10	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	288/1605	4.62	4.09	4.07	4.13	4.62
		T	_															
1 17		Lecture			1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4 07	76/1514	4 07	4 40	4 20	4 27	4 07
		uctor's lecture		-	1	0	0	0	0	2		4.97 4.93	76/1514 358/1551		4.40 4.55	4.39		4.97 4.93
		ctor seem inter		xplained clearly	1	-	0	0	1	9		4.93	,		4.16	4.00		4.93
		es contribute to			1	0	0	0	2	6		4.63					4.22	
				our understanding	2	7	1	1	3	_		4.14	,			4.26		
5. DIG at	udiovisua.	ı techniques em	nance y	our understanding	۷	/	Τ	Τ	3	ь	11	4.14	519/1311	4.14	3.76	3.85	3.89	4.14
		Discus																
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	576/1490	4.39	3.90	4.05	4.18	4.39
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	12	0	0	1	1	3		4.58	567/1502		4.06	4.26	4.46	4.58
3. Did th	he instru	ctor encourage :	fair an	d open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	411/1489	4.78	4.13	4.29	4.44	4.78
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	ssful		12	10	1	2	0	1	5	3.78	651/1006	3.78	3.40	4.00	4.11	3.78
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits I		Character CDA		There are all Considers				Da		_			m				Ma	
creaits i	Earned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re:	ason	s 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	3	A 22		Red	quire	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e 1	.4	Majo	r	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 7														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	14	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		Ele	ecti	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1				_	ιh
P 0													respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
I 0							her				3	0						
				? 0														

Course Section: CMSC 621 0101 University of Maryland
Title ADV OPERATING SYSTEMS Baltimore County

Title ADV OPERATING SYSTEMS Baltimore County Instructor: JOSHI, ANUPAM Fall 2006

Ρ

I

?

0

0

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 28

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 446

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

							Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil		om this course	0	0	0	0	1	11	16	4.54	556/1669	4.54	4.28	4.23	4.35	4.54
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	8	18	4.57	472/1666	4.57	4.23	4.19	4.19	4.57
		uestions reflect			0	0	0	1	4	8	15	4.32	755/1421	4.32	4.27	4.24	4.33	4.32
4. Did ot	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	1	5	13	9	4.07	987/1617	4.07	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.07
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contribu	te to	what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	9	12	4.19	622/1555	4.19	3.39	4.00	4.07	4.19
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contri	bute t	to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	9	12	3.89	1027/1543	3.89	4.11	4.06	4.27	3.89
7. Was th	he grading	g system clearly	expla	ained	0	0	1	0	5	13	9	4.04	1027/1647	4.04	4.26	4.12	4.15	4.04
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	570/1668	4.93	4.67	4.67	4.83	4.93
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overal	l tead	ching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	13	9	4.41	499/1605	4.41	4.09	4.07	4.13	4.41
		Lecture																
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lectures		prepared	0	0	0	0	1	11	16	4.54	763/1514	4.54	4.40	4.39	4.37	4.54
		ctor seem intere			0	0	0	0	1	8	19	4.64	1055/1551	4.64	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.64
				explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	12	12	4.25	879/1503	4.25	4.16	4.24	4.22	4.25
		es contribute to			0	0	0	0	3	12	13	4.36	819/1506	4.36	4.11	4.26	4.24	4.36
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques enh	ance y	our understanding	3	4	5	2	3	9	2	3.05	1110/1311	3.05	3.76	3.85	3.89	3.05
		Discuss	ion															
1. Did cl	lass disc			what you learned	11	0	0	0	5	9	3	3.88	965/1490	3.88	3.90	4.05	4.18	3.88
				ed to participate	12	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	522/1502		4.06	4.26	4.46	4.63
		_	_	nd open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	196/1489	4.94	4.13	4.29	4.44	4.94
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	sful	-	12	10	0	2	0	3	1	3.50	****/1006	***	3.40	4.00	4.11	****
				Frequ	iency	, Dist	rib	ution	n									
a 1'.	- 1	a ana						_					_					
Credits E	Earned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A 21		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e 1	.2	Majo	or	21
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 7														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	l				0	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	βh

Other

28

Course Section: CMSC 681 0101

Title Advanced Comp. Network

Instructor: Sidhu, D
Enrollment: 0
Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 2 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	_	_		_	_	_								
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	3	3	1		1596/1669	****	4.14	4.23	4.02	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	2	2	2		1570/1666	****	3.93	4.19	4.11	3.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	3	0	2	1		1410/1421	****	4.00	4.24	4.11	2.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	1	3	2		1500/1617	****	4.02	4.15	3.99	3.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	4	1		1383/1555	****	4.12	4.00	3.92	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	5	1		1331/1543	****	3.98	4.06	3.86	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	1	5	0		1526/1647	****	3.81	4.12	4.06	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	3	6	0		1638/1668	****	4.72	4.67		3.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	1391/1605	***	3.90	4.07	3.96	3.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	4	2	1	3	3.30	1424/1514	****	4.30	4.39	4.32	3.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	4	1	4	3.80	1462/1551	****	4.63	4.66	4.55	3.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	1	4	3.80	1210/1503	****	4.15	4.24	4.17	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	0	3	3	3.50	1319/1506	****	4.07	4.26	4.17	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	0	1	3	1	3.14	1091/1311	****	4.14	3.85	3.68	3.14
Discussion	0	•	-	•		0	-	2 05	1065/1400	als als als als	4 11	4 05	2 05	2 05
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	4	2	1		1265/1490	****	4.11	4.05	3.85	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	4	2	1		1346/1502	****	4.32	4.26	4.06	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	0	3	2	1		1398/1489	***	4.23	4.29	4.07	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	891/1006	****	4.20	4.00	3.81	3.20
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	3.81	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.51	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	****	4.04	4.35	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 112	****	4.53	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	,	****	4.23	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 92	****	3.93	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 105	****	4.17	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 98	***	3.80	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 58	****	3.70	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 52	****	3.53	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 40	****	2.40	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
0.35 7 3														
Self Paced	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/	****	1 10	1 21	1 17	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0			1	•	4.00	****/ 55		4.48	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42 ****/ 46	****	4.67	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	, 10	****	4.00	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9 9	0 0	0	0	0	1 1	0	4.00	****/ 33 ****/ 29		****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	U	U	U	U	Т	0	4.00	/ 29			4.34	4.22	

Course Section: CMSC 681 0101 Title Advanced Comp. Network

Instructor: Sidhu, D
Enrollment: 0
Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 2 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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