Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR

Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M

Enrollment: 44

Enrollment: 44
Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 368 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	quer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	1	1	3	18	4.65	406/1481	4.51	4.33	4.29	4.14	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	192/1481	4.56	4.27	4.23	4.18	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	261/1249	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.14	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	193/1424	4.51	4.20	4.21	4.06	4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	13	3	3	1	1	2	2.60	1358/1396	2.71	3.35	3.98	3.89	2.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	5	4	7	3.94	832/1342	3.68	4.05	4.07	3.88	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	344/1459	4.51	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	825/1480	4.92	4.75	4.68	4.64	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	431/1450			4.09	3.97	4.44
. 3														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	169/1409	4.49	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	450/1407	4.72	4.67	4.69	4.57	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	502/1399	4.26	4.25	4.26	4.23	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	229/1400	4.49	4.19	4.27	4.19	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	1	1	3	11	4.29	411/1179	4.19		3.96		4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	1	3	10	4.25	570/1262	3.36	3.92	4.05	3.77	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	6	2	7	4.07	878/1259	3.73	4.10	4.29	4.06	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	785/1256	3.82	4.05	4.30	4.08	4.23
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	1	1	2	1	6	3.91	487/ 788	3.91	3.90	4.00	3.80	3.91
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	3.93	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 249	****	4.29	4.11	3.95	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 242	****	4.82	4.40	4.33	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.54	4.20	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 217	****	4.24	4.04	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.54	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.14	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	***	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	***	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****

Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR

Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M

Enrollment: 44
Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 368 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 7	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	5	Under-grad	24	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR

BLOCK, DAWN M

Instructor:

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 369 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	§ 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	0	0	0	0	2	7	20	4 60	420/1401	<i>1</i> F1	4 22	4 20	1 1 1	4 60
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0 1	2 2	7 6	20 20	4.62	439/1481	4.51		4.29	4.14	4.62 4.55
 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 	0	0	0	0	4	5	20	4.55 4.55	458/1481	4.56	4.27		4.18 4.14	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	4	6	20 16	4.55	451/1249 485/1424	4.50 4.51	4.24	4.27 4.21	4.14	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	6	2	3	4	2		1354/1396	2.71	3.35	3.98	3.89	2.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	5	4	10	4.10	695/1342	3.68	4.05	4.07	3.88	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	168/1459	4.51	4.03	4.16	4.17	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1480	4.92		4.68		5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	3	1	14	8		819/1450			4.09	3.97	
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	6	17	4.41	891/1409	4.49	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	4	22	4.74	842/1407	4.72	4.67	4.69	4.57	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	5		14	4.08	976/1399	4.26	4.25	4.26	4.23	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	0	2	6	16	4.19	921/1400	4.49	4.19	4.27	4.19	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	2	1	7	15	4.27	434/1179	4.19	3.98	3.96	3.85	4.27
Discussion				_		_	_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	3	1	4	1	5		1074/1262		3.92	4.05	3.77	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	715/1259	3.73	4.10	4.29	4.06	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0 9	0	1 1	4 2	3	6	4.00	901/1256		4.05	4.30	4.08	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	14	9	U	1	2	1	2	3.67	****/ 788	3.91	3.90	4.00	3.80	^^^
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	3.93	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 249	****	4.29	4.11	3.95	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 242	****	4.82	4.40	4.33	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 240	***	4.54	4.20	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.24	4.04	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.54	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1 1		****/ 69 ****/ 68	****	5.00 ***	4.35	4.14	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	^^^^/ 68	* * * *	* * * *	3.92	3.80	^^^
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****

Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR

Instructor:

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 29

Baltimore County BLOCK, DAWN M Spring 2006

Page 369 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	А	16	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	8	Under-grad	29	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	14	_			
				?	0						

Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR

Instructor: BURT, GARY

Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 370 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		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	0	2	0	5	8	4.27	831/1481	4.51	4.33	4.29	4.14	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	736/1481	4.56	4.27	4.23	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	788/1249	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.14	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	728/1424	4.51	4.20	4.21	4.06	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	1	3	2	1	2.89	1330/1396	2.71	3.35	3.98	3.89	2.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	3	5	1	3	3.00	1269/1342	3.68	4.05	4.07	3.88	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	1	3	9	4.13	881/1459	4.51	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	491/1480	4.92	4.75	4.68	4.64	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left($	4	0	0	0	5	5	1	3.64	1174/1450	4.04	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	1098/1409	4.49	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.14
O Bid the instruction of the format in the subject	- 1	^	0	^	2	-1	10	4 50	1107/1407	4 70	1 (7	1 (0	4 55	4 50

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	1098/1409	4.49	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	1107/1407	4.72	4.67	4.69	4.57	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	2	7	4.14	929/1399	4.26	4.25	4.26	4.23	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	0	10	4.46	636/1400	4.49	4.19	4.27	4.19	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	g 2	1	1	1	2	1	7	4.00	590/1179	4.19	3.98	3.96	3.85	4.00
Diamondan														

Discussion													
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	7	0	0	2.56 1218/1262	3.36	3.92	4.05	3.77	2.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	0	6	0	1	2.78 1205/1259	3.73	4.10	4.29	4.06	2.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	0	3	2	2	3.22 1148/1256	3.82	4.05	4.30	4.08	3.22
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	0	3	0	4.00 ****/ 788	3.91	3.90	4.00	3.80	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	А	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	15	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there a	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	8	_			
				?	0						

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 20 Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 371 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	eaner	ncies			Inst	ructor	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	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	210/1481	4.61	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	103/1481	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	127/1249	4.65	4.24	4.27	4.36	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1424	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.28	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	2	0	4		1218/1396	2.75	3.35	3.98	3.94	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1342	4.41	4.05	4.07	4.05	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.92	91/1459	4.55	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	0	10	4.82		4.91	4.75	4.68	4.68	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	417/1450	4.33	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1407	4.77	4.67	4.69	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92		4.59	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	218/1400	4.47	4.19	4.27		4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	104/1179	4.32	3.98	3.96	4.05	4.52
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	659/1262	4.04	3.92	4.05	4.11	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	1	0	7	4.33	729/1259	4.05	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	571/1256	3.93	4.05	4.30	4.28	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	105/ 788	3.25	3.90	4.00	3.98	4.75
- 1 · ·														
Laboratory	2	0	-	•	0	-	_		00/046	4 45	4 42	4 00	4 = 1	
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	89/ 246	4.47	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.44
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	6 7	4.75 5.00	40/ 249	4.55	4.29 4.82	4.11	4.32	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4 4	1 0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 242 1/ 240	4.81 4.80		4.40	4.63 4.58	5.00 5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	6	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 217	4.80	$4.54 \\ 4.24$	4.20	4.58	5.UU ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	U	U	U	U	۷	5.00	/ 21/	4.40	4.24	4.04	4.20	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.72	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.55	****
Field Work		_			_	_								
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.67	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	****	4.00	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.64	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	***	****	4.26	4.69	* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.80	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.44	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.50	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	1	0	0	0		,	****	****	4.65	4.66	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, -	****	****	4.83	4.43	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****
The state of the s		-	-	-	-	-	_		, 51			02		

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 12

Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 371 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there a	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	2						

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Instructor:

Enrollment:

EVANS, SUSAN A (Instr. B)

20 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 372 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	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	0	1	0	11	4.83	210/1481	4.61	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	103/1481	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	127/1249	4.65	4.24	4.27	4.36	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1424	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.28	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	2	0	4		1218/1396	2.75	3.35	3.98	3.94	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1342	4.41	4.05	4.07	4.05	5.00
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	0	0	0	0	0			4.92	91/1459	4.55	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	0	10	4.82		4.91	4.75	4.68	4.68	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	164/1450	4.33	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.60
Lecture	_	0	•	•	•	-		4 00	224/1400	4 50	1 16	4 40	4 45	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	334/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1407	4.77	4.67	4.69	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1399	4.59	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0		4.60	492/1400	4.47	4.19	4.27		4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	487/1179	4.32	3.98	3.96	4.05	4.52
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	659/1262	4.04	3.92	4.05	4.11	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	1	0	7	4.33	729/1259	4.05	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	571/1256	3.93	4.05	4.30	4.28	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	105/ 788		3.90	4.00		4.75
i. Were special ecciniques successivi	3	3	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	5	1.75	1037 700	3.23	3.70	1.00	3.70	1.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	89/ 246	4.47	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.44
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	40/ 249	4.55	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	0	0	7		1/ 242			4.40	4.63	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 240	4.80	4.54	4.20	4.58	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 217	4.40	4.24	4.04	4.28	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.72	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.55	****
m! 11 m 1														
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.67	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.64	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.69	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	***	****	4.42	4.80	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.50	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.75	4.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.43	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****
J. Here effect chough proceeds for all the scudelles		U	J	J	J	J		5.00	/ 24			1.02	5.00	

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Instructor:

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 12

Baltimore County EVANS, SUSAN A (Instr. B) Spring 2006

20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

University of Maryland

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	2						

Page 372

JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029 Course-Section: CMSC 201 0102 University of Maryland

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 12

Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 373 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

		Ouestion	g		MD	NA	Fr	eque:	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mear
		Quescion																
		Genera																
. Did you	gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	395/1481	4.61	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.6
. Did the	instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	422/1481	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.58
. Did the	exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	498/1249	4.65	4.24	4.27	4.36	4.50
. Did oth	er evalı	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	395/1424	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.28	4.55
. Did ass	igned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	3	4	1	3	1	0	2.11	1390/1396	2.75	3.35	3.98	3.94	2.1
. Did wri	tten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	755/1342	4.41	4.05	4.07	4.05	4.0
		system clearl			0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	854/1459	4.55	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.1
. How man	y times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1480	4.91	4.75	4.68	4.68	5.0
	-			hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	692/1450	4.33	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.2
		Lectur	e															
. Were th	e instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	290/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.83
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	963/1407	4.77	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.6
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	480/1399	4.59	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.5
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	312/1400		4.19	4.27	4.34	
				our understanding	0	1	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	299/1179		3.98	3.96	4.05	4.4
		Discus	gion															
Did ala	ee diea			what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	345/1262	4.04	3.92	4.05	4.11	4.5
				d to participate	7	0	1	0	1	2	1		1127/1259		4.10	4.29	4.34	3.4
		-	_	d open discussion	8	0	1	0	2	1	0		1206/1256		4.05	4.30	4.28	2.7
		echniques succe		d Open discussion	7	4	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 788		3.90	4.00	3.98	***
		Labora	+ 0 2011															
Did tho	lah ing	crease understa	_	f the material	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	67/ 246	4.47	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.5
			_			0	0	0	1	1		4.57	66/ 249		4.43	4.11	4.32	4.5
_	_	_		ground information	5	1	0	0	0	0	5 6	5.00						
	_			or lab activities	5				-	-			1/ 242			4.40	4.63	5.0
		structor provid			5	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	73/ 240				4.58	4.7
. Were re	quiremer	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	5	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	66/ 217	4.40	4.24	4.04	4.28	4.5
7.7		Semina			11	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	****/ 60	****	****	3.92	2 55	***
. were cr	iteria i	for grading mad	e clear		11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	***	* * * *	3.92	3.55	***
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
redits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	 jor	 s	0	 Graduat	e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	в 3														
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	2	Non-	-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									5				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		El	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enous	ah
	•	2.20 1.00	-	P 0			-001					-	respons				_	,
				I O		∩ +	her				1	1	1 00 00 10	LO 1	o bigi	cai		

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0103 University of Maryland Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 6

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Baltimore County

Page 374 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

								Fre	eque	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	-	om this cou	rse	0	0	0	Ο	0	1	5	4.83	210/1481	4.61	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.83
		ctor make clear				0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1481	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.29	5.00
		uestions reflec				0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1249	4.65	4.24	4.27	4.36	5.00
	_	uations reflect				0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	178/1424	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.28	4.80
		eadings contrib				0	2	1	0	1	1	_		1199/1396	2.75	3.35	3.98	3.94	3.25
		signments contr				0	5	0	0	0	0	1		****/1342	4.41	4.05	4.07	4.05	****
		g system clearl			10011100	0	0	0	0	0	0	6		1/1459	4.55	4.21	4.16	4.17	5.00
		was class cand				0	0	0	0	0	0	6		1/1480	4.91		4.68	4.68	5.00
		grade the overa		ching effec	tiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1450		4.10	4.09		5.00
1 77	Lecture						0	0	0	0	0	_	F 00	1 /1 400	4 70	1 16	4 40	4 47	F 00
	re the instructor's lectures well prepared I the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.47	5.00
						0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1407	4.77	4.67	4.69	4.78	5.00
		terial presente				0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1399	4.59	4.25	4.26	4.29	5.00
		es contribute t				0	0	0	0	0	0	6		1/1400	4.47	4.19	4.27	4.34	5.00
5. Did au	lalovisua.	l techniques en	nance y	your unders	tanding	0	U	U	U	U	0	6	5.00	1/1179	4.32	3.98	3.96	4.05	5.00
		Discus																	
		ussions contrib				1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	295/1262	4.04	3.92	4.05	4.11	4.60
		nts actively en				2	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	895/1259	4.05	4.10	4.29	4.34	
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open dis	cussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	773/1256	3.93	4.05	4.30	4.28	4.25
		Labora	tory																
1. Did th	ne lab ind	crease understa		of the mate:	rial	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 246	4.47	4.43	4.20	4.51	5.00
2. Were y	ou provid	ded with adequa	te back	kground info	ormation	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	53/ 249	4.55	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.67
3. Were n	ecessary	materials avai	lable f	for lab act:	ivities	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 242	4.81	4.82	4.40	4.63	5.00
4. Did th	ne lab ins	structor provid	e assis	stance		3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 240	4.80	4.54	4.20	4.58	5.00
5. Were r	requiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	learly spec	ified	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	4.40	4.24	4.04	4.28	****
	ere requirements for lab reports clearly specified						, Dist	trib	utio	n									
								0112	u010.										
Credits E	its Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad								Rea	asons	3			Туј	e 			Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	Α	5		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	9	1	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1														
FC 02	0	2 00 2 00	Δ.	~	^		0	'	7				^	TT-n all n and north		_	37		^

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0104 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I

EVANS, SUSAN A

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 6

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 375 Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

							Fr	equei	ncies	3		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															
. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	395/1481	4.61	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.67
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	162/1481	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.83
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1249	4.65	4.24	4.27	4.36	5.00
	_	ations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	437/1424	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.28	4.50
				what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1167/1396	2.75	3.35	3.98	3.94	3.33
				o what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342		4.05	4.07	4.05	5.00
		system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	276/1459	4.55	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.67
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1480		4.75	4.68	4.68	5.00
	_			hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	722/1450		4.10	4.09	4.15	4.17
		Lectur	e															
. Were th	ne instru	actor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	559/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.67
. Did the	instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1107/1407	4.77	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.50
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	376/1399	4.59	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.67
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	591/1400		4.19	4.27	4.34	4.50
				our understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3		4.17	510/1179		3.98	3.96	4.05	4.17
. Dia aud	erovibaa.	-	-	our unactionaling	Ü	Ü	J	Ü	_	3	_	1.1,	310/11/3	1.52	3.70	3.70	1.03	
. Did cla	ıss discı	Discus Issions contrib		what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	708/1262	4.04	3.92	4.05	4.11	4.00
				d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	588/1259		4.10	4.29	4.34	4.50
				d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	571/1256		4.05	4.30	4.28	4.50
		chniques succe			2	3	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 788		3.90	4.00	3.98	****
		Labora	tory															
. Did the	lab inc	rease understa	nding o	f the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	74/ 246	4.47	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.50
. Were yo	u provid	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	76/ 249	4.55	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.50
_	_	_		or lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 242	4.81	4.82	4.40	4.63	5.00
. Did the	lab ins	structor provid	e assis	tance	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 240	4.80	4.54	4.20	4.58	5.00
		_		early specified	4	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 217		4.24	4.04	4.28	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
redits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		 Pa		ed fo	 or Ma	ior		0	 Graduat		0	 Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2		1/6	quit!	cu I	J. 1110	، ٢٠٠٢	J	U	Graduat	_	J	Maje) <u>+</u>	J
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ga	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad	6	Non-	-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		Ge	iici a	_				J	onder-9	Lau	J	14011-	ila JUI	U
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		רים	ecti	7700				0	#### -	Maana +	here -	re not	enous	rh
grau.	U	3.30-4.00	_	P 0		ъŢ	CCCI	veb				U	respons				_	111
				P 0		0+	her					6	respons	es lo I	e sigi	ıııcan	IL	
				5 0 T 0		Ut	ner					6						

