```
Course-Section: CMSC 104  0101          University of Maryland                              Page  393
Title        PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR      Baltimore County                                  JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  STEPHENS, ARTHU             Spring 2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      37
Questionnaires:  22                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
       Questions                          NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0  2  5  7  8  3.95 1171/1522  4.30  4.05  4.30  4.14  3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   1  1  3  9  8  4.00 1080/1522  4.31  3.97  4.26  4.18  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0  1  3  5 13  4.36  682/1285  4.49  4.10  4.30  4.22  4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   3   0  3  4  3  9  3.95 1079/1476  4.07  3.96  4.22  4.09  3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1   3  2  6  8  2  3.19 1303/1412  3.31  3.40  4.06  4.01  3.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7  0  0  5  5  5  4.00  806/1381  4.08  3.85  4.08  3.93  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0  2  0  6 14  4.45  556/1500  4.37  4.01  4.18  4.16  4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   1   0  0  0  5 16  4.76  784/1517  4.94  4.74  4.65  4.62  4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  2  9  4  4  3.53 1269/1497  3.97  3.89  4.11  4.02  3.53

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0  0  4  8 10  4.27 1031/1440  4.43  4.22  4.45  4.40  4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0  1  6  6  9  4.05 1348/1448  4.57  4.63  4.71  4.63  4.05
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   1  1  3  8  8  4.00 1056/1436  4.31  4.04  4.29  4.24  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   4  1  0  9  8  3.73 1203/1432  4.21  4.01  4.29  4.23  3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  1   0  2  2  8  8  4.10  572/1221  4.12  3.86  3.93  3.86  4.10

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11  0   2  1  2  4  2  3.27 1126/1280  3.57  3.89  4.10  3.92  3.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11  0   0  0  4  4  3  3.91 1013/1277  4.09  4.02  4.34  4.13  3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0   1  1  1  5  3  3.73 1047/1269  3.86  4.15  4.31  4.04  3.73
4. Were special techniques successful                   11  4   1  0  1  4  1  3.57  658/ 854  3.35  3.80  4.02  3.87  3.57

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   18  0   0  0  0  1  3  4.75 ****/ 215  ****  4.64  4.36  4.31  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50 ****/ 228  ****  4.53  4.35  4.33  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 18 0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50 ****/ 217  ****  4.53  4.51  4.51  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            18  0   0  0  0  1  3  4.75 ****/ 216  ****  4.75  4.42  4.41  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  18  1   0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/ 205  ****  4.33  4.23  4.28  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  ****  4.58  4.13  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  77  ****  ****  4.52  4.03  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  65  ****  ****  4.49  3.85  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     21  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  78  ****  ****  4.45  3.88  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 21  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.11  3.79  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  21  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.41  3.90  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria   21  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  45  ****  ****  4.30  3.90  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        21  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.40  3.99  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    21  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.31  4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  21  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  34  ****  ****  4.30  4.11  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.63  4.53  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     21  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  23  ****  ****  4.41  4.19  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       21  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.69  4.57  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        21  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  22  ****  ****  4.54  4.31  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      21  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  18  ****  ****  4.49  4.11  ****
```

Enrollment: 37
Questionnaires: 22   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                         Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   9   0.00-0.99   0   A   13   Required for Majors   2   Graduate   0   Major   3
28-55   4   1.00-1.99   1   B   7
56-83   1   2.00-2.99   5   C   2   General   4   Under-grad   22   Non-major   19
84-150   1   3.00-3.49   2   D   0
Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   5   F   0   Electives   5   #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0   responses to be significant
                                        I   0   Other   10
                                        ?   0

```
Course-Section: CMSC 104  0301                 University of Maryland                                      Page  394
Title       PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR             Baltimore County                                           JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  BLOCK, DAWN M                     Spring 2007                                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     49
Questionnaires: 31                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                        NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5 Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