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0201 University of Maryland COMPUTER SCIENCE I Title

5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified

Baltimore County Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A Spring 2006

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 376

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		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	1	4.50	549/1481	4.61	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	517/1481	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	498/1249	4.65	4.24	4.27	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1424	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.28	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1083/1396	2.75	3.35	3.98	3.94	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	755/1342	4.41	4.05	4.07	4.05	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	460/1459	4.55	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1480	4.91	4.75	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	836/1450	4.33	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	762/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1107/1407	4.77	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	567/1399	4.59	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	591/1400	4.47	4.19	4.27	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	894/1179	4.32	3.98	3.96	4.05	3.50
Laboratory														
<u>-</u>	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	74/ 246	4.47	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.50
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	76/ 249	4.47	4.43	4.11	4.32	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	113/ 242	4.81	4.82	4.11	4.63	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 240	4.80	4.54	4.20	4.58	5.00
1. Did the lab imperator provide approxime	U	J	J	9	9	9		3.00	1/ 210	1.00	1.51	1.20	1.50	3.00

Frequency Distribution

0 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 198/217 4.40 4.24 4.04 4.28 3.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors		Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	1
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	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2	•			
				-	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0202 Title

COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 377 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	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	Ω	0	0	0	Ω	1	5	4.83	210/1481	4.61	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1481		4.27	4.23	4.29	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	n	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1249		4.24	4.27	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	n	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1424		4.20	4.21	4.28	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	0	0	1		1384/1396		3.35	3.98	3.94	2.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342		4.05	4.07	4.05	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	143/1459		4.21	4.16	4.17	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1480			4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	259/1450		4.10		4.15	
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	Λ	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1407			4.69	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1399		4.25	4.26	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4		591/1400		4.19	4.27	4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	4		208/1179		3.98			4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	0	1	1	2.80	1190/1262	4.04	3.92	4.05	4.11	2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	0	3		1027/1259		4.10	4.29	4.34	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	0	0	3		1084/1256		4.05	4.30	4.28	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	2	0	0	0	0		787/ 788			4.00	3.98	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	74/ 246	4.47	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	40/ 249	4.55	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	1	0	0	0	0	3		1/ 242			4.40	4.63	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 240	4.80	4.54	4.20	4.58	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 217		4.24	4.04	4.28	5.00
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.72	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	***	****	3.92	3.55	****
Frequ	.ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Crodita Farnod Cum CDA Exposted Crades				P.C.	agon	,			Ф. п	00			Majora	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors (Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	6	Non-major	0
84-150	1	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 sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0203
Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Page 378 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

		Question		NR	NA	Fro	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		_		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		Genera	1															
1 Did you	ı dəin new		_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	4 61	4.33	4.29	4.40	5.00
		or make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.29	5.00
				xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1249		4.24	4.27	4.36	5.00
		tions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1424		4.20	4.21	4.28	5.00
				what you learned	0	1	1	1	0	0	0		1394/1396		3.35	3.98	3.94	1.50
				o what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342		4.05	4.07	4.05	5.00
		system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	276/1459	4.55	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.67
		as class cand			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1480	4.91	4.75	4.68	4.68	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1450	4.33	4.10	4.09	4.15	5.00
		Lectur	е															
1. Were th	ne instruc	ctor's lecture	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the	e instruct	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	4.77	4.67	4.69	4.78	5.00		
3. Was led	cture mate	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1399	4.59	4.25	4.26	4.29	5.00		
4. Did the	e lectures	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1400	4.47	4.19	4.27	4.34	5.00		
5. Did aud	the lectures contribute to what you learned audiovisual techniques enhance your understa					0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1179	4.32	3.98	3.96	4.05	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discus	sions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	931/1262	4.04	3.92	4.05	4.11	3.67
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	729/1259	4.05	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.33
3. Did the	e instruct	or encourage	fair an	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	901/1256	3.93	4.05	4.30	4.28	4.00
4. Were sp	pecial tec	chniques succe	ssful		0	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	781/ 788	3.25	3.90	4.00	3.98	2.00
		Labora	tory															
				f the material	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	74/ 246	4.47	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.50
				ground information	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 249	4.55	4.29	4.11	4.32	5.00
	_			or lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 242	4.81	4.82	4.40	4.63	5.00
		ructor provid			1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 240	4.80	4.54	4.20	4.58	5.00
5. Were re	equirement	s for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 217	4.40	4.24	4.04	4.28	5.00
		Semina																
4. Did pre	esentation	ns contribute	to what	you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.72	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	3		
00-27						Red		ed f	or Ma	iors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55										,	-	-		-	-		-	-
56-83						Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	C 0 D 0									5				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Otl	ner					2						

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 379 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	395/1481	4.61	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	603/1481	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	647/1249	4.65	4.24	4.27	4.36	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	773/1424	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.28	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1292/1396	2.75	3.35	3.98	3.94	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	303/1342	4.41	4.05	4.07	4.05	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	550/1459	4.55	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1480	4.91	4.75	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1133/1450	4.33	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.71
. 3														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	217/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1153/1407	4.77	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	855/1399	4.59	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	969/1400	4.47	4.19	4.27	4.34	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	259/1179	4.32	3.98	3.96	4.05	4.50
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	1059/1262	4.04	3.92	4.05	4.11	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	2.	1	1		1152/1259	4.05	4.10	4.29	4.34	3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	2	2	1	1		1156/1256	3.93	4.05	4.30	4.28	3.17
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	1	1	0	0	0		****/ 788		3.90	4.00	3.98	****
1. Hold Special Commiques Successful		-	_	_	ŭ	ŭ	Ū	1.50	, , , , , ,	3.23	3.70	1.00	3.70	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	147/ 246	4.47	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	142/ 249	4.55	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.13
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	48/ 242	4.81	4.82	4.40	4.63	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	41/ 240	4.80	4.54	4.20	4.58	4.88
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	49/ 217	4.40	4.24	4.04	4.28	4.67
5. Here requirements for run reperts orearry specified	-		ŭ	ŭ	ŭ	-	_	1.07	13, 21,	1.10		1.01	1.20	1.07
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 69	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.72	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	2	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.55	****
J. Here criteria for grading made crear	Ü	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	-	o	1.00	, 00			3.72	3.33	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.66	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.43	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****
J. Here energy enough proceeds for all the students	U	U	J	J	_	U	U	5.00	, 24			1.02	5.00	

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

I 0 Other 8 ? 0

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
Instructor: NICHOLAS, CHARL (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 10

Spring 2006
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 380 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

	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	Λ	0	1	0	2	1	6	4 10	1006/1481	4.61	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	4		1179/1481		4.27	4.23	4.29	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	788/1249		4.24	4.27	4.36	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00			4.20	4.21	4.28	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	2	0	1		1374/1396		3.35	3.98	3.94	2.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	2	0	2		1166/1342		4.05	4.07	4.05	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	909/1459	4.55	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	729/1480	4.91	4.75	4.68	4.68	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1133/1450	4.33	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	762/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1107/1407	4.77	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1163/1399	4.59	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	977/1400	4.47	4.19	4.27	4.34	3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	359/1179	4.32	3.98	3.96	4.05	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	295/1262	4.04	3.92	4.05	4.11	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	588/1259	4.05	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	809/1256	3.93	4.05	4.30	4.28	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	604/ 788	3.25	3.90	4.00	3.98	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	116/ 246	4.47	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	114/ 249	4.55	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	159/ 242	4.81	4.82	4.40	4.63	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	137/ 240	4.80	4.54	4.20	4.58	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	94/ 217	4.40	4.24	4.04	4.28	4.33
Frequ	ency.	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Farned Cum CDA Expected Grades				Po:	acon	-			ጥኒክ	ne.			Majorg	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-	-	_	
				2	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0301 Title

University of Maryland COMPUTER SCIENCE I Baltimore County NICHOLAS, CHARL (Instr. B) Spring 2006

Enrollment: 15

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 381 JUN 13, 2006 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	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	1006/1481	4.61	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	2	4		1179/1481	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.29	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	788/1249	4.65	4.24	4.27	4.36	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	959/1424	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.28	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	2	0	1	2.43	1374/1396	2.75	3.35	3.98	3.94	2.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1166/1342	4.41	4.05	4.07	4.05	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	909/1459	4.55	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	729/1480	4.91	4.75	4.68	4.68	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1450	4.33	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1407	4.77	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	753/1399	4.59	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1269/1400	4.47	4.19	4.27	4.34	3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1041/1179	4.32	3.98	3.96	4.05	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	295/1262	4.04	3.92	4.05	4.11	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	588/1259	4.05	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	809/1256	3.93	4.05	4.30	4.28	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	604/ 788	3.25	3.90	4.00	3.98	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	Λ	2	4.33	116/ 246	4.47	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	114/ 249	4.55	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	159/ 242	4.81	4.82	4.40	4.63	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	137/ 240	4.80	4.54	4.20	4.58	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	94/ 217	4.40	4.24	4.04	4.28	4.33
J. Mere requirements for rab reports creatry specified	,	U	J	0		J	2	1.33	J1/ Z1/	1.40	1.21	1.01	1.20	1.33
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0302 University of Maryland COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Baltimore County

Instructor: NICHOLAS, CHARL Spring 2006

Enrollment: 15 Ouestionnaires: 12 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 382

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Ouestions Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 2 7 4.33 749/1481 4.61 4.33 4.29 4.40 4.33 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 7 4 4.25 822/1481 4.59 4.27 4.23 4.29 4.25 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 7 4 4.25 742/1249 4.65 4.24 4.27 4.36 4.25 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 2 0 0 1 7 2 4.10 908/1424 4.56 4.20 4.21 4.28 4.10 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 2 3 1 2.80 1341/1396 2.75 3.35 3.98 3.94 2.80 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 7 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 542/1342 4.41 4.05 4.07 4.05 4.257. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 2 4 6 4.33 695/1459 4.55 4.21 4.16 4.17 4.33 0 1 0 0 0 5 6 4.55 1025/1480 4.91 4.75 4.68 4.68 4.55 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1 0 0 1 9 1 4.00 836/1450 4.33 4.10 4.09 4.15 4.00Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 4 7 4.50 762/1409 4.79 4.46 4.42 4.47 4.50 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 10 4.83 659/1407 4.77 4.67 4.69 4.78 4.83 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 2 6 4 4.17 910/1399 4.59 4.25 4.26 4.29 4.17 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 0 4 7 4.42 692/1400 4.47 4.19 4.27 4.34 4.42 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 1 0 0 5 5 4.18 495/1179 4.32 3.98 3.96 4.05 4.18 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 2 3 5 4.09 677/1262 4.04 3.92 4.05 4.11 4.09 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 4 6 1 3.73 1052/1259 4.05 4.10 4.29 4.34 3.73 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 1 0 4 4 2 3.55 1097/1256 3.93 4.05 4.30 4.28 3.55 4. Were special techniques successful 1 10 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 788 3.25 3.90 4.00 3.98 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 116/246 4.47 4.43 4.20 4.51 4.33 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 9 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 114/249 4.55 4.29 4.11 4.32 4.33 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 84/242 4.81 4.82 4.40 4.63 4.67 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 9 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 137/ 240 4.80 4.54 4.20 4.58 4.33 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 9 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 94/ 217 4.40 4.24 4.04 4.28 4.33 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 11 0 0 0 4.00 ****/ 68 **** **** 4.49 5.00 **** 0 1 0 2.00 ****/ 69 **** **** 4.53 4.83 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 11 0 0 1 0 0 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** / 63 **** *** 4.44 4.00 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 11 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 69 5.00 5.00 4.35 4.72 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 11 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 68 **** **** 3.92 3.55 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades 0.00-0.99 0 A 8 Required for Majors 0 00-27 6 Graduate Major 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 В 2 2.00-2.99 0 C 2 0 56-83 0 General Under-grad 12 Non-major 1 D 0 84-150 3.00-3.49 4 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 11

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Instructor: WORTMAN, DANA T

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 383 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	1					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	0	0	1	5	4.29	805/1481	4.43	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	790/1481	4.39	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	432/1249	3.74	4.24	4.27	4.36	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	706/1424	4.05	4.20	4.21	4.28	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	2	0	1	2.67	1353/1396	2.82	3.35	3.98	3.94	2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	755/1342	3.63	4.05	4.07	4.05	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1086/1459	4.08	4.21	4.16	4.17	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1480	4.77	4.75	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	836/1450	4.25	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	682/1409	4.50	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	1053/1407	4.80	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	659/1399	4.39	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	421/1400	4.27	4.19	4.27	4.34	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	726/1179	4.07	3.98	3.96	4.05	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1262	4.02	3.92	4.05	4.11	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	451/1259	3.86	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256	3.67	4.05	4.30	4.28	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	3.98	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	Λ	0	1	2	4.75	44/ 246	4.37	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	76/ 249	3.89	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	63/ 242	4.82	4.82	4.40	4.63	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	103/ 240	4.02	4.54	4.20	4.58	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	66/ 217	4.03	4.24	4.04	4.28	4.50
	_	-	-	-	-	=			== .				. = -	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	7				
				2	0						

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Instructor: WORTMAN, DANA T

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 384 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course	${\tt Evaluation}$	Questionnaire
----------------	--------------------	---------------

	1					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	0	2	3	2	3.63	1315/1481	4.43	4.33	4.29	4.40	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	942/1481	4.39	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	992/1249	3.74	4.24	4.27	4.36	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	885/1424	4.05	4.20	4.21	4.28	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	1	0	2	2.83	1337/1396	2.82	3.35	3.98	3.94	2.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1071/1342	3.63	4.05	4.07	4.05	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	460/1459	4.08	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	4.77	4.75	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1055/1450	4.25	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	924/1409	4.50	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1200/1407	4.80	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	4	2		1110/1399	4.39	4.25	4.26	4.29	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	4	1	3.25	1283/1400	4.27	4.19	4.27	4.34	3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	793/1179	4.07	3.98	3.96	4.05	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	507/1262	4.02	3.92	4.05	4.11	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	451/1259	3.86	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1069/1256	3.67	4.05	4.30	4.28	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	3.98	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 246	4.37	4.43	4.20	4.51	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	53/ 249	3.89	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 242	4.82	4.82	4.40	4.63	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 240	4.09	4.54	4.20	4.58	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 217	4.03	4.24	4.04	4.28	5.00

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0104
Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II

2. Were you provided with adequate background information

3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities

5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified

4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance

Instructor: WORTMAN, DANA T

Enrollment: 5
Ouestionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 385 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

4.00 145/ 249 3.89 4.29 4.11 4.32 4.00

0 2.00 210/ 217 4.03 4.24 4.04 4.28 2.00

1/ 242 4.82 4.82 4.40 4.63 5.00

1/ 240 4.09 4.54 4.20 4.58 5.00

			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	1	1	2	4.25	844/1481	4.43	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	228/1481	4.39	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	498/1249	3.74	4.24	4.27	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	437/1424	4.05	4.20	4.21	4.28	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1167/1396	2.82	3.35	3.98	3.94	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1340/1342	3.63	4.05	4.07	4.05	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1337/1459	4.08	4.21	4.16	4.17	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1480	4.77	4.75	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1450	4.25	4.10	4.09	4.15	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1409	4.50	4.46	4.42	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1407	4.80	4.67	4.69	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1399	4.39	4.25	4.26	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	1017/1400	4.27	4.19	4.27	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	134/1179	4.07	3.98	3.96	4.05	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1081/1262	4.02	3.92	4.05	4.11	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1209/1259	3.86	4.10	4.29	4.34	2.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1145/1256	3.67	4.05	4.30	4.28	3.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	155/ 246	4.37	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.00

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Frequency Distribution

0 0 0 0

0 0 0 0

0 0

0 0 0

1 0 0

1 0

1 5.00

1 5.00

3

3 0 0

3

3

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

COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Title

Instructor: WORTMAN, DANA T

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 386

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque:	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	780/1481	4.43	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1000/1481		4.27	4.23	4.29	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1136/1249	3.74	4.24	4.27	4.36	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	807/1424	4.05	4.20	4.21	4.28	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	2	4	0	3.00	1292/1396	2.82	3.35	3.98	3.94	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	755/1342	3.63	4.05	4.07	4.05	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	695/1459	4.08	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1480	4.77	4.75	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1267/1450	4.25	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	383/1409		4.46	4.42	4.47	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	963/1407	4.80	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	753/1399		4.25	4.26	4.29	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	791/1400		4.19	4.27	4.34	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	840/1179	4.07	3.98	3.96	4.05	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	1		3.83	842/1262		3.92	4.05	4.11	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	895/1259		4.10	4.29	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	3	1		1012/1256		4.05	4.30	4.28	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	3.98	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	130/ 246	4.37	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	76/ 249	3.89	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	113/ 242	4.82	4.82	4.40	4.63	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	103/ 240	4.09	4.54	4.20	4.58	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	120/ 217	4.03	4.24	4.04	4.28	4.14
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.72	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.55	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.67	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.64	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.69	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.80	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.66	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.43	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Instructor: WORTMAN, DANA T

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 386 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0201 University of Maryland Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 387

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD (Instr. A)

4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance

Enrollment: 16 Ouestionnaires: 5

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 5 5.00 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1/1481 4.43 4.33 4.29 4.40 5.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 2 4.20 884/1481 4.39 4.27 4.23 4.29 4.20 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 1 1 2 0 2.80 1212/1249 3.74 4.24 4.27 4.36 2.80 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 3 2 0 3.40 1298/1424 4.05 4.20 4.21 4.28 3.40 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 2 3 0 0 0 1.00 1395/1396 2.82 3.35 3.98 3.94 1.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 1 0 0 0 2 3.67 1039/1342 3.63 4.05 4.07 4.05 3.67 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 2 0 1 2 3.60 1228/1459 4.08 4.21 4.16 4.17 3.60 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 997/1480 4.77 4.75 4.68 4.68 4.60 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 334/1450 4.25 4.10 4.09 4.15 4.25 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 Ω Ω 1 1 3 4.40 891/1409 4.50 4.46 4.42 4.47 4.20 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1407 4.80 4.67 4.69 4.78 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 3 2 4.40 683/1399 4.39 4.25 4.26 4.29 4.20 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 492/1400 4.27 4.19 4.27 4.34 4.30 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0 0 1 2 1 4.00 590/1179 4.07 3.98 3.96 4.05 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 507/1262 4.02 3.92 4.05 4.11 4.33 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 2 0 0 0 2 3.00 1162/1259 3.86 4.10 4.29 4.34 3.00 2 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 1 2.33 1233/1256 3.67 4.05 4.30 4.28 2.33 4. Were special techniques successful 3 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 788 **** 3.90 4.00 3.98 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 3 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 155/ 246 4.37 4.43 4.20 4.51 4.00 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 246/249 3.89 4.29 4.11 4.32 2.50 1/ 242 4.82 4.82 4.40 4.63 5.00

Frequency Distribution

3 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 212/ 240 4.09 4.54 4.20 4.58 3.00

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0201 University of Maryland Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II Baltimore County

Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 388

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD (Instr. B)
Enrollment: 16

Ouestionnaires: 5

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 5 5.00 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1/1481 4.43 4.33 4.29 4.40 5.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 2 4.20 884/1481 4.39 4.27 4.23 4.29 4.20 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals

0 0 1 1 1 2 0 2.80 1212/1249 3.74 4.27 4.25 4.29 4.20

4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals

0 0 0 0 3 2 0 3.40 1298/1424 4.05 4.20 4.21 4.28 3.40 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 2 3 0 0 0 0 1.00 1395/1396 2.82 3.35 3.98 3.94 1.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 1 0 0 0 2 3.67 1039/1342 3.63 4.05 4.07 4.05 3.67 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 2 0 1 2 3.60 1228/1459 4.08 4.21 4.16 4.17 3.60 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 997/1480 4.77 4.75 4.68 4.68 4.60 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 836/1450 4.25 4.10 4.09 4.15 4.25 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 Ω Ω 1 1 4.00 1152/1409 4.50 4.46 4.42 4.47 4.20 Ω 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 5.00 3 0 0 0 0 0 1/1407 4.80 4.67 4.69 4.78 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 1002/1399 4.39 4.25 4.26 4.29 4.20 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 1017/1400 4.27 4.19 4.27 4.34 4.30 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 590/1179 4.07 3.98 3.96 4.05 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 507/1262 4.02 3.92 4.05 4.11 4.33 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 2 0 0 0 2 3.00 1162/1259 3.86 4.10 4.29 4.34 3.00 2 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 1 2.33 1233/1256 3.67 4.05 4.30 4.28 2.33 4. Were special techniques successful 3 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 788 **** 3.90 4.00 3.98 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 3 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 155/ 246 4.37 4.43 4.20 4.51 4.00 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 246/249 3.89 4.29 4.11 4.32 2.50 1/ 242 4.82 4.82 4.40 4.63 5.00 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 3 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 212/ 240 4.09 4.54 4.20 4.58 3.00

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

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 389 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eane	ncie	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sec
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mea
General														
. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	918/1481	4.43	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.2
. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	183/1481	4.39	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.8
. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	893/1249	3.74	4.24	4.27	4.36	4.0
. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	959/1424		4.20	4.21	4.28	4.0
. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	877/1396		3.35	3.98	3.94	3.8
. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	l 0	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1115/1342		4.05	4.07	4.05	3.5
. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	611/1459	4.08	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.4
. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	839/1480		4.75	4.68	4.68	4.8
. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	217/1450	4.25	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.6
Lecture														
. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	648/1409	4.50	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.6
. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	728/1407	4.80	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.
. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	459/1399	4.39	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.
. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	250/1400		4.19	4.27	4.34	4.
. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	590/1179		3.98	3.96	4.05	4.
Discussion														
. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	958/1262	4.02	3.92	4.05	4.11	3.
. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	821/1259		4.10	4.29	4.34	4.
. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	1	1	2		1084/1256		4.05	4.30	4.28	3.
. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 788		3.90	4.00	3.98	**
Laboratory														
. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	74/ 246	4.37	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.
. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	76/ 249	3.89	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.
. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 242		4.82	4.40	4.63	**
. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	4.09	4.54	4.20	4.58	* *
. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 217		4.24	4.04	4.28	* *
Field Work														
. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.67	* *
. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.07	* *
Self Paced														
. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.44	* *
Fred	quency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade:	\$			Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
		 Re	auir	 ed f	or Ma	aior:	 s	0	 Graduat	 e	0	 Majo	 r	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	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 si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-		5	
				2	0						

COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Title Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 390 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Overtions				_	ncies	3			ructor	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	0	3	9	4.54	522/1481	4.43	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	917/1481	4.39	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	4	3.85	1005/1249	3.74	4.24	4.27	4.36	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	557/1424	4.05	4.20	4.21	4.28	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	901/1396	2.82	3.35	3.98	3.94	3.78
Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		9	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	303/1342	3.63	4.05	4.07	4.05	4.50
. Was the grading system clearly explained		0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	242/1459	4.08	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1029/1480	4.77	4.75	4.68	4.68	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	702/1450	4.25	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1131/1409	4.50	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	804/1407	4.80	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	703/1399	4.39	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	729/1400	4.27	4.19	4.27	4.34	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	340/1179	4.07	3.98	3.96	4.05	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	Λ	0	1	8	4.89	134/1262	4.02	3.92	4.05	4.11	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	451/1259	3.86	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	723/1256	3.67	4.05	4.30	4.28	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 788		3.90	4.00	3.98	****
1. Were apecial econityaca auceessial	-	,	O	U	2	O	U	3.00	, , , , ,		3.50	1.00	3.70	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	35/ 246	4.37	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	63/ 249	3.89	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 242	4.82	4.82	4.40	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 240	4.09	4.54	4.20	4.58	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	3	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 217	4.03	4.24	4.04	4.28	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	В	12	_					
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad 13		Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	12	=			
				2	^						

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 391 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean	Mean
General	
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 395/1481 4.43 4.33 4.29 4.40	4 60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 324/1481 4.39 4.27 4.23 4.29	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 2 2 4.00 893/1249 3.74 4.24 4.27 4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 2 1 2 4.00 959/1424 4.05 4.20 4.21 4.28	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 2 1 1 1 1 0 2.50 1368/1396 2.82 3.35 3.98 3.94	2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 0 1 2 1 4.00 755/1342 3.63 4.05 4.07 4.05	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 2 0 3 3.83 1101/1459 4.08 4.21 4.16 4.17	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 4 2 4.33 1158/1480 4.77 4.75 4.68 4.68	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness $$ 2 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 $$ 334/1450 4.25 4.10 4.09 4.15	4.50
Lecture	
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 3 3 4.50 762/1409 4.50 4.46 4.42 4.47	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1407 4.80 4.67 4.69 4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 3 2 4.17 910/1399 4.39 4.25 4.26 4.29	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 791/1400 4.27 4.19 4.27 4.34	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 1 2 0 3 3.83 739/1179 4.07 3.98 3.96 4.05	3.83
Discussion	
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 931/1262 4.02 3.92 4.05 4.11	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 1 0 1 0 1 3.00 1162/1259 3.86 4.10 4.29 4.34	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1256 3.67 4.05 4.30 4.28	5.00
Laboratory	
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 5 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 246 4.37 4.43 4.20 4.51	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** / 249 3.89 4.29 4.11 4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 5 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 212 4.82 4.82 4.40 4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 240 4.09 4.54 4.20 4.58	****

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0205 Title

COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 7

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 392 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questions			Fre	equer 2	ncies	3 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean			Sect Mean
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	NR 	NA 												
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	652/1481	4.43	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	264/1481	4.39	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	0	1	3	3.57	1102/1249	3.74	4.24	4.27	4.36	3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	840/1424		4.20	4.21	4.28	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	502/1396	2.82	3.35	3.98	3.94	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	0	1	1		1186/1342	3.63	4.05	4.07	4.05	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	224/1459		4.21	4.16	4.17	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	770/1480		4.75	4.68	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	334/1450	4.25	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.50
<u> </u>														
Lecture	_	0	^	0	0	0	_	4 71	402/1400	4 50	1 16	4 40	4 45	4 71
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	483/1409		4.46	4.42	4.47	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	614/1407	4.80	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.71	311/1399		4.25	4.26	4.29	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.43	844/1400 323/1179	4.27 4.07	4.19	4.27 3.96	4.34	4.29 4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	U	U	U	Т	2	4	4.43	323/11/9	4.07	3.98	3.90	4.05	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1081/1262	4.02	3.92	4.05	4.11	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	451/1259	3.86	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1134/1256	3.67	4.05	4.30	4.28	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	***	3.90	4.00	3.98	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	Λ	1	2	4.00	155/ 246	4.37	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	224/ 249		4.29	4.11	4.32	3.25
<ol> <li>Were you provided with adequate background information</li> <li>Were necessary materials available for lab activities</li> </ol>		0	0	0	0	2	2		113/ 242		4.82	4.40	4.63	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	225/ 240		4.54	4.20	4.58	2.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	66/ 217		4.24	4.04	4.28	4.50
									,					
From	onar	Diat	- wih	1+ i 0r	,									

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

DISCRETE STRUCTURES

Title Instructor: ARTOLA, PAUL

Enrollment: 34

Spring 2006 Questionnaires: 24 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 393 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

		NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	7	7	8	3.83	1206/1481	4.00	4.33	4.29	4.40	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	14	4.46	589/1481	4.02	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	18	4.58	423/1249	4.36	4.24	4.27	4.36	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	6	4	11	4.24	762/1424	3.96	4.20	4.21	4.28	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	4	4	4	4	3.22	1210/1396	3.20	3.35	3.98	3.94	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	719/1342	3.87	4.05	4.07	4.05	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	344/1459	4.16	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	351/1480	4.98	4.75	4.68	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	761/1450	3.78	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	290/1409	4.53	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	919/1407	4.65	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	8	12	4.35	743/1399	3.83	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	0	7	13	4.41	704/1400	3.97	4.19	4.27	4.34	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	1	2	3	0	5	3.55	880/1179	3.48	3.98	3.96	4.05	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	877/1262	3.58	3.92	4.05	4.11	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1036/1259	3.69	4.10	4.29	4.34	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	992/1256	3.90	4.05	4.30	4.28	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	335/ 788	4.17	3.90	4.00	3.98	4.17
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	4.51	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.29	4.11	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.82	4.40	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.54	4.20	4.58	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.24	4.04	4.28	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.72	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.55	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.67	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.64	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.69	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.80	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.66	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.43	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES

Instructor: ARTOLA, PAUL

Enrollment: 34
Questionnaires: 24

34

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 393 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there a	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to 1	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 203 0201 University of Maryland Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor: CHANG, RICHARD Enrollment: 34

Questionnaires: 26

Page 394 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

					Frequencies		Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect						
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
1 543		Genera	_		0	^	1	^	2	_	1 77	4 40	CEO /1 401	4 00	4 22	4 00	4 40	4 40	
		w insights,ski			0	0	1	0	3	5	17	4.42	,			4.29	4.40	4.42	
		tor make clear			0	0	0	1 1	3	11	11	4.23	843/1481		4.27	4.23	4.29	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals						2 15	0	U T	2	, 5	14 1	4.42	611/1249		4.24	4.27	4.36	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						15 8	0	3	4	5 1	_		1213/1424		4.20	4.21	4.28	3.70	
	5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned						2	3 1	1	_			1210/1396		3.35	3.98	3.94	3.22	
					0	12 0	0 1	1	4	3	6	4.00	755/1342		4.05	4.07	4.05	4.00	
		system clearl		ined	0	-	_	_	8				1030/1459		4.21	4.16	4.17	3.92	
		was class canc			0 4	0	0	0	0	1		4.96	- ,		4.75	4.68	4.68	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness						0	1	Τ	3	12	5	3.86	1005/1450	3.78	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.86	
		Lectur	e																
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well [.]	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	400/1409	4.53	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.77	
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	804/1407	4.65	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.77	
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	1	8	10	6		1125/1399		4.25	4.26	4.29	3.84	
		s contribute t			0	0	0	2	2	13	9	4.12	977/1400		4.19	4.27	4.34	4.12	
				our understanding	0	17	1	1	2	3	-		924/1179			3.96		3.44	
J. Dia aa	alovibaai	ccciniiqueb en	nance j	our underbeanding	Ü		_	_	-	3	-	5.11	221/11/2	3.10	3.70	3.70	1.05	3.11	
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	19	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	829/1262	3.58	3.92	4.05	4.11	3.86	
2. Were a	ll studen	ts actively en	courage	d to participate	19	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	846/1259	3.69	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.14	
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	19	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	901/1256	3.90	4.05	4.30	4.28	4.00	
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		19	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	4.17	3.90	4.00	3.98	***	
		Field							_	_	_								
3. Was the	e instruc	tor available	for con	sultation	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.64	****	
		Self	Paced																
3. Were v	our conta	cts with the i		or helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.66	****	
1																			
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	1										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Pes	son	e e			ጥን	ре			Majors	•	
										ь 									
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0	
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	в 13															
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C 2		Ger	neral	L				2	Under-g	rad 2	16	Non-	major	2	
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D 0															
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				2	#### -	Means there are not enough					
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt		
				I 0		Oth	ner				1	7							
				ი 1															

Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES

Instructor: CHANG, RICHARD

Enrollment: 31 Questionnaires: 20

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 395 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

	Frequencies			Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	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	4	9	6	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	7	4		1232/1481	4.02	4.27	4.23	4.29	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	7	6	4.00	893/1249	4.36	4.24	4.27	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	4	7	1	3.75	1186/1424	3.96	4.20	4.21	4.28	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	7	6	1	3.05	1282/1396	3.20	3.35	3.98	3.94	3.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	1	5	3	1	3.40	1166/1342	3.87	4.05	4.07	4.05	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	5	9	4.05	935/1459	4.16	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1480	4.98	4.75	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	7	6	4	3.72	1124/1450	3.78	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	891/1409	4.53	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	1153/1407	4.65	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	9	6	2	3.35	1272/1399	3.83	4.25	4.26	4.29	3.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	9	4	6	3.75	1145/1400	3.97	4.19	4.27	4.34	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	17	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1179	3.48	3.98	3.96	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	1092/1262	3.58	3.92	4.05	4.11	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	2	5	3	0		1158/1259	3.69	4.10	4.29	4.34	3.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	5	3	2		1059/1256	3.90	4.05	4.30	4.28	3.70
4. Were special techniques successful	10	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 788	4.17	3.90	4.00	3.98	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.29	4.11	4.32	***
Seminar		_			_									
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.67	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.80	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.44	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.66	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	utio	n									

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 203 0401 University of Maryl Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES Baltimore County Instructor: NIRUNBERG, SERG Spring 2006

?