          General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   0   2   6  23  4.68  424/1522  4.30  4.05  4.30  4.14  4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   1   9  21  4.65  383/1522  4.31  3.97  4.26  4.18  4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   2   2  27  4.81  228/1285  4.49  4.10  4.30  4.22  4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   4   0   0   2   7  18  4.59  387/1476  4.07  3.96  4.22  4.09  4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  12   4   1   4   2   6  3.29 1275/1412  3.31  3.40  4.06  4.01  3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 10   1   1   1   6  11  4.25  604/1381  4.08  3.85  4.08  3.93  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0   0   0   2   4  24  4.73  232/1500  4.37  4.01  4.18  4.16  4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0   0   0   0  30  5.00    1/1517  4.94  4.74  4.65  4.62  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0   0   0   2  14  12  4.36  554/1497  3.97  3.89  4.11  4.02  4.36


          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   1   9  21  4.65  630/1440  4.43  4.22  4.45  4.40  4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   0   1  30  4.97  198/1448  4.57  4.63  4.71  4.63  4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   0   3   7  21  4.58  502/1436  4.31  4.04  4.29  4.24  4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0   1   1   6  23  4.65  478/1432  4.21  4.01  4.29  4.23  4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  1   0   1   2   9  18  4.47  311/1221  4.12  3.86  3.93  3.86  4.47


          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 20  0   1   0   1   3   6  4.18  631/1280  3.57  3.89  4.10  3.92  4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 20  0   1   1   0   2   7  4.18  855/1277  4.09  4.02  4.34  4.13  4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 20 0   1   1   1   1   7  4.09  855/1269  3.86  4.15  4.31  4.04  4.09
4. Were special techniques successful                   20  6   1   0   1   0   3  3.80 ****/ 854  3.35  3.80  4.02  3.87  ****


          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   29  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 215  ****  4.64  4.36  4.31  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 30 0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 228  ****  4.53  4.35  4.33  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 30 0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 217  ****  4.53  4.51  4.51  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            30  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 216  ****  4.75  4.42  4.41  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  30  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 205  ****  4.33  4.23  4.28  ****


          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 30  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  ****  4.58  4.13  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 30 0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  77  ****  ****  4.52  4.03  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 30  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  65  ****  ****  4.49  3.85  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     30  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  78  ****  ****  4.45  3.88  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 30  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.11  3.79  ****


          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  30  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.41  3.90  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  30  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  45  ****  ****  4.30  3.90  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        30  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.40  3.99  ****

4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    30  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.31  4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  30  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  34  ****  ****  4.30  4.11  ****


          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 30  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.63  4.53  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     30  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  23  ****  ****  4.41  4.19  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       30  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.69  4.57  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        30  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  22  ****  ****  4.54  4.31  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      30  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  18  ****  ****  4.49  4.11  ****
```

Enrollment: 49
Questionnaires: 31   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                         Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
  00-27   5   0.00-0.99   0   A   20   Required for Majors   1   Graduate   0   Major   6
  28-55   6   1.00-1.99   0   B   7
  56-83   1   2.00-2.99   8   C   1   General   3   Under-grad   31   Non-major   25
  84-150   4   3.00-3.49   2   D   0
  Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   6   F   0   Electives   5   #### - Means there are not enough
                                              P   1   responses to be significant
                                              I   0   Other   19
                                              ?   0

```
Course-Section: CMSC 104  0401             University of Maryland                              Page  395
Title       PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR         Baltimore County                                   JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:    BLOCK, DAWN M               Spring 2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    31