0

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

34

University of Maryland Page 396
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Courge	Fvaluation	Ouestionnaire	

						Frequencies NA 1 2 3 4 5				tructor	Course Dept							
		Question	S		NR	NA	Τ	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	w insights,ski		m this course	0	0	1	0	6	4	5	3.75	1254/1481	4.00	4.33	4.29	4.40	3.75
_	_	tor make clear			0	0	0	2	4	7	3		1242/1481	4.02	4.27	4.23	4.29	3.69
	3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals				0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	586/1249		4.24	4.27	4.36	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						4	0	0	1	8	3	4.17			4.20	4.21	4.28	4.17
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned					2	2	2	2	6	2		1188/1396		3.35	3.98	3.94	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned					0	5	0	0	3	5	3		755/1342		4.05	4.07	4.05	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained						0	0	2	3	3	8	4.06	929/1459	4.16	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.06
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1480	4.98	4.75	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness					2	0	0	2	5	6	1	3.43	1258/1450			4.09	4.15	3.43
Lecture							0	0	2	7	_	1 12	1104/1400	4 52	1 10	4 40	1 17	1 12
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	3 1	7			1104/1409				4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						•	1	-	2				963/1407		4.67		4.78 4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly							1						1145/1399			4.26		3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	1 1	U T	3		3			1204/1400					3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					2	Т	U	3	4	3	3	3.46	914/1179	3.48	3.98	3.96	4.05	3.46
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	995/1262	3.58	3.92	4.05	4.11	3.50
2. Were al	ll studen	its actively en	courage	d to participate	12	0	0	-		1	1	3.75	1043/1259	3.69	4.10	4.29	4.34	3.75
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	12		0	0	2	0	2	4.00	901/1256	3.90	4.05	4.30	4.28	4.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		12	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 788	4.17	3.90	4.00	3.98	****
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	crib	ation	า									
	_				_													
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	; 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В 5			_									_		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	nera:	l				1	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### - 1	Means there are not enough				ſh
				P 0									responses to be s			ifican		
				I 0		Otl	ner				1	.3						

Course-Section: CMSC 291A 0101 Title

University of Maryland PRINCIPLES OF EE LAB Baltimore County Spring 2006

0

I

Instructor: YAN, LI Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 397 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

								_	ncies				ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	-	m this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.33	4.29	4.40	5.00
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.27	4.23	4.29	5.00
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.24	4.27	4.36	5.00
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.20	4.21	4.28	5.00
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	5.00	3.35	3.98	3.94	5.00
		_		o what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.05	4.07	4.05	5.00
		g system clearl		ined	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.21	4.16	4.17	5.00
	-	was class cand			1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.75	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.10	4.09	4.15	5.00
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.46	4.42	4.47	5.00
		n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.78	5.00		
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presente	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.25	4.26	4.29	5.00	
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.19	4.27	4.34	5.00	
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	5.00	3.98	3.96	4.05	5.00	
		Discus																
1. Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	5.00	3.92	4.05	4.11	5.00
				ed to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.10	4.29	4.34	5.00
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1256		4.05	4.30	4.28	5.00
		Labora	+ 02077															
1 Did the	e lah ind		-	of the material	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	155/ 246	4.00	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.00
				ground information	1	0	0	0	0	1	0		145/ 249	4.00	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.00
				for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 242	5.00	4.82	4.40	4.63	5.00
		structor provid			1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	4.54	4.20	4.58	5.00
		_		early specified	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	129/ 217	4.00	4.24	4.04	4.28	4.00
		Frequ	encv	. Diet	-rih	ıtioı	٦											
			rrequ	cricy	DISC		20101	-										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	 S	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0	1.0										_			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General							0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1				_	h
				P 0		Electives							respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	

Other

2

Course-Section: CMSC 313 0101

Title COMP ORGAN & ASSEMB LA

Instructor: BURT, GARY

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 398 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fre	eane	ncie	s		Tnsi	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA		_	3	4	5	Mean			_		Mean	
1 Didin	General		2	0	1	2	7	7	_	2 25	1404/1401	2 24	4 22	4 20	4 20	2 25
<ol> <li>Did you gain new</li> <li>Did the instructor</li> </ol>			2	0	4 5	3	11	, 5			1404/1481 1449/1481		4.33	4.29	4.29	3.35 2.85
3. Did the exam ques			3	0	1	<i>5</i>	9	6			1177/1249		4.24	4.23		3.16
4. Did other evaluat		-	2	2	0	3	7	5			1177/1249			4.21	4.27	3.78
5. Did assigned read			3	1	4	1	11	3			1239/1396		3.35	3.98	4.00	3.17
6. Did written assign	_	_	4	8	1	3	5	4			1192/1342		4.05	4.07	4.12	3.31
7. Was the grading s		_	3	0	1	7	7	5			1339/1459		4.21	4.16	4.17	3.24
8. How many times wa		ariica	3	1	1	0	3	19			1435/1480			4.68	4.65	
9. How would you gra		ching effectiveness	7	0	3	6	9	1	_		1417/1450			4.09	4.10	
					-	_	-	_	_		,					
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruct	or's lectures well	prepared	4	0	3	5	10	5	1	2.83	1381/1409	2.78	4.46	4.42	4.43	2.83
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						6	4	10		1334/1407		4.67	4.69	4.67	3.83
3. Was lecture mater	Was lecture material presented and explained clea:						6	4	1	2.50	1381/1399	2.62	4.25	4.26	4.27	2.50
4. Did the lectures	contribute to what	you learned	5	1	5	4	9	3	1	2.59	1356/1400	2.56	4.19	4.27	4.28	2.59
5. Did audiovisual t	echniques enhance	your understanding	5	0	6	3	8	5	1	2.65	1116/1179	2.94	3.98	3.96	4.02	2.65
	-	-														
	Discussion															
1. Did class discuss	sions contribute to	what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1262	3.00	3.92	4.05	4.14	****
2. Were all students	actively encourag	ed to participate	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1259	3.00	4.10	4.29	4.34	****
3. Did the instructo	or encourage fair a	nd open discussion	26	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1256		4.05	4.30	4.34	****
4. Were special tech	niques successful		26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.07	****
	Laboratory															
2. Were you provided	kground information	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	4.29	4.11	4.23	****	
		Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	;	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	16	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 313 0201

COMP ORGAN & ASSEMB LA

Instructor: BURT, GARY

Enrollment: 37 Questionnaires: 15

Title

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 399 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	quer	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank			Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	4	4	5	2		1407/1481			4.29	4.29	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	4	4	2	3.07	1415/1481	2.96	4.27	4.23	4.23	3.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	6	2	3.40	1136/1249	3.28	4.24	4.27	4.28	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	5	3	3	3.46	1284/1424	3.62	4.20	4.21	4.27	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	5	2	2	3.17	1239/1396	3.17	3.35	3.98	4.00	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	5	4	3	3.62	1065/1342	3.46	4.05	4.07	4.12	3.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	7	3	2	3.20	1348/1459	3.22	4.21	4.16	4.17	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	3	8	2		1446/1480		4.75	4.68	4.65	3.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	4	1	4	2	3.00	1354/1450	2.83	4.10	4.09	4.10	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	2	7	2	1	2 73	1388/1409	2.78	4.46	4.42	4.43	2.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	3	4	7		1288/1407	3.98	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	2	5	2			1365/1399		4.25	4.26	4.27	2.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	5	4	2	1		1361/1400		4.19	4.27	4.28	2.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	2	2	2	2		1005/1179		3.98	3.96	4.02	
J. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding	1	,	_	2	2	2	4	3.22	1003/11/2	2.74	3.90	3.90	4.02	3.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	2	0	0	2		1146/1262		3.92	4.05	4.14	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	3	0	1		1162/1259	3.00	4.10	4.29	4.34	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	3	0	1	0	1		1241/1256	2.20	4.05	4.30	4.34	2.20
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	***	3.90	4.00	4.07	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	4.20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 249	****	4.29	4.11	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 242	****	4.82	4.40	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.54	4.20	3.96	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 217	***	4.24	4.04	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00		****	****	4.44	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	11	U	U		U	U	U	2.00	, 00			3.92	1.13	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	****	4.60	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****

Course-Section: CMSC 313 0201

Title COMP ORGAN & ASSEMB LA

Instructor: BURT, GARY

Enrollment: 37
Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 399 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Tarned	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	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 331 0101 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF PROG LANGUAGES

2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate

4. Were special techniques successful

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 20 0

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor: MCSHANE, MARGE

Enrollment: 34 Ouestionnaires: 24

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 400

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

0 4 5.00 ****/1259 **** 4.10 4.29 4.34 **** 0 0 0 4 5.00 ****/1256 **** 4.05 4.30 4.34 ****

0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 788 **** 3.90 4.00 4.07 ****

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1 0 0 1 3 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 8 11 4.26 831/1481 4.20 4.33 4.29 4.29 4.26 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 2 8 13 4.48 560/1481 4.07 4.27 4.23 4.24 4.37 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 1 1 5 16 4.57 442/1249 4.26 4.24 4.27 4.28 4.57 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 1 0 0 11 11 4.35 633/1424 4.17 4.20 4.21 4.27 4.35 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 4 5 3 3 5 3.00 1292/1396 3.32 3.35 3.98 4.00 3.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 4 0 0 5 7 7 4.11 695/1342 4.16 4.05 4.07 4.12 4.117. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 1 8 14 4.57 390/1459 4.16 4.21 4.16 4.17 4.57 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 23 5.00 1/1480 4.62 4.75 4.68 4.65 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 2 15 4 4.10 786/1450 4.07 4.10 4.09 4.10 4.10 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 Ω 0 4 18 4.82 319/1409 4.43 4.46 4.42 4.43 4.82 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 1 4 17 4.73 880/1407 4.55 4.67 4.69 4.67 4.73 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 0 0 9 12 4.57 491/1399 4.10 4.25 4.26 4.27 4.57 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 7 15 4.68 397/1400 4.22 4.19 4.27 4.28 4.68 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 1 1 6 14 4.50 259/1179 4.28 3.98 3.96 4.02 4.50 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 ****/1262 **** 3.92 4.05 4.14 ****

## 20 1 0 Frequency Distribution

20 0

0

0

0 0

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General		Under-grad	24	Non-major	2
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 331 0201 University of Maryland
Title PRIN OF PROG LANGUAGES Baltimore County

PRIN OF PROG LANGUAGES Baltimore County VICK, SHON Spring 2006

Instructor: VICK, SHON

4. Were special techniques successful

Enrollment: 41
Ouestionnaires: 22

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 401

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

0 1 0 2 4.33 ****/ 788 **** 3.90 4.00 4.07 ****

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 2 3 7 10 4.14 976/1481 4.20 4.33 4.29 4.29 4.14 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 1 2 7 4 7 3.67 1253/1481 4.07 4.27 4.23 4.23 3.67 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 7 6 8 3.95 936/1249 4.26 4.24 4.27 4.28 3.95 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 3 0 3 2 5 8 4.00 959/1424 4.17 4.20 4.21 4.27 4.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 4 3 0 3 5 6 3.65 998/1396 3.32 3.35 3.98 4.00 3.65 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 7 1 0 1 5 7 4.21 573/1342 4.16 4.05 4.07 4.12 4.217. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 4 5 4 8 3.76 1148/1459 4.16 4.21 4.16 4.17 3.76 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 4 8 9 4.24 1230/1480 4.62 4.75 4.68 4.65 4.24 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 1 4 7 7 4.05 808/1450 4.07 4.10 4.09 4.10 4.05Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 1 0 4 9 8 4.05 1140/1409 4.43 4.46 4.42 4.43 4.05 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 1 3 4 13 4.38 1194/1407 4.55 4.67 4.69 4.67 4.38 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 1 1 9 4 6 3.62 1213/1399 4.10 4.25 4.26 4.27 3.62 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 4 4 6 7 3.76 1140/1400 4.22 4.19 4.27 4.28 3.76 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 6 0 2 3 2 8 4.07 570/1179 4.28 3.98 3.96 4.02 4.07 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 1 1 2 1 3.60 ****/1262 **** 3.92 4.05 4.14 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0 0 1 1 1 2 3.80 ****/1259 **** 4.10 4.29 4.34 **** 1 1 1 2 3.80 ****/1256 **** 4.05 4.30 4.34 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0 0

# 16 3 0 0 Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	<b>L</b>	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	22	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0101 University of Maryland DATA STRUCTURES FREY, DENNIS

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 25

36

Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 402

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionna	ire

			Fre	equer	ncie	c		Tnat	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	8	15	4.52	531/1481	4.52	4.33	4.29	4.29	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	15	4.54	469/1481	4.57	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	11	12	4.46	561/1249	4.47	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	4	10	7	4.14	863/1424	4.26	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	3	8	2	2	2.83	1337/1396	3.30	3.35	3.98	4.00	2.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	5	0	3	4	3.50	1115/1342	4.26	4.05	4.07	4.12	3.50
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	1	0	0	0	0	8	16	4.67	276/1459	4.60	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1480	4.97	4.75	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	319/1450	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	94/1409	4.74	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	591/1407	4.76	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	335/1399	4.54	4.25	4.26	4.27	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	385/1400	4.60	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	3	10	7	4.05	576/1179	4.35	3.98	3.96	4.02	4.05
Discussion		_		_	_									
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1262		3.92	4.05	4.14	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1259		4.10	4.29	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1256	3.92	4.05	4.30	4.34	****
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	8	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	1						

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0201

28

DATA STRUCTURES

FREY, DENNIS

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 403

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	5		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	4	14	4.78	268/1481	4.52	4.33	4.29	4.29	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	324/1481	4.57	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	334/1249	4.47	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	406/1424	4.26	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	3	5	3	2	3.14	1250/1396	3.30	3.35	3.98	4.00	3.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	474/1342	4.26	4.05	4.07	4.12	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	231/1459	4.60	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1480	4.97	4.75	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	281/1450	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	113/1409	4.74	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	300/1407	4.76	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	300/1399	4.54	4.25	4.26	4.27	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	349/1400	4.60	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	340/1179	4.35	3.98	3.96		4.40
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1262	3.83	3.92	4.05	4.14	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1259	4.08	4.10	4.29	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1256	3.92	4.05	4.30	4.34	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ıt i oı	า									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there a	re not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sign	ificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				2	2						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0301

37

DATA STRUCTURES

EDELMAN, MITCHE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 24

Spring 2006

Page 404

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions				Fr	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 gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	1	2	7	14	4.42	665/1481	4.52	4.33	4.29	4.29	4.42
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	15	4.46	589/1481	4.57	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.46
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	13	4.38	647/1249	4.47	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.38
4. Did oth	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	1	1	1	3	5	13	4.22	784/1424	4.26	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.22
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	8	1	2	4	5	4	3.56	1048/1396	3.30	3.35	3.98	4.00	3.56
6. Did wri	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	13	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	354/1342	4.26	4.05	4.07	4.12	4.45
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	1	0	0	1	3	5	14	4.39	623/1459	4.60	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.39
8. How mar	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	756/1480	4.97	4.75	4.68	4.65	4.87
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	9	9	4.17	712/1450	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.17
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	1	2	4	17	4.54	716/1409	4.74	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.54
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	3	4	17	4.58	1046/1407	4.76	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.58
3. Was led	the instructor seem interested in the subject lecture material presented and explained clear			explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	7	13	4.38	713/1399	4.54	4.25	4.26	4.27	4.38
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	1	0	3	5	15	4.38	741/1400	4.60	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.38
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	0	1	1	1	4	16	4.43	315/1179	4.35	3.98	3.96	4.02	4.43
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	18	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	931/1262	3.83	3.92	4.05	4.14	3.67
2. Were al	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	18	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	836/1259	4.08	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.17
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	18	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1012/1256	3.92	4.05	4.30	4.34	3.83
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		18	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.07	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Re	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	5
				- 														
00-27					ке	quir	ea I	or Ma	ijor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	)r.	0	
28-55	33 6 2.00-2.99 3 C 5			<b>a</b>		7				0	TTrades		1.4	Mari		0		
56-83				Ge	nera	Т				0	Under-g	rad 2	24	Non-	-major	0		
84-150 Grad.						ר יוד	ecti [.]					0	#### - 1	Moona +	homo -	n-+		-h
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	5	P 0		FT.	ECL1,	ves				U	respons				_	)II
				I O		Ot1	her				2	1	_		3			

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 405

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0401 University of Maryland DATA STRUCTURES

Questionnaires: 8

Title Instructor: PENG, YUN Spring 2006 Enrollment: 15

				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	3	4	4.38	708/1481	4.52	4.33	4.29	4.29	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	374/1481	4.57	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	647/1249	4.47	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the exp	ected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	863/1424	4.26	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to v	hat you learned	0	2	0	2	0	2	2	3.67	985/1396	3.30	3.35	3.98	4.00	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to	what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	135/1342	4.26	4.05	4.07	4.12	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explain	ned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	321/1459	4.60	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1480	4.97	4.75	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teach	ning effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	630/1450	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.25
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well p	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	762/1409	4.74	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in	the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1008/1407	4.76	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and ex	plained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	713/1399	4.54	4.25	4.26	4.27	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what y	ou learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	468/1400	4.60	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance yo	our understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	259/1179	4.35	3.98	3.96	4.02	4.50
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to v	hat you learned	5	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	708/1262	3.83	3.92	4.05	4.14	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged	l to participate	5	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	895/1259	4.08	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and	l open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	901/1256	3.92	4.05	4.30	4.34	4.00
. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion . Were special techniques successful			2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	***	3.90	4.00	4.07	****
	Frequ	ency.	Dist	ribu	ıtioı	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	

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

Course-Section: CMSC 345 0101 University of Maryland Title SOFTWARE DESIGN/DEVELO MITCHELL, SUSAN

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 406

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			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 you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	600/1481	4.44	4.33	4.29	4.29	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	246/1481	4.58	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	470/1249	4.47	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	364/1424	4.53	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	5	6	2	3.57	1042/1396	3.57	3.35	3.98	4.00	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	626/1342	4.10	4.05	4.07	4.12	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	749/1459	4.29	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	2		1295/1480	4.56	4.75	4.68	4.65	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	525/1450	4.16	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	450/1409	4.64	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	591/1407	4.75	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	289/1399	4.51	4.25	4.26	4.27	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	492/1400	4.37	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	2	2	3	6	4.00	590/1179	4.06	3.98	3.96	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	437/1262	4.28	3.92	4.05	4.14	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	422/1259	4.65	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	216/1256	4.68	4.05	4.30	4.34	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	501/ 788	4.09	3.90	4.00	4.07	3.86

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	14	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 345 0201 University of Maryland Title SOFTWARE DESIGN/DEVELO

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 407

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 22

MITCHELL, SUSAN

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			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 you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	12	6	4.05	1043/1481	4.44	4.33	4.29	4.29	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	12	8	4.33	736/1481	4.58	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	10	7	4.20	788/1249	4.47	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	10	11	4.52	416/1424	4.53	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	5	5	4	5	3.14	1255/1396	3.57	3.35	3.98	4.00	3.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	7	5	6	3.50	1115/1342	4.10	4.05	4.07	4.12	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	7	6	6	3.76	1148/1459	4.29	4.21	4.16	4.17	3.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	12	4.55	1025/1480	4.56	4.75	4.68	4.65	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	6	8	3	3.82	1038/1450	4.16	4.10	4.09	4.10	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	10	1.0	4.36	935/1409	4.64	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	7	13		1107/1407	4.75	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	10	8	4.18	892/1399	4.51	4.25	4.26	4.27	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	8	6	6	3.81	1120/1400	4.37	4.19	4.27	4.28	3.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	5	10	4	3.71	820/1179	4.06	3.98	3.96	4.02	3.71
Discussion														
	_	0	0	1	4	_	_	4.00	700/1060	4 20	3.92	4 05	1 11	4 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	11		708/1262	4.28		4.05	4.14	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	7	11 9	4.59 4.47	524/1259 603/1256	4.65 4.68	4.10 4.05	4.29 4.30	4.34	4.59 4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	5 5	0	0	0	7	6	6	4.47	318/ 788	4.08	3.90	4.30	4.34	4.47
4. Mete special reculliques successiul	5	4	U	U	3	O	O	4.20	210/ 188	4.09	3.90	4.00	4.0/	4.20

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	1
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 345 0301
Title SOFTWARE DESIGN/DEVELO

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor: PETERSON, SPENC
Enrollment: 19

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 408 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

							Fr	eque	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 yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls from	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	225/1481	4.44	4.33	4.29	4.29	4.81
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	299/1481	4.58	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.69
3. Did th	ie exam qu	estions reflec	t the ex	xpected goals	0	1	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	334/1249	4.47	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.67
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	437/1424	4.53	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.50
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to v	what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	5	5	4.00	707/1396	3.57	3.35	3.98	4.00	4.00
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	206/1342	4.10	4.05	4.07	4.12	4.64
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla:	ined	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	155/1459	4.29	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.81
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	1	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1480	4.56	4.75	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	2	1	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	578/1450	4.16	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.31
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well p	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	319/1409	4.64	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.81
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested in	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	568/1407	4.75	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.88
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	d and ex	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	431/1399	4.51	4.25	4.26	4.27	4.63
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what y	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	397/1400	4.37	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.69
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	0	1	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	291/1179	4.06	3.98	3.96	4.02	4.47
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to v	what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	418/1262	4.28	3.92	4.05	4.14	4.43
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	451/1259	4.65	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.67
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair and	d open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	457/1256	4.68	4.05	4.30	4.34	4.67
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		10	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	318/ 788	4.09	3.90	4.00	4.07	4.20
		Field	Work															
1. Did fi	eld exper	rience contribu	te to wh	nat you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	<b>;</b>
				 										- 				
00-27 28-55	0 0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	A 11 B 3		ке	quir	ea I	or Ma	ijor	5	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	Σ	0
28-55 56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		0-	nera	1				2	Under-q	~~d 1	6	Moss	mo i o	3
	6		3	D 0		Ge:	nera.	Т				∠	unaer-g	rau l	.0	NON-	-major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3 4	D U F O		ר קו	0 a t d .					1		Moona +	homo -	n-+		·h
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	4	- 0		ĽТ	ecti [,]	ves				Τ.	#### -				_	111
				P 0 I 0		٥-	hon				1	2	respons	es lo I	e sign	iiican	IL	
				2 1		Ut.	her				1	.3						
				? 1														

Course-Section: CMSC 411 0101 University of Maryla Title COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE Baltimore County Instructor: YOUNIS, MOHAMED Spring 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 21

42

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 409

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

C .				
Stuc	dent Cours	se Evaluati	on Ouesti	onnaire

			Fr	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	1	8	4	8	3.90	1162/1481	4.10	4.33	4.29	4.45	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	9	4.19	884/1481	4.35	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	639/1249	4.54	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	863/1424	4.21	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	4	2	4	5	3.50	1083/1396	3.53	3.35	3.98	4.09	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	1	4	9	4.19	603/1342	4.19	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	332/1459	4.68	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1480	4.98	4.75	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	6	8	4	3.79	1072/1450	4.05	4.10	4.09	4.28	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	6	13	4.48	800/1409	4.59	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	2	16	4.62	1019/1407	4.68	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	8	2	8	3.67	1196/1399	4.07	4.25	4.26	4.36	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	7	3	8	3.67	1183/1400	4.10	4.19	4.27	4.38	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	3	3	2	5	7	3.50	894/1179	3.97	3.98	3.96	4.07	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1262	****	3.92	4.05	4.33	***
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1259		4.10	4.29	4.57	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/1256			4.30	4.60	****
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7		Re	auir	ed f	or Ma		 `s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	 Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	0
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20	_			
				2	0						

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: CMSC 411 0201 University of Maryland Page 410 Title COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE JUN 13, 2006 Instructor: YOUNIS, MOHAMED Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 27

36

			Fre	equer	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	1	0	3	9	14	4.30	792/1481	4.10	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	11	15	4.52	505/1481	4.35	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	19	4.70	287/1249	4.54	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	706/1424	4.21	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	2	6	4	5	3.56	1054/1396	3.53	3.35	3.98	4.09	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	603/1342	4.19	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	203/1459	4.68	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	281/1480	4.98	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	11	11	4.32	557/1450	4.05	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	20	4.70	500/1409	4.59	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	842/1407	4.68	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	5	18	4.48	590/1399	4.07	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	8	16	4.54	561/1400	4.10	4.19	4.27	4.38	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	2	9	12	4.43	315/1179	3.97	3.98	3.96	4.07	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/1262	****	3.92	4.05	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1259	****	4.10	4.29	4.57	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/1256	****	4.05	4.30	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	22	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.26	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	В	7						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	С	5	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	0
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
			I	0	Other	26	_				
				2	2						

Course-Section: CMSC 421 0101

Title PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS

Instructor: SIVALINGAM, KRI

Enrollment: 56
Questionnaires: 38

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 411 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestion	naire

			Fre	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														
	-		^	2	2	1 2	1.0	1 0 1	057/1401	4 2 4	4 22	4 00	4 45	4 0 4
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Ţ	0	0	3	3	13	18	4.24	857/1481		4.33	4.29	4.45	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	Ţ	6	18	13	4.13	934/1481	4.25	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	Τ.	0	1	0	9	16	11	3.97	919/1249	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.44	3.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	1	7	10	15	4.09	918/1424	4.11	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	6	11	15	3.94	763/1396		3.35	3.98	4.09	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	1	2	4	7	10	3.96	819/1342	4.02	4.05	4.07	4.21	3.96
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	2	0	1	2	6	11	16	4.08	919/1459	4.23	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	2	0	1	33	4.81	839/1480	4.90	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	10	13	10	4.00	836/1450	4.18	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.00
Lecture														
<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> </ol>	2	0	0	1	2	10	23	4.53	739/1409	4.64	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	10	24	4.57	1061/1407	4.64	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	17	14	4.22	855/1399	4.37	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	6	15	14	4.17	937/1400	4.32	4.19	4.27	4.38	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	1	2	8	9	7	3.70	827/1179	3.89	3.98	3.96	4.07	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	****/1262	****	3.92	4.05	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	****/1259	****	4.10	4.29	4.57	***
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	****/1256	****	4.05	4.30	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	31	5	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.26	****
		_	-	-	-	_	-		,					

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	6	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	38	Non-major	1
84-150	21	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	34	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 421 0201

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2006

Title PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS Instructor: FREY, DENNIS

Enrollment: 56
Questionnaires: 44

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 412 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

	Overtions						Fre	eque:	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 .1															
1. Did v	you gain n	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	1	2	18	23	4.43	639/1481	4.34	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.43
_		ctor make clear			0	0	2	0	3	14	25	4.36	704/1481	4.25	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.36
		uestions reflec		_	0	0	1	2	1	17	23	4.34	671/1249	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.34
4. Did o	other eval	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	5	1	1	7	13	17	4.13	885/1424	4.11	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.13
5. Did a	assigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	3	1	3	8	11	17	4.00	707/1396	3.97	3.35	3.98	4.09	4.00
6. Did w	written as:	signments contr	ribute t	to what you learned	0	11	0	2	7	10	14	4.09	701/1342	4.02	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.09
7. Was t	the grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	1	1	4	12	26	4.39	635/1459	4.23	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.39
8. How m	many times	was class cand	elled		0	1	0	0	0	0	43	5.00	1/1480	4.90	4.75	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How w	would you	grade the overa	all tead	ching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	3	15	18	4.35	525/1450	4.18	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.35
1. Were	Lecture Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	2	0	5	36	4.74	433/1409	4.64	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.74
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	1	1	7	34	4.72	880/1407	4.64	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.72
				explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	10	28	4.51	556/1399	4.37	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.51
		es contribute t			1	0	0	2	3	11	27	4.47	636/1400	4.32	4.19	4.27	4.38	4.47
				your understanding	1	6	1	1	8	11	16	4.08	563/1179	3.89	3.98	3.96	4.07	4.08
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	class disc	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	40	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/1262	***	3.92	4.05	4.33	****
2. Were	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	40	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1259	****	4.10	4.29	4.57	***
3. Did t	the instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	40	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1256	****	4.05	4.30	4.60	****
		Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n											
Crodita	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Do					т.	<b></b>			Majawa	
creatts	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							ке.	ason	ເຮ			Ту]	pe 			Majors	; ·
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Red	quir	ed f	or M	lajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 19														
56-83						Gei	nerai	1				0	Under-a	rad 4	4	Non-	-maior	0

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	19						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	44	Non-major	0
84-150	30	3.00-3.49	20	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	41				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CMSC 431 0101 Title

COMPILER DESIGN PRINC

Instructor: VICK, SHON

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 8

## Baltimore County Spring 2006

University of Maryland

Page 413 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			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	1	0	5	2	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1025/1396	3.60	3.35	3.98	4.09	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	542/1342	4.25	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	1256/1459	3.50	4.21	4.16	4.25	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1133/1480	4.38	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1086/1409	4.17	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1107/1407	4.50	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	910/1399	4.17	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1017/1400	4.00	4.19	4.27	4.38	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1021/1179	3.17	3.98	3.96	4.07	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	708/1262	4.00	3.92	4.05	4.33	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	783/1259	4.25	4.10	4.29	4.57	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	571/1256	4.50	4.05	4.30	4.60	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.26	***

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

Course-Section: CMSC 433 0101 University of Maryla Title SCRIPTING LANGUAGES Baltimore County Instructor: HOOD, DANIEL J Spring 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 30

51

University of Maryland Page 414
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnair	e
---------	--------	------------	--------------	---

	Overtiens					Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	.1															
1 Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		om this course	1	0	0	0	Λ	2	27	4.93	111/1481	4.93	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.93
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	121/1481	4.90	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.90
		uestions reflec			1	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	190/1249	4.83	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.83
	_	uations reflect			1	5	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	148/1424	4.88	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.88
				what you learned	1	10	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	493/1396	4.26	3.35	3.98	4.09	4.26
	_	_		to what you learned	1	10	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	101/1342	4.84	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.84
		g system clearl		-	1	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	107/1459	4.90	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.90
		was class cand		221100	1	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	281/1480	4.97	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.97
	-			ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	9	18	4.67	217/1450		4.10		4.28	
J. 11011 110	Julu jou	grade one evere		311113 0110001,011000		Ü	Ū	Ü	Ü	-		1.07	227, 2130	1.07	1.10	1.05	1120	2.07
		Lectur	re															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	131/1409	4.93	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.93
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	200/1407	4.97	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.97
	as lecture material presented and explained clearly				1	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	162/1399	4.86	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.86
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	1	0	3	4	21	4.52	581/1400	4.52	4.19	4.27	4.38	4.52
5. Did au	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					2	0	1	1	3	21	4.69	162/1179	4.69	3.98	3.96	4.07	4.69
		-	-															
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	24	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/1262	****	3.92	4.05	4.33	****
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	24	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	****/1259	****	4.10	4.29	4.57	****
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	24	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/1256	****	4.05	4.30	4.60	****
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	essful		24	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.26	****
				Frequ	lency	Dist	cribu	ition	1									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	7	Expected Grades				Rea	sons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	
	·																	
00-27						Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ijor	S	2	Graduat	9	0	Majo	r	0
28-55						_					_	_	1					
56-83						Ger	neral	-			1	7	Under-g	rad 3	0	Non-	major	0
84-150												0			1			1-
Grad.	0 3.50-4.00 11 F 0					E⊥€	ectiv	res				2	#### - 1				_	n
				P 1		0/1						0	respons	es to b	e sign	.111can	IT	
				I 0		Otł	ner					9						
	? 1																	