Questionnaires: 22                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	1	1	4	13	4.35	791/1522	4.30	4.05	4.30	4.14	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	0	2	16	4.55	488/1522	4.31	3.97	4.26	4.18	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	1	1	17	4.65	376/1285	4.49	4.10	4.30	4.22	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	1	0	1	3	12	4.47	519/1476	4.07	3.96	4.22	4.09	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	6	5	0	1	2	4	3.00	1327/1412	3.31	3.40	4.06	4.01	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	743/1381	4.08	3.85	4.08	3.93	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	0	3	16	4.65	325/1500	4.37	4.01	4.18	4.16	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1517	4.94	4.74	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	481/1497	3.97	3.89	4.11	4.02	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	224/1440	4.43	4.22	4.45	4.40	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	296/1448	4.57	4.63	4.71	4.63	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	141/1436	4.31	4.04	4.29	4.24	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	327/1432	4.21	4.01	4.29	4.23	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	359/1221	4.12	3.86	3.93	3.86	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	869/1280	3.57	3.89	4.10	3.92	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	789/1277	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.13	4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1047/1269	3.86	4.15	4.31	4.04	3.73
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	766/ 854	3.35	3.80	4.02	3.87	3.13
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 215	****	4.64	4.36	4.31	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 228	****	4.53	4.35	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	1	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 217	****	4.53	4.51	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	2	0	0	3	0	2.80	****/ 216	****	4.75	4.42	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 205	****	4.33	4.23	4.28	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	2	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	3.79	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	2						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: CMSC 104  0501            University of Maryland                           Page  396
Title      PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR         Baltimore County                                JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:   BURT, GARY                  Spring 2007                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    37
Questionnaires: 17                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

				Freq	uenc	ies		Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

General

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	919/1522	4.30	4.05	4.30	4.14	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	6	6	4.06	1053/1522	4.31	3.97	4.26	4.18	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	4	8	4.13	865/1285	4.49	4.10	4.30	4.22	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	3	1	1	2	4	3.27	1376/1476	4.07	3.96	4.22	4.09	3.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	1	3	8	3.76	1005/1412	3.31	3.40	4.06	4.01	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	0	1	3	9	3.94	898/1381	4.08	3.85	4.08	3.93	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	4	2	7	3.65	1244/1500	4.37	4.01	4.18	4.16	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1517	4.94	4.74	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	2	4	6	2	3.57	1250/1497	3.97	3.89	4.11	4.02	3.57

Lecture

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	1238/1440	4.43	4.22	4.45	4.40	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	2	1	9	4.31	1284/1448	4.57	4.63	4.71	4.63	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	3	6	3	3.77	1209/1436	4.31	4.04	4.29	4.24	3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	3	1	6	3.69	1215/1432	4.21	4.01	4.29	4.23	3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	3	2	2	3	3.50	899/1221	4.12	3.86	3.93	3.86	3.50

Discussion

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	0	2	0	3	3.00	1187/1280	3.57	3.89	4.10	3.92	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	4	0	4	4.00	930/1277	4.09	4.02	4.34	4.13	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	972/1269	3.86	4.15	4.31	4.04	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 854	3.35	3.80	4.02	3.87	****

Laboratory

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.64	4.36	4.31	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.53	4.35	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.53	4.51	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 216	****	4.75	4.42	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.33	4.23	4.28	****

Seminar

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	3.79	****

Field Work

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****

Self Paced

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	A	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	4	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: CMSC 201  0101            University of Maryland                        Page  397
Title      COMPUTER SCIENCE I             Baltimore County                             JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  FREY, DENNIS                 Spring 2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    19
Questionnaires: 13                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                           Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  0  1 12 4.92  141/1522 4.62  4.05  4.30 4.34  4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  0 12 4.85  171/1522 4.61  3.97  4.26 4.29  4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  0  2 11 4.85  196/1285 4.60  4.10  4.30 4.36  4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   4  0  0  0  2  7 4.78  207/1476 4.57  3.96  4.22 4.20  4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  7  1  0  2  0  1 3.00 1327/1412 3.57  3.40  4.06 4.00  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  5  0  0  0  1  5 4.83  108/1381 4.78  3.85  4.08 3.97  4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0  0  1  0  3  8 4.50  483/1500 4.55  4.01  4.18 4.20  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0  0  0  0  2 10 4.83  645/1517 4.74  4.74  4.65 4.63  4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  0  0  1  4  7 4.50  385/1497 4.34  3.89  4.11 4.11  4.50