Course-Section: CMSC 437 0101

Title GRAPH USE INTERFACE PR

Instructor: SQUIRE, JON

Enrollment: 30

Questionnaires: 18

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 415 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				aner	cies	:		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	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	2	2	6	7		1037/1481	4.06	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	5	7	4.06	979/1481	4.06	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	757/1249	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	807/1424	4.20	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	4	1	1	3		1272/1396	3.10	3.35	3.98	4.09	3.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	2	2	2			1039/1342	3.67	4.05	4.07	4.21	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4			4.47	505/1459	4.47	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.75	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	792/1450	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	559/1409	4.67	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	963/1407	4.67	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	801/1399	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	5	4			1101/1400	3.87	4.19	4.27	4.38	3.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	3	10		187/1179		3.98		4.07	4.64
5. Did addiovibual teelmiques cimanee your understanding	5	_	Ü	O	_	5	10	1.01	107/1179	1.01	3.50	3.50	1.07	1.01
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1262	****	3.92	4.05	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1259	****	4.10	4.29	4.57	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1256	****	4.05	4.30	4.60	****
- 1														
Laboratory	1 77	0	^	^	0	0	1	F 00	**** / 016	****	4 42	4 00	4 4 5	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	4.45	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 249		4.29	4.11	3.87	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 242	***	4.82	4.40	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	***	4.54	4.20	4.43	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.24	4.04	3.86	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.68	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.64	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.49	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.10	****
ni da wada														
Field Work	1.77	0	^	^	0	^	1	г оо	****/ 59	****		4 20	4 02	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, 55	****	****	4.30	4.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 51			4.00	4.56	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.91	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.83	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.86	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.71	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****

Course-Section: CMSC 437 0101

Title GRAPH USE INTERFACE PR

Instructor: SQUIRE, JON

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 415 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	С	0	General	8	Under-grad	18	Non-major	1
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CMSC 441 0101 University of Maryland Page 416
Title ALGORITHMS Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Instructor: YESHA, YAACOV Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 27

Questionnaires: 13

Student (	Course	Evaluation	Ouest:	ionnaire
-----------	--------	------------	--------	----------

							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	vou gain m	new insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	2	1	7	2	1	2 92	1466/1481	3.63	4.33	4.29	4.45	2.92
		uctor make clear			0	0	0	2	2	3	6		1000/1481	3.96	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.00
		questions reflec		_	0	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	548/1249	3.96	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.46
		luations reflect		_	0	5	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	595/1424	3.90	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.38
				what you learned	0	1	3	1	3	2	3		1276/1396		3.35	3.98	4.09	3.08
	_	_		o what you learned	0	6	1	0	2	2	2		1084/1342		4.05	4.07	4.21	3.57
		ng system clearl			0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	635/1459	4.38	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.38
		s was class canc			1	2	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	702/1480		4.75	4.68	4.74	
	-			hing effectiveness	3	0	1	2	4	3	0		1386/1450		4.10	4.09		2.90
J. 110W	would you	grade the overa	II ccac	ming criccerveness	3	J	_	_	-	3	Ü	2.50	1300/1130	3.33	1.10	1.05	1.20	2.50
		Lectur	e															
1. Wer	e the inst	ructor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	7	4	2	3.62	1279/1409	4.03	4.46	4.42	4.51	3.62
2. Did	the instru	uctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	1318/1407	4.37	4.67	4.69	4.79	3.92
3. Was	lecture ma	aterial presente	d and e	explained clearly	0	0	0	3	6	2	2	3.23	1297/1399	3.64	4.25	4.26	4.36	3.23
4. Did	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						2	3	6	0	1	2.58	1357/1400	3.31	4.19	4.27	4.38	2.58
5. Did	audiovisua	al techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	9	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	997/1179	3.25	3.98	3.96	4.07	3.25
		-	_															
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class disc	cussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1262	****	3.92	4.05	4.33	****
2. Wer	e all stude	ents actively en	courage	ed to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1259	****	4.10	4.29	4.57	****
3. Did	the instru	uctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1256	****	4.05	4.30	4.60	****
4. Wer	e special t	techniques succe	ssful		12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.26	****
				Frequ	uency	7 Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credit	s Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			ТУ	pe			Majors	1		
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7					 Re	anir	 ed f	 or Ms	ajors		0	Graduat		0	Majo		0
28-55						110	2u11	-u 1	J_ 1/1C	2015		J	Graduat	_	J	1.10. ) (		J
56-83						Ge.	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	3	Non-	major	0
	34-150 7 3.00-3.49 5 D 0					GC.	C- U.	-				~	onacr 9			1,011		0
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0					E1.	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
oraa.	P 0					Electives			<pre>0 #### - Means there are not enou     responses to be significant</pre>		_							
	I 0					O+	her				1	3	10000115		c bigi			
		± 0		00.	1101				_									

?

2

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: CMSC 441 0201

ALGORITHMS

40

COLE, FLOYD

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 24

Page 417 JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

- ·				
Ctudant	COLLEGA	Evaluation	Ollegtion	n $a$ $r$ $a$

					Frequencies						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 n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	5	6	13	4.33	749/1481	3.63	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.33
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	1	1	5	8	8	3.91	1106/1481	3.96	4.27	4.23	4.32	3.91
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	1	4	7	7	5	3.46	1127/1249	3.96	4.24	4.27	4.44	3.46
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	12	0	1	7	2	2	3.42	1295/1424	3.90	4.20	4.21	4.35	3.42
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	6	1	0	6	4	7	3.89	816/1396	3.49	3.35	3.98	4.09	3.89
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	17	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	755/1342	3.79	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.00
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	3	6	14	4.38	647/1459	4.38	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.38
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	1	0	0	12	11	4.33	1158/1480	4.62	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.33
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	2	3	12	3	3.80	1055/1450	3.35	4.10	4.09	4.28	3.80
		Lectur	۵															
1 Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	1	0	0	0	3	7	13	4.43	852/1409	4.03	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.43
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	,			4.69	4.79	4.83
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	1	5	9	8	4.04	,		4.25	4.26	4.36	4.04
		es contribute t			1	0 0	1	2	2	8			1004/1400		4.19	4.27	4.38	4.04
				our understanding	3		0	0	2	1			****/1179				4.07	****
		Discus	_:															
1 Did al	laga diga			what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	4 00	****/1262	****	3.92	4.05	4.33	****
				d to participate	21	0	0	0	7	0	1		****/1259	****	4.10	4.05	4.53	****
				d to participate d open discussion	21	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/1256		4.10	4.30	4.60	****
		echniques succe		d Open discussion	21	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 788		3.90	4.00	4.26	****
1. Were b	opeciai c	comingues succe	DDIGI			_	Ü	J	_	Ü	_	1.00	, , , , , ,		3.50	1.00	1.20	
				Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2					Re	anir	ed fo	 วr M	 aior		o	Graduat	 e	1	Majo		0
28-55						1/6/	2u11	-u 1	1·1 ــــر	۱۰۲ م	_	J	Graduat	_	_	1.10. ) (	-	J
56-83						Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 2	:3	Non-	major	2
	84-150 11 3.00-3.49 6 D 1					00.	u	-				-	orract 9		. •	11011		-
Grad.					Electives					0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ιh		
P 0					Electives			0 #### - Means there are not enounce responses to be significant			,							
	I 0					Other					1	18						

? 0

Course-Section: CMSC 443H 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County Instructor: STEPHENS, ARTHU Spring 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 18

22

University of Maryland Page 418
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

C+11don+	Courac	Erraluation	Ouestionnaire
bludent	COULSE	Evaluation	Ouescronnarie

	1					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	1	0	2	15	4.72	328/1481	4.72	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	255/1481	4.72	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	228/1249	4.78	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	302/1424	4.65	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	675/1396	4.06	3.35	3.98	4.09	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	257/1342	4.57	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	61/1459	4.94	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	1065/1480	4.47	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	494/1450	4.39	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	633/1409	4.61	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	567/1399	4.50	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	13	4.56	541/1400	4.56	4.19	4.27	4.38	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	712/1179	3.88	3.98	3.96	4.07	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	958/1262	3.60	3.92	4.05	4.33	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	680/1259	4.40	4.10	4.29	4.57	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	516/1256	4.60	4.05	4.30	4.60	4.60
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utior	n									

Credits E	Credits Earned			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	10	Under-grad	18	Non-major	0
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: CMSC 446 0101

19

DESIGN PATTERNS

TARR, ROBERT M

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 18

JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 419

C+11don+	Comman	Errolmotion	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnarie

					1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1					Inst	ructor	Course Dept		pt UMBC Level		Sect		
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 L															
1. Did y	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	268/1481	4.78	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.78
2. Did t	he instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	422/1481	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.59
3. Did t	he exam qu	estions reflect	the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	451/1249	4.56	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.56
		uations reflect			0	1	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	695/1424	4.29	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.29
5. Did a	ssigned re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	5	8	4.06	675/1396	4.06	3.35	3.98	4.09	4.06
6. Did w	ritten ass	signments contri	bute t	to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	504/1342	4.30	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.30
7. Was t	he grading	g system clearly	expla	ained	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.50
8. How m	any times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	1158/1480	4.33	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.33
9. How w	ould you	grade the overal	ll tead	ching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	403/1450	4.45	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.45
		Lecture	9															
1. Were	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	4	12	4.75	417/1409	4.75	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.75
2. Did t	he instruc	ctor seem intere	ested i	in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	705/1407	4.81	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.81
3. Was 1	ecture mat	terial presented	and e	explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	502/1399	4.56	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.56
4. Did t	he lecture	es contribute to	what	you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	591/1400	4.50	4.19	4.27	4.38	4.50
5. Did a	udiovisual	l techniques enh	nance y	your understanding	2	3	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	404/1179	4.31	3.98	3.96	4.07	4.31
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did c	lass discu	ussions contribu	ite to	what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	842/1262	3.83	3.92	4.05	4.33	3.83
2. Were	all studer	nts actively end	courage	ed to participate	12	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.10	4.29	4.57	4.00
3. Did t	he instruc	ctor encourage f	air ar	nd open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	723/1256	4.33	4.05	4.30	4.60	4.33
4. Were	. Were special techniques successful					3	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.26	****
	Fr							utio	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00.07																		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 12		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	S	U	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	G							-	***** - 3		0			-

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	12	Required for Majors	0	 Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	18	Non-major	1
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: CMSC 451 0101 University of Maryland Title AUTOMATA THRY& FORM LA

Baltimore County

Instructor: KALPAKIS, KONST Enrollment: 39

Questionnaires: 23

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 420

		Frequencies						Instructor		Course Dept		pt 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	7	14	4.52	531/1481	4.52	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	166/1249	4.87	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	256/1424	4.71	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	3	5	7	5	3.70	959/1396	3.70	3.35	3.98	4.09	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	257/1342	4.58	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	5	12	4.26	766/1459	4.26	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.75	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	296/1450	4.55	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	400/1409	4.76	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	601/1399	4.48	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	480/1400	4.62	4.19	4.27	4.38	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	705/1179	3.89	3.98	3.96	4.07	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	154/1262	4.83	3.92	4.05	4.33	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	451/1259	4.67	4.10	4.29	4.57	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			0	0	0	1	5	4.83	272/1256	4.83	4.05	4.30	4.60	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	17	4	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.26	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	В	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	23	Non-major	0
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 461 0101 University of Maryland Page 421 Title DATABASE MANGMT SYSTEM Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006

Instructor: MUNDUR, PADMA

Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 25

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

			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 you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	12	9	4.12	986/1481	4.12	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	12	7	3.96	1047/1481	4.11	4.27	4.23	4.32	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	15	9	4.28	718/1249	4.31	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	0	5	7	8	4.00	959/1424	4.04	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	2	5	5	6	3.55	1054/1396	3.54	3.35	3.98	4.09	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	424/1342	4.24	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	1	10	10	4.13	890/1459	4.21	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	1	0	0	1	22	4.79	847/1480	4.87	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	8	10	1	3.63	1174/1450	3.63	4.10	4.09	4.28	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	2	9	10	4.08	1128/1409	4.06	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	9	13	4.40	1184/1407	4.29	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	3	10	9	4.04	987/1399	3.85	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	5	10	7	3.88	1098/1400	3.87	4.19	4.27	4.38	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	6	7	6	3.76	786/1179	3.75	3.98	3.96	4.07	3.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1262	****	3.92	4.05	4.33	***
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1259	****	4.10	4.29	4.57	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1256	****	4.05	4.30	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.26	****

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	25	Non-major	1
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	_			
				?	2						

Course-Section: CMSC 461 0201

DATABASE MANGMT SYSTEM

Title Instructor: MUNDUR, PADMA

Enrollment: 37

Questionnaires: 24

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 422

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions		NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	11	9	4.13	986/1481	4.12	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	9	11	4.25	822/1481	4.11	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	13	4.33	679/1249	4.31	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	9	9	4.08	918/1424	4.04	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	6	7	6	3.52	1071/1396	3.54	3.35	3.98	4.09	3.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	2	11	6	4.10	695/1342	4.24	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	5	13	4.30	732/1459	4.21	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	351/1480	4.87	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	7	11	2	3.62	1184/1450	3.63	4.10	4.09	4.28	3.62
Lecture	_		_	_	_	_								
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	3	9	9		1140/1409	4.06	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	3	9	9		1279/1407	4.29	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.18
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	6	10	3		1196/1399	3.85	4.25	4.26	4.36	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	6	8	6		1104/1400	3.87	4.19	4.27	4.38	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	2	1	3	7	6	3.74	806/1179	3.75	3.98	3.96	4.07	3.74
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	3	1	4 00	****/1262	****	3.92	4.05	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	1	1	3		****/1259	****	4.10	4.29	4.57	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	1	4		****/1256	****	4.05	4.30	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	4	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.26	****
1. Were special techniques successian	10	-	O	O	Ü	_	_	1.50	, , , , , ,		3.50	1.00	1.20	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	4.45	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.29	4.11	3.87	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	4.82	4.40	4.45	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.54	4.20	4.43	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.24	4.04	3.86	****
Seminar				_		_								
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.68	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,	****	****	4.53	4.64	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.49	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	5.00	,	****	5.00	4.35	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.10	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	Λ	3 00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	1	0	0		,	****	****	4.00	4.56	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	, -	****	****	4.60	4.91	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.72	****
	23	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 31		****		4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	۷3	U	U	U	Т	U	U	3.00	/ 31			4.42	4.03	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.86	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.71	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****

Course-Section: CMSC 461 0201

Title DATABASE MANGMT SYSTEM

Instructor: MUNDUR,

Enrollment: 37
Questionnaires: 24

MUNDUR, PADMA

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 422 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	24	Non-major	5
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 475 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County NEURAL NETWORKS Instructor: PENG, YUN

Title

Spring 2006

Page 423

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	16		-
Questionnaires:	10	Student Course	Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions NR		NΙΔ	Fre	quen 2	cies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Questions														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0	)	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	918/1481	4.20	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0	)	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1179/1481	3.80	4.27	4.23	4.32	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0	)	0	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	980/1249	3.90	4.24	4.27	4.44	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0	)	1	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0	)	1	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	816/1396	3.89	3.35	3.98	4.09	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0	)	4	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	303/1342	4.50	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0	)	0	0	0	3	3	4		909/1459	4.10	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled 0	)	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.75	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1	L	0	0	1	2	6	0	3.56	1206/1450	3.56	4.10	4.09	4.28	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1	_	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	559/1409		4.46	4.42	4.51	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1		0	0	0	1	2	6		1069/1407	4.56	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1		0	0	1	1	5	2		1105/1399	3.89	4.25	4.26	4.36	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1	_	0	0	1	3	2			1135/1400		4.19	4.27	4.38	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3	3	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1027/1179	3.14	3.98	3.96	4.07	3.14
Discussion			_	_	_	_	_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9	)	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1262		3.92	4.05	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9		0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1259	****	4.10	4.29	4.57	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9		0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1256	****	4.05	4.30	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful 9	)	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.26	****
_														
Frequency	ЗУ	Dist	rıbu	tıon										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Ty	рe			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 4		Rea	 uire	 d fი	r Ma	ior	 5	0	Graduat	 e	3	Majo	 r	0
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 4		1				,	-	-		-	-	) 0		-
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 1		Gen	eral					6	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	2
84-150 4 3.00-3.49 3 D 0									3				-	
Grad. 3 3.50-4.00 2 F 0	Electives					1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h		
P 0	FIECCIVES					respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt				
I 0		Oth	er					1	_		3			
? 0														

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Instructor

Frequencies

Page 424

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Questionnaires: 26 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: CMSC 481 0101

47

COMPUTER NETWORKS

GREEN, FRANK E.