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  0  0 13 5.00    1/1440 4.90  4.22  4.45 4.42  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  0  0 13 5.00    1/1448 4.89  4.63  4.71 4.78  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  2 11 4.85  179/1436 4.70  4.04  4.29 4.29  4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  0  0  4  9 4.69  418/1432 4.61  4.01  4.29 4.31  4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  2  2  0  0  1  7 4.10  572/1221 4.42  3.86  3.93 4.02  4.10

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  1  1  0  3  4 3.89  834/1280 4.16  3.89  4.10 4.08  3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  0  0  1  2  6 4.56  560/1277 3.91  4.02  4.34 4.33  4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0  0  0  1  1  6 4.63  493/1269 3.97  4.15  4.31 4.33  4.63
4. Were special techniques successful                 5   6  0  0  1  0  1 4.00 ****/ 854 4.10  3.80  4.02 4.00  ****

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6   0  0  0  1  3  3 4.29  128/ 215 4.60  4.64  4.36 4.62  4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6  0  0  0  0  2  5 4.71   53/ 228 4.63  4.53  4.35 4.56  4.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6  1  0  0  0  2  4 4.67   91/ 217 4.67  4.53  4.51 4.57  4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          6   1  0  0  0  3  3 4.50  121/ 216 4.63  4.75  4.42 4.72  4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6  5  0  0  0  0  2 5.00 ****/ 205 **** 4.33  4.23 4.37  ****

                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  79 **** ****  4.58 4.58  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   12  0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  78 **** ****  4.45 5.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               12  0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  80 **** ****  4.11 4.00  ****

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 12  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  47 **** ****  4.41 4.83  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 12  0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  45 **** ****  4.30 4.58  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                   Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     4       0.00-0.99   1      A   7         Required for Majors  0      Graduate     0       Major       4
 28-55     1       1.00-1.99   0      B   5
 56-83     1       2.00-2.99   1      C   0         General              1      Under-grad  13       Non-major   9
 84-150    4       3.00-3.49   1      D   0
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   6      F   0         Electives            1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P   0                                    responses to be significant
                                      I   0         Other               10
                                      ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 201  0102                    University of Maryland                              Page  398
Title        COMPUTER SCIENCE I                     Baltimore County                                 JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  FREY, DENNIS                            Spring 2007                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      18
Questionnaires:   9                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  1  2  6  4.56  548/1522  4.62  4.05  4.30  4.34  4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  2  5  2  4.00 1080/1522  4.61  3.97  4.26  4.29  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  2  4  3  4.11  873/1285  4.60  4.10  4.30  4.36  4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  1  1  3  3  4.00 1009/1476  4.57  3.96  4.22  4.20  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5  0  1  0  0  3  4.25  604/1381  4.78  3.85  4.08  3.97  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  1  0  1  7  4.56  435/1500  4.55  4.01  4.18  4.20  4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  3  6  4.67  932/1517  4.74  4.74  4.65  4.63  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  2  1  4  4.29  622/1497  4.34  3.89  4.11  4.11  4.29

           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  1  2  6  4.56  740/1440  4.90  4.22  4.45  4.42  4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  4  5  4.56 1114/1448  4.89  4.63  4.71  4.78  4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  2  2  5  4.33  793/1436  4.70  4.04  4.29  4.29  4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  2  3  4  4.22  907/1432  4.61  4.01  4.29  4.31  4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 1  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  279/1221  4.42  3.86  3.93  4.02  4.50

           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0  0  0  0  5  2  4.29  566/1280  4.16  3.89  4.10  4.08  4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0  1  1  1  2  1  3.17 1201/1277  3.91  4.02  4.34  4.33  3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0  0  0  2  1  2  4.00  875/1269  3.97  4.15  4.31  4.33  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   3  0  0  2  0  0  3.00 ****/ 854  4.10  3.80  4.02  4.00  ****

           Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  6   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/ 215  4.60  4.64  4.36  4.62  5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0 0  0  0  1  2  4.67   61/ 228  4.63  4.53  4.35  4.56  4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6 1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 217  4.67  4.53  4.51  4.57  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           6   1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 216  4.63  4.75  4.42  4.72  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6   2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 205  ****  4.33  4.23  4.37  ****