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

								cque	11010			1110	cr accor	COULDC	DCPC	OFIDC	TC / CI	DCCC
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 al															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	ills fro	om this course	0	0	0	1	2	17	6	4.08	1024/1481	4.08	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.08
2. Did th	he instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	1	2	18	5	4.04	987/1481	4.04	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.04
3. Did th	he exam q	uestions reflec	ct the e	expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	21	3	3.96	927/1249	3.96	4.24	4.27	4.44	3.96
4. Did ot	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	2	0	1	5	13	5	3.92	1074/1424	3.92	4.20	4.21	4.35	3.92
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	1	0	1	5	11	8	4.04	681/1396	4.04	3.35	3.98	4.09	4.04
6. Did wi	ritten as	signments conti	ribute t	to what you learned	0	3	0	1	2	13	7	4.13	660/1342	4.13	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.13
7. Was th	he gradin	g system clearl	ly expla	ained	0	0	0	0	4	8	14	4.38	635/1459	4.38	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.38
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	celled		1	0	0	0	1	0	24	4.92	561/1480	4.92	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.92
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	all tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	4	13	9	4.19	692/1450	4.19	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.19
		Lectur	re															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	7	12	7	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.00
		ctor seem inter			0		0	0	4				1137/1407		4.67			
				_	0		0	2		19			991/1399		4.25			
	Was lecture material presented and explained clear Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	2	9	14			1222/1400					3.54
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					0 1	2	1	5	15			873/1179					
		-	-	,														
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	677/1262	4.09	3.92	4.05	4.33	4.09
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively er	ncourage	ed to participate		0	0	0				4.73						
3. Did th	he instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	704/1256	4.36	4.05	4.30	4.60	4.36
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	essful		15	2	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	526/ 788	3.78	3.90	4.00	4.26	3.78
				Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits I		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Da		_			m				M = = = = = =	_
	earned	Cum. GPF		Expected Grades					ason	.s 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	; 
00-27	0	0.00-0.99		A 6		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99		В 12														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99		C 5		Ge	nera	1			1	2	Under-g	rad 2	16	Non-	-major	5
84-150	16	3.00-3.49		D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F 0	Electives				1	#### - 1				_	յh			
				P 0						respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt				
I 0					Ot	her				1	.0							
				? 0														

Course-Section: CMSC 483 0101 University of Maryland Title PARALLEL & DISTR PROCE

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor: MOTTELER, HOWAR

Enrollment: 16 Ouestionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 425

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

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 1 0 0 0 1 9 2 4.08 1018/1481 4.08 4.33 4.29 4.45 4.08 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 1 8 3 4.17 909/1481 4.17 4.27 4.23 4.32 4.17 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 1 0 6 5 4.25 742/1249 4.25 4.24 4.27 4.44 4.25 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 1 0 0 0 5 6 4.55 395/1424 4.55 4.20 4.21 4.35 4.55 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 2 0 5 1 2 1 2.89 1330/1396 2.89 3.35 3.98 4.09 2.89 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 1 0 1 1 4 4 4.10 695/1342 4.10 4.05 4.07 4.21 4.10 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 1 0 3 7 4.45 535/1459 4.45 4.21 4.16 4.25 4.45 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 1 10 4.91 702/1480 4.91 4.75 4.68 4.74 4.91 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 3 8 1 3.83 1030/1450 3.83 4.10 4.09 4.28 3.83 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 2 5 5 4.25 1031/1409 4.25 4.46 4.42 4.51 4.25 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 2 10 4.83 659/1407 4.83 4.67 4.69 4.79 4.83 1 0 0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 1 8 3 4.17 910/1399 4.17 4.25 4.26 4.36 4.17 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 4 4 4 4.00 1017/1400 4.00 4.19 4.27 4.38 4.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 7 2 1 1 0 1 2.40 1140/1179 2.40 3.98 3.96 4.07 2.40 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 1 3 1 1 3.00 1146/1262 3.00 3.92 4.05 4.33 3.00 2 2 3 4.14 846/1259 4.14 4.10 4.29 4.57 4.14 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 00 1 4 2 4.14 837/1256 4.14 4.05 4.30 4.60 4.14 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** / 68 **** *** 4.49 4.68 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** / 69 **** **** 4.53 4.64 **** **** **** 3.92 4.10 **** 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 68 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 12 0 0 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 12 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 59 **** **** 4.30 4.93 ****

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

Course-Section: CMSC 491D 0101

Title SPEC TOPIC IN COMP SCI

Instructor: YESHA, YELENA

Enrollment: 5

Questionnaires: 5

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 426 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

#### 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	Ο	0	0	5	0	4 00	1069/1481	4.00	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	661/1481	4.40	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.60	405/1249	4.60	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	2	1		1186/1424	3.75	4.20	4.21	4.35	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	554/1396	4.20	3.35	3.98	4.09	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	542/1342	4.25	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1260/1480	4.20	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	891/1409	4.40	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	823/1407	4.75	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	459/1399	4.60	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	704/1400	4.40	4.19	4.27	4.38	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	340/1179	4.40	3.98	3.96	4.07	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	Ο	4	5.00	1/1262	5.00	3.92	4.05	4.33	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.10	4.29	4.57	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.05	4.30	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	254/ 788	4.33	3.90	4.00	4.26	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.68	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.64	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.49	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.10	****

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

Course-Section: CMSC 491E 0101 University of Maryland Title EMBEDDED SYSTEMS Baltimore County Instructor: BURT, GARY Spring 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

19

University of Maryland Page 427
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

			A
Student	('Ollred	Fixa luation	Ouestionnaire

	Questions					NA	Fre	_	ncies	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General	L															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,ski	lls from	n this course	0	0	3	0	1	3	5	3.58	1330/1481	3.58	4.33	4.29	4.45	3.58
2. Did the	e instruc	tor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	2	0	2	3	5	3.75	1205/1481	3.75	4.27	4.23	4.32	3.75
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	9	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	679/1249	4.33	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.33
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	918/1424	4.08	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.08
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contribu	ite to v	what you learned	0	1	2	0	2	1	6	3.82	869/1396	3.82	3.35	3.98	4.09	3.82
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	0	2	1	0	2	7	3.92	871/1342	3.92	4.05	4.07	4.21	3.92
		system clearly		ned	1	3	0	0	1	2		4.50	,		4.21	4.16	4.25	4.50
		was class cance			1	1	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1324/1480	4.10	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.10
9. How wor	ıld you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1055/1450	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.28	3.80
1 77 11		Lecture			_	0	1	1	0	_	4	2 70	1064/1400	2 70	1 10	4 40	4 51	2 70
		ctor's lectures	_	_	2	0	1	1	1	2			1264/1409		4.46 4.67		4.51	
		tor seem intere		_	2	0	0	0	3	3 2	6	4.50	1107/1407	4.50		4.69	4.79	4.50
				plained clearly	3	0	0	2	3 1	2			956/1399		4.25	4.26	4.36	4.11
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi					3	0	∠ 1	1	0			1095/1400		4.19	4.27	4.38	3.89
5. Did aud	ilovisuai	. tecnniques en	nance yo	our understanding	2	3	U	Τ	Τ	U	5	4.29	419/1179	4.29	3.98	3.96	4.07	4.29
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1262	5.00	3.92	4.05	4.33	5.00
				d to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	5		1/1259	5.00	4.10	4.29	4.57	5.00
				d open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	5		1/1256		4.05	4.30	4.60	5.00
		chniques succes			7	2	0	0	0	0	3		1/ 788		3.90	4.00	4.26	5.00
-		-																
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	tribu	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	ре			Majors	3
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 10						 quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	- – – - S	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			-									<b>J</b> -		
56-83						Gei	neral	L				9	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	-major	0
84-150																	_	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives					0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh		
				P 0							respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt			
				I 0	Other					2	_							
				? 0														

Course-Section: CMSC 491L 0101 University of Mary
Title MACHINE LEARNING Baltimore County
Instructor: OATES, TIMOTHY Spring 2006

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 428

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

TIID CT GC COT .	OHIES, IIHOIHI	Spiing 2000
Enrollment:	35	
Questionnaires:	28	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Frequencies			Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course				0	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	196/1481	4.86	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.86
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals					0	0	0	0	7	21	4.75	228/1481	4.75	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.75
	3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals						0	1	2	7	18	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.50
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	169/1424	4.82	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.82
5. Did as:	signed re	adings contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	7	14	4.14	603/1396	4.14	3.35	3.98	4.09	4.14
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contr	ribute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	12	16	4.57	257/1342	4.57	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.57
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	1	6	21	4.71	224/1459	4.71	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.71
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	celled		0	0	0	0	0	16	12	4.43	1100/1480	4.43	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.43
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	all tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	139/1450	4.81	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.81
		Lectur	re															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	es well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	261/1409	4.86	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.86
2. Did the	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	ed and	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	19	4.67	376/1399	4.67	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.67
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	59/1400	4.96	4.19	4.27	4.38	4.96
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	your understanding	1	3	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	177/1179	4.67	3.98	3.96	4.07	4.67
		Discus																
				what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	570/1262	4.25	3.92	4.05	4.33	4.25
				ed to participate	16	0	0	0	2	1	9		524/1259	4.58	4.10	4.29	4.57	4.58
		_		nd open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	394/1256	4.73	4.05	4.30	4.60	4.73
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	essful		16	8	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.26	****
		Labora																
				of the material	25	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	4.45	****
				kground information	26	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 249	****	4.29	4.11	3.87	****
3. Were n	ecessary	materials avai	llable 1	for lab activities	26	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	4.82	4.40	4.45	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	utior	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Reasons							Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 A 17		Rec	uire	ed fo	or M	 aior	 ajors 5		Graduat	 e	7	Majo	 or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 9	Required for					J						5		-
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	neral	L		18		Under-grad 21		1	Non-major		3	
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D 0									3				3	
Grad.					Electives					0			#### - Means there are not enough					h
	Р 0								responses to be significant					ıt				

Other

0

1

I ? Course-Section: CMSC 491M 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County MALICIOUS SOFTWARE

Title Instructor: PINKSTON, JOHN (Instr. A) Spring 2006

Enrollment: 10

Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 429

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies				Inst	tructor	Course Dept		t 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	4	4	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	0	2	3	3.63	1275/1481	3.63	4.27	4.23	4.32	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1091/1249	3.63	4.24	4.27	4.44	3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	1333/1424	3.25	4.20	4.21	4.35	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	623/1396	4.13	3.35	3.98	4.09	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1011/1342	3.71	4.05	4.07	4.21	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	2	2	0	1	0	2.00	1438/1459	2.00	4.21	4.16	4.25	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.75	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	5	0	3.57	1199/1450	3.70	4.10	4.09	4.28	3.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	865/1409	4.41	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	1053/1407	4.69	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	929/1399	4.27	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1017/1400	4.10	4.19	4.27	4.38	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	945/1179	3.53	3.98	3.96	4.07	3.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	Λ	0	Λ	Λ	2	5 00	****/1262	****	3.92	4.05	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1259		4.10	4.29	4.57	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1256		4.05	4.30	4.60	****
3. Dia the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	,	U	3	5	5	3		3.00	/ 1250		1.05	1.50	1.00	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	9	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	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	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: CMSC 491M 0101 University of Maryland Page 430 Title MALICIOUS SOFTWARE Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 9 Spring 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Ouestion	2		NIP	NA	Fre	eque:	ncies 3	3	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls from	n this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.50
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the exp	ected goals	1	0	0	3	0	2	3	3.63	1275/1481	3.63	4.27	4.23	4.32	3.63
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	t the ex	spected goals	1	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1091/1249	3.63	4.24	4.27	4.44	3.63
4. Did ot	ther evalu	uations reflect	the exp	ected goals	1	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	1333/1424	3.25	4.20	4.21	4.35	3.25
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	623/1396	4.13	3.35	3.98	4.09	4.13
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1011/1342	3.71	4.05	4.07	4.21	3.71
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y explai	ned	2	2	2	2	0	1	0	2.00	1438/1459	2.00	4.21	4.16	4.25	2.00
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.75	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1030/1450	3.70	4.10	4.09	4.28	3.70
		Lectur	e															
		uctor's lecture	_	-	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	891/1409	4.41	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.41
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested in	n the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	728/1407	4.69	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.69
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presente	d and ex	plained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	683/1399	4.27	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.27
		es contribute t			4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	913/1400	4.10	4.19	4.27	4.38	4.10
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	nance yo	our understanding	4	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	840/1179	3.53	3.98	3.96	4.07	3.53
		Discus																
				hat you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1262	****	3.92	4.05	4.33	****
		-	_	l to participate	7	-	0	0	0	0	2		****/1259	****	4.10	4.29	4.57	***
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair and	l open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1256	****	4.05	4.30	4.60	***
				Frequ	ency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	 0	A 4		Red	auir	ed f	or Ma	iors	- <b></b> -	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2					10	. ,	-	-		-	-	) ~		-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera	1				5	Under-q	rad	9	Non-	-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D 0		00.		_				-	3		-	011		_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	ιh
	-	2.22 2.30	_	P 0								-	respons					,
				I 0		Otl	her					4			5			
				? 0														

Course-Section: CMSC 491N 0101

Title INTRO NETWORK SECURITY

Instructor: PHATAK, DHANANJ

Enrollment:

11 Questionnaires: 10 Spring 2006

Page 431 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

							Fr	eque	ncies	3		Ins	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 you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	- lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	2	1	4	3	3.80	1225/1483	L 3.80	4.33	4.29	4.45	3.80
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	4	4	1	3.50	1320/1483	L 3.50	4.27	4.23	4.32	3.50
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	1096/1249	3.60	4.24	4.27	4.44	3.60
4. Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	2	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1108/1424	3.88	4.20	4.21	4.35	3.88
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	633/1396	5 4.11	3.35	3.98	4.09	4.11
. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	672/1342	2 4.13	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.13
. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	1228/1459	3.60	4.21	4.16	4.25	3.60
B. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	702/1480	4.90	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.90
. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1081/1450	3.78	4.10	4.09	4.28	3.78
		Lectur	e															
L. Were th	he instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	2	1	5	2	3.70	1264/1409	3.70	4.46	4.42	4.51	3.70
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	728/1407	7 4.80	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.80
				explained clearly	0	0	0	3	1	4	2	3.50	1237/1399	3.50	4.25	4.26	4.36	3.50
		es contribute t			0	0	1	2	2	2	3	3.40	1256/1400	3.40	4.19	4.27	4.38	3.40
				our understanding	0	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00			3.98	3.96	4.07	4.00
		Discus	sion															
l. Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	345/1262	2 4.50	3.92	4.05	4.33	4.50
				ed to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	,		4.10	4.29	4.57	4.50
				nd open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83			4.05	4.30	4.60	4.83
		echniques succe			4	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	254/ 788		3.90	4.00	4.26	4.33
		Labora	torv															
. Were yo	ou provid		-	ground information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.29	4.11	3.87	****
		Semina	r															
2. Was the	e instru	ctor available	for ind	dividual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	) ****	****	4.53	4.64	****
				what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.49	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ty	<i>т</i> ре			Majors	l
00-27 28-55	2 0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 5 B 2		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	1	Graduat	ce	1	Majo	or	0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C 2		Ger	nera	1				7	Under-	grad	9	Non-	-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	there a	are not	enoug	h
				P 0									respons	ses to b	oe sigr	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Otl	her					1						
				0 0														

?