                                  Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type               Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      4      0.00-0.99   0       A    2      Required for Majors  0      Graduate     0      Major        3
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0       B    5
 56-83      2      2.00-2.99   3       C    0      General              0      Under-grad   9      Non-major    6
 84-150     0      3.00-3.49   1       D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   1       F    0      Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other              7
                                        ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 201  0104            University of Maryland                         Page  399
Title       COMPUTER SCIENCE I             Baltimore County                              JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:   FREY, DENNIS                 Spring 2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      19
Questionnaires:  15                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                       Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  3  4  8  4.33  814/1522  4.62  4.05  4.30  4.34  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  2  5  8  4.40  702/1522  4.61  3.97  4.26  4.29  4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  4  3  8  4.27  759/1285  4.60  4.10  4.30  4.36  4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  4  0  0  2  5  4  4.18  871/1476  4.57  3.96  4.22  4.20  4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  8  1  0  2  1  3  3.71 1045/1412  3.57  3.40  4.06  4.00  3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  7  0  0  1  1  6  4.63  233/1381  4.78  3.85  4.08  3.97  4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  1  0  1  0  1 12  4.71  252/1500  4.55  4.01  4.18  4.20  4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  5 10  4.67  932/1517  4.74  4.74  4.65  4.63  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  4  2  0  0  1  3  5  4.44  457/1497  4.34  3.89  4.11  4.11  4.44

           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  0 15  5.00    1/1440  4.90  4.22  4.45  4.42  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  1  1 13  4.80  765/1448  4.89  4.63  4.71  4.78  4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  2  0  0  0  0  2 11  4.85  179/1436  4.70  4.04  4.29  4.29  4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  0  1  3 10  4.64  478/1432  4.61  4.01  4.29  4.31  4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  1  1  0  1  0  4  8  4.46  311/1221  4.42  3.86  3.93  4.02  4.46

           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  5  0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  184/1280  4.16  3.89  4.10  4.08  4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  5  0  0  0  1  2  7  4.60  527/1277  3.91  4.02  4.34  4.33  4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  7  0  0  0  2  0  6  4.50  586/1269  3.97  4.15  4.31  4.33  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  5  5  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   88/ 854  4.10  3.80  4.02  4.00  4.80

           Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  11  0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50   89/ 215  4.60  4.64  4.36  4.62  4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11  0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50   83/ 228  4.63  4.53  4.35  4.56  4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 11  1  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 217  4.67  4.53  4.51  4.57  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           11  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75   69/ 216  4.63  4.75  4.42  4.72  4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 11  1  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 205  ****  4.33  4.23  4.37  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 201  0201           University of Maryland                              Page  400
Title          COMPUTER SCIENCE I         Baltimore County                                   JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:    EVANS, SUSAN A             Spring 2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    18
Questionnaires:  6                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                     Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   1   2   3  4.33   814/1522  4.62  4.05  4.30  4.34  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   2   4  4.67   358/1522  4.61  3.97  4.26  4.29  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   2   4  4.67   366/1285  4.60  4.10  4.30  4.36  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2   0   0   0   1   3  4.75   226/1476  4.57  3.96  4.22  4.20  4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  4   0   0   1   0   1  4.00   760/1412  3.57  3.40  4.06  4.00  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4  0   0   0   0   2  5.00     1/1381  4.78  3.85  4.08  3.97  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   2   1   3  4.17   871/1500  4.55  4.01  4.18  4.20  4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   3   3  4.50  1080/1517  4.74  4.74  4.65  4.63  4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1  0   0   0   3   1  4.25   654/1497  4.34  3.89  4.11  4.11  4.25


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   0   6  5.00     1/1440  4.90  4.22  4.45  4.42  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0   6  5.00     1/1448  4.89  4.63  4.71  4.78  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   0   1   5  4.83   188/1436  4.70  4.04  4.29  4.29  4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   0   6  5.00     1/1432  4.61  4.01  4.29  4.31  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1  0   0   0   1   4  4.80    99/1221  4.42  3.86  3.93  4.02  4.80


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   1   0   0   2   3  4.00   718/1280  4.16  3.89  4.10  4.08  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0   0   3   0   3  4.00   930/1277  3.91  4.02  4.34  4.33  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  0   0   3   0   3  4.00   875/1269  3.97  4.15  4.31  4.33  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   5   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 854  4.10  3.80  4.02  4.00  ****