0

Course-Section: CMSC 491V 0101 University of Maryland
Title ELECTRONIC VOTING SYS Baltimore County
Instructor: SHERMAN, ALAN Spring 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 6

9

University of Maryland Page 432
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Fraluation	Ouestionnaire

							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 vo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	-	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	210/1481	4.83	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.83
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	909/1481	4.17	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.17
		uestions reflec		_	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.24	4.27	4.44	****
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.33
				what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	854/1396	3.83	3.35	3.98	4.09	3.83
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	474/1342	4.33	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.33
		g system clearl			0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1101/1459	3.83	4.21	4.16	4.25	3.83
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1281/1480	4.17	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.17
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	.ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	546/1450	4.33	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.33
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.00
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	828/1399	4.25	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.25
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1145/1400	3.75	4.19	4.27	4.38	3.75
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	793/1179	3.75	3.98	3.96	4.07	3.75
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	507/1262	4.33	3.92	4.05	4.33	4.33
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.10	4.29	4.57	5.00
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	723/1256	4.33	4.05	4.30	4.60	4.33
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.26	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	<b>;</b>
				·														
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors		0	Graduat	е	3	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	T				4	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0										. =				
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ıh
				P 0								_	respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot]	her					2						

Course-Section: CMSC 491W 0101

Title SPEC TOPICS IN COMP SC

Instructor: SEGALL, ZARY

Enrollment: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Page 433 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	14	Student Course	Eval	uati	on Qı	uesti	onna	aire	2					
	Questions	NR	NA		-	ncies 3		5		ructor Rank	Course Mean	_		

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	2	12	4.86	196/1481	4.89	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	349/1481	4.74	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1249	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	923/1424	4.44	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	2	3	3	3.45	1109/1396	4.00	3.35	3.98	4.09	3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	858/1342	4.23	4.05	4.07	4.21	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	775/1459	4.38	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	561/1480	4.92	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	334/1450	4.69	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	261/1409	4.93	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	400/1407	4.96	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	311/1399	4.73	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	444/1400	4.74	4.19	4.27	4.38	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	162/1179	4.80	3.98	3.96	4.07	4.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	631/1262	4.52	3.92	4.05	4.33	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	451/1259	4.77	4.10	4.29	4.57	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	272/1256	4.85	4.05	4.30	4.60	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	133/ 788	4.58	3.90	4.00	4.26	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	4.45	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 249	****	4.29	4.11	3.87	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 242	****	4.82	4.40	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 240	****	4.54	4.20	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 217	***	4.24	4.04	3.86	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	14	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	10	Under-grad	10	Non-major	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0			_		-	
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Į
				P	0			responses to	be sid	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-	-	_	
				2	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 491W 0201 University of Maryland
Title SPEC TOPICS IN COMP SC Baltimore County

Baltimore County
Spring 2006

Instructor: SEGALL, ZARY

Enrollment: 14 Ouestionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 434

JUN 13, 2006

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 0 1 11 4.92 143/1481 4.89 4.33 4.29 4.45 4.92 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 2 10 4.83 162/1481 4.74 4.27 4.23 4.32 4.83 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 9 0 0 1 2 4.67 334/1249 4.67 4.24 4.27 4.44 4.67 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 1 0 0 1 0 9 4.80 178/1424 4.44 4.20 4.21 4.35 4.80 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 2 1 8 4.55274/1396 4.00 3.35 3.98 4.09 4.55 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 5 6 4.55277/1342 4.23 4.05 4.07 4.21 4.55 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 4 7 4.50 460/1459 4.38 4.21 4.16 4.25 4.50 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 11 4.92 631/1480 4.92 4.75 4.68 4.74 4.92 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  $\phantom{0}$  3  $\phantom{0}$  0  $\phantom{0}$  0  $\phantom{0}$  1  $\phantom{0}$  8  $\phantom{0}$  4.89 107/1450 4.69 4.10 4.09 4.28 4.89 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 Ω Ω 0 0 12 5.00 1/1409 4.93 4.46 4.42 4.51 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 12 5.00 1/1407 4.96 4.67 4.69 4.79 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 3 9 4.75 267/1399 4.73 4.25 4.26 4.36 4.75 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 10 4.83 218/1400 4.74 4.19 4.27 4.38 4.83 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 1 10 4.91 88/1179 4.80 3.98 3.96 4.07 4.91 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 0 7 4.88 138/1262 4.52 3.92 4.05 4.33 4.88 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 238/1259 4.77 4.10 4.29 4.57 4.88 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 240/1256 4.85 4.05 4.30 4.60 4.88 4. Were special techniques successful 4 0 1 0 1 6 4.50 176/ 788 4.58 3.90 4.00 4.26 4.50 Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	5	 Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	8	Under-grad	7	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: CMSC 611 0101

ADV COMPUTER ARCHITECT

Title ADV COMPUTER Instructor: OLANO, MARC

Enrollment: 35
Questionnaires: 30

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Page 435 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General			_	_	_	_								
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	7	9	11		1187/1481	3.87	4.33	4.29	4.28	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	12	13	4.20	884/1481	4.20	4.27	4.23	4.11	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	12	11	4.03	881/1249	4.03	4.24	4.27	4.24	4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	1	16	8		1138/1424		4.20	4.21	4.16	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	6	2	8	9		1167/1396	3.33	3.35	3.98	4.00	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	7	11	7		1101/1342		4.05	4.07	4.18	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	5	20	4.43	565/1459	4.43	4.21	4.16	4.01	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0 2	0 1	0 2	1 1	1	3 11	25 10	4.73	896/1480 890/1450		4.75	4.68	4.74	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	Τ	2	Τ	3	11	10	3.96	890/1450	3.96	4.10	4.09	3.96	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	4	9	15	4.28	1019/1409	4.28	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	1	2	7	17	4.24	1260/1407	4.24	4.67	4.69	4.73	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	3	13	12	4.21	874/1399	4.21	4.25	4.26	4.16	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	10	15	4.30	829/1400	4.30	4.19	4.27	4.17	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	5	9	13	4.10	557/1179	4.10	3.98	3.96	3.81	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	1	3	6	3		1010/1262		3.92	4.05	4.07	3.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	3	7	3		1067/1259	3.67	4.10	4.29	4.30	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	876/1256	4.07	4.05	4.30	4.33	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	16	9	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	3.97	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	2	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	4.27	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.29	4.11	3.93	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	4.82	4.40	4.27	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 240	****	4.54	4.20	4.15	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 217	****	4.24	4.04	3.73	****
J. Note requirements for tab reports creatly specified	2,	J	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	J	1.00	, 21,		1.21	1.01	3.73	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.23	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.46	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.16	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.71	****
11 1														
Field Work			_			_								
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.01	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.27	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.58	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.95	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.54	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****

Course-Section: CMSC 611 0101

Title ADV COMPUTER ARCHITECT

Instructor: OLANO, MARC

Enrollment: 35
Questionnaires: 30

35

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 435 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

## Frequency Distribution

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	17	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	16	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	16	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	1			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CMSC 641 0101 University of Maryland Title DESIGN & ANALY ALGORTH

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor: KARGUPTA, HILLO Enrollment: 30

Questionnaires: 24

Page 436 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Ev	luation Questionnaire
-------------------	-----------------------

									eque			_		tructor		_		Level	
		Questio	ns 			NR	NA		2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Gener	al																
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,sk	ills fro	m this cour	rse	0	0	1	1	7	8	7	3.79	1230/1481	3.79	4.33	4.29	4.28	3.79
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clea	r the ex	spected goal	s	0	0	1	4	7	8	4	3.42	1359/1481	3.42	4.27	4.23	4.11	3.42
		uestions refle				0	0	7	7	4	4	2	2.46	1237/1249	2.46	4.24	4.27	4.24	2.46
		uations reflec				0	5	4	4	6	4	1	2.68	1405/1424	2.68	4.20	4.21	4.16	2.68
		eadings contri				0	4	1	0	5	9	5	3.85	839/1396	3.85	3.35	3.98	4.00	3.85
		signments cont		_	learned	0	0	3	5	2	7	7	3.42	1160/1342	3.42	4.05	4.07	4.18	3.42
		g system clear		ined		0	0	3	1	5	9			1233/1459		4.21		4.01	3.58
	-	was class can				0	0	0	0	0	20			1281/1480			4.68	4.74	
9. How wo	ould you	grade the over	all teac	ching effect	iveness	4	0	2	3	6	7	2	3.20	1320/1450	3.20	4.10	4.09	3.96	3.20
		Lectu																	
		uctor's lectur				0	0	0	4	4	12	4	3.67	1270/1409	3.67	4.46	4.42	4.36	3.67
		ctor seem inte				0	0	1	3	3	10	7		1340/1407		4.67	4.69	4.73	3.79
		terial present				0	0	1	6	5	8		3.33	1277/1399	3.33	4.25	4.26	4.16	3.33
		es contribute				0	0	3	3	5	8	5	3.38	1261/1400	3.38	4.19	4.27	4.17	3.38
5. Did au	ıdiovisua	l techniques e	nhance y	our underst	anding	0	5	4	4	2	7	2	2.95	1068/1179	2.95	3.98	3.96	3.81	2.95
		Discu																	
		ussions contri				10	0	0	3	2	8	1		995/1262		3.92	4.05	4.07	3.50
		nts actively e				10	0	1	2	4	6	1		1141/1259		4.10	4.29	4.30	3.29
		ctor encourage		nd open disc	cussion	10	0	1	1	4	6			1106/1256		4.05	4.30	4.33	3.50
4. Were s	special t	echniques succ	essful			10	10	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	3.97	****
		Labor	-																
2. Were y	you provi	ded with adequ	ate back	ground info	ormation	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.29	4.11	3.93	****
					Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP.	A	Expected	d Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	 3	0.00-0.99	 1	 A	 7		 Re	anir	 ed f	 วะ M	 ajors		0	 Graduat	 _ 1	 L4	Majo		0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	9		100	-1 CTT.	- L	J. 11	دا د د ر ک		-	Gradac			1100)	-	0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0		Ge:	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	LO	Non-	-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0								-			-			
Grad.	14	3.50-4.00	10	F	0		E1	ecti [.]	ves				2	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enone	rh
		3.33 1.00		P	0								_	respons				_	,
				I	0		O+	her				1	.7	I COP OND					
				?	4		00.					_							
				•	-														

Course-Section: CMSC 645 0101 University of Maryland
Title ADV SOFTWARE ENGINEERI Baltimore County

Instructor:

SIDHU, DEEPINDE

Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 437

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 9 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

? 0

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	cructor	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 n	ew insights,ski	- lls fro	m this course	2	0	1	0	0	5	1	3.71	1277/1481	3.71	4.33	4.29	4.28	3.71
_	_	ctor make clear			2	0	1	0	3	3	0	3.14	1404/1481	3.14	4.27	4.23	4.11	3.14
		uestions reflec			2	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1066/1249	3.71	4.24	4.27	4.24	3.71
	_	uations reflect			2	0	1	0	1	4	1		1251/1424	3.57	4.20	4.21	4.16	3.57
				what you learned	2	0	0	2	0	4	1		1042/1396		3.35	3.98	4.00	3.57
	_	_		o what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	4	1		1011/1342		4.05	4.07	4.18	3.71
		g system clearl		_	2	1	2	2	2	0	0		1438/1459		4.21	4.16	4.01	2.00
		was class canc		11100	2	0	0	1	2	2	2		1443/1480		4.75	4.68	4.74	
	-			hing effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	3	1		1160/1450		4.10	4.09		3.67
3. 110W WO	did you	grade the overa	II ccac	ning cricectveness	3	J	Ü	-	_	3	_	3.07	1100/1100	3.07	1.10	1.05	3.50	3.07
		Lectur																
		uctor's lecture			3	0	0	0	1	4	1		1152/1409	4.00	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.00
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject		3	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1334/1407	3.83	4.67	4.69	4.73	3.83		
3. Was le	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1237/1399	3.50	4.25	4.26	4.16	3.50
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	3	0	1	1	0	3	1	3.33	1269/1400	3.33	4.19	4.27	4.17	3.33
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	820/1179	3.71	3.98	3.96	3.81	3.71
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al	acc dicc			what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	0	1	3 20	1092/1262	3.20	3.92	4.05	4.07	3.20
				d to participate	4	0	0	0	3	1	1		1079/1259	3.60	4.10	4.29	4.30	3.60
				d open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	1	1		1084/1256	3.60	4.05	4.30	4.33	3.60
		echniques succe		a open arseassion	4	1	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	604/ 788	3.50	3.90	4.00		3.50
T. WEIE B	peciai c	ecimiques succe	ssiui		-		U	U	3	U	_	3.30	004/ /00	3.30	3.90	1.00	3.91	3.30
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	<b>;</b>
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 7		Re	quir	ea i	or Ma	ajors		2	Graduat	e	3	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0		~		,				0	1	,	_			2
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	T				2	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0								0			,			,
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	m
Р 0				responses to be signif				ıiıcan	ıt									
				I 0		Other						1						

Course-Section: CMSC 651 0101

Title AUTOMATA THRY/FORML LA

Instructor: YESHA, YAACOV

Enrollment: 5
Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 438 JUN 13, 2006 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	1	1	1	1	3 50	1358/1481	3.50	4.33	4.29	4.28	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	1		1205/1481	3.75	4.27	4.23	4.11	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.24	4.27	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1292/1396	3.00	3.35	3.98	4.00	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.05	4.07	4.18	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	775/1459	4.25	4.21	4.16	4.01	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.75	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1160/1450	3.67	4.10	4.09	3.96	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	762/1409	4.50	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	823/1407	4.75	4.67	4.69	4.73	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	0	1		1294/1399	3.25	4.25	4.26	4.16	3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	1		1145/1400	3.75	4.19	4.27	4.17	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	1114/1179	2.67	3.98	3.96	3.81	2.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1146/1262	3.00	3.92	4.05	4.07	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.10	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	901/1256	4.00	4.05	4.30	4.33	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 246	5.00	4.43	4.20	4.27	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 249	5.00	4.29	4.11	3.93	5.00

### Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 652 0101 University of Maryland Title CRYPTOGRAPHY & DATA SE Baltimore County Instructor: LOMONACO JR, SA

Page 439 JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	9			
Questionnaires:	7	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		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	om this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	967/1481	4.14	4.33	4.29	4.28	4.14
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1296/1481	3.57	4.27	4.23	4.11	3.57
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.24	4.27	4.24	4.00
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	2	1	0	1	3	3.29	1327/1424	3.29	4.20	4.21	4.16	3.29
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1042/1396	3.57	3.35	3.98	4.00	3.57
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	1313/1342	2.83	4.05	4.07	4.18	2.83
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1086/1459	3.86	4.21	4.16	4.01	3.86
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.75	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.10	4.09	3.96	4.00
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were t	he instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	1307/1409	3.43	4.46	4.42	4.36	3.43
2. Did th	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject				0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	1245/1407	4.29	4.67	4.69	4.73	4.29
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presente	d and	explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	4.25	4.26	4.16	4.00
		es contribute t			0	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	844/1400	4.29	4.19	4.27	4.17	4.29
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques er	hance y	our understanding	0	5	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1156/1179	2.00	3.98	3.96	3.81	2.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1257/1262	1.50	3.92	4.05	4.07	1.50
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	5	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	1247/1259	2.00	4.10	4.29	4.30	2.00
3. Did th	ne instruc	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1220/1256	2.50	4.05	4.30	4.33	2.50
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		5	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	3.97	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
														- 				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А б		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	5	0	Graduat	e	5	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				5	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves							ere are not enough			
				Р 0									respons	nses to be significant				
				т О		O+1	L					2						

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0 A 6 Required for Major		Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	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	2	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
			2	Λ							

Course-Section: CMSC 691B 0101 BASIC RESRCH METHODS Baltimore County DESJARDINS, MAR

I

?

0

0

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

13

University of Maryland Page 440 JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

1

_			
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		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 vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	210/1481	4.83	4.33	4.29	4.28	4.83
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	228/1481	4.75	4.27	4.23	4.11	4.75
		uestions reflec			0	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.24	4.27	4.24	****
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	217/1424	4.75	4.20	4.21	4.16	4.75
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	2	4.00	707/1396	4.00	3.35	3.98	4.00	4.00
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	104/1342	4.83	4.05	4.07	4.18	4.83
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	143/1459	4.83	4.21	4.16	4.01	4.83
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	1044/1480	4.50	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.50
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	217/1450	4.67	4.10	4.09	3.96	4.67
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	417/1409	4.75	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.75
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	823/1407	4.75	4.67	4.69	4.73	4.75
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	267/1399	4.75	4.25	4.26	4.16	4.75
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	511/1400	4.58	4.19	4.27	4.17	4.58
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	331/1179	4.42	3.98	3.96	3.81	4.42
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc			what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	570/1262	4.25	3.92	4.05	4.07	4.25
				d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	238/1259	4.88	4.10	4.29	4.30	4.88
				d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	496/1256	4.63	4.05	4.30	4.33	4.63
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssful	-	5	3	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	291/ 788	4.25	3.90	4.00	3.97	4.25
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
G 14 t		G GD3		Towns of Goods				D -									26	
Credits E	sarned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				ке:	asons	3 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	; 
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Graduat	е	6	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				8	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		_						_			_			
Grad.	Grad. 6 3.50-4.00 4 F 0					Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0							responses to be signif				uficar	ıt		

Other