                            Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 201  0204                  University of Maryland                                    Page  401
Title      COMPUTER SCIENCE I                      Baltimore County                                      JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  EVANS, SUSAN A                          Spring 2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     10
Questionnaires:  2                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
          ------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                   General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50   605/1522  4.62  4.05  4.30  4.34  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00     1/1522  4.61  3.97  4.26  4.29  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00     1/1285  4.60  4.10  4.30  4.36  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50   473/1476  4.57  3.96  4.22  4.20  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00     1/1500  4.55  4.01  4.18  4.20  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00     1/1517  4.74  4.74  4.65  4.63  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  1   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00   898/1497  4.34  3.89  4.11  4.11  4.00

                   Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00     1/1440  4.90  4.22  4.45  4.42  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00     1/1448  4.89  4.63  4.71  4.78  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50   601/1436  4.70  4.04  4.29  4.29  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50   632/1432  4.61  4.01  4.29  4.31  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  0   0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50   899/1221  4.42  3.86  3.93  4.02  3.50

                   Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   0   0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50  1031/1280  4.16  3.89  4.10  4.08  3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   0   0   0   0   2   0   0  3.00  1214/1277  3.91  4.02  4.34  4.33  3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  0   0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50  1117/1269  3.97  4.15  4.31  4.33  3.50


                                            Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 201  0205            University of Maryland                                      Page  402
Title       COMPUTER SCIENCE I            Baltimore County                                           JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:   EVANS, SUSAN A              Spring 2007                                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     20
Questionnaires:  9                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                               Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1522  4.62  4.05  4.30  4.34  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  3  5  4.44  639/1522  4.61  3.97  4.26  4.29  4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  0  4  5  4.56  478/1285  4.60  4.10  4.30  4.36  4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   2  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  151/1476  4.57  3.96  4.22  4.20  4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  7  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/1412  3.57  3.40  4.06  4.00  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1381  4.78  3.85  4.08  3.97  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  1  1  7  4.67  312/1500  4.55  4.01  4.18  4.20  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  4  5  4.56 1037/1517  4.74  4.74  4.65  4.63  4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1 0  0  1  3  4  4.38  534/1497  4.34  3.89  4.11  4.11  4.38

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  412/1440  4.90  4.22  4.45  4.42  4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  821/1448  4.89  4.63  4.71  4.78  4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  1  2  6  4.56  539/1436  4.70  4.04  4.29  4.29  4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  0  1  2  6  4.56  579/1432  4.61  4.01  4.29  4.31  4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1  0  0  1  2  5  4.50  279/1221  4.42  3.86  3.93  4.02  4.50

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0  1  0  0  1  4  4.17  644/1280  4.16  3.89  4.10  4.08  4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  594/1277  3.91  4.02  4.34  4.33  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 1  0  1  1  3  3.83  989/1269  3.97  4.15  4.31  4.33  3.83
4. Were special techniques successful                 3   4  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 854  4.10  3.80  4.02  4.00  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 201  0206                University of Maryland                                    Page  403
Title      COMPUTER SCIENCE I                    Baltimore County                                       JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:    EVANS, SUSAN A                     Spring 2007                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    16
Questionnaires:  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	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	492/1522	4.62	4.05	4.30	4.34	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1522	4.61	3.97	4.26	4.29	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	228/1285	4.60	4.10	4.30	4.36	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	378/1476	4.57	3.96	4.22	4.20	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1412	3.57	3.40	4.06	4.00	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1381	4.78	3.85	4.08	3.97	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	839/1500	4.55	4.01	4.18	4.20	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1517	4.74	4.74	4.65	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	312/1497	4.34	3.89	4.11	4.11	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1440	4.90	4.22	4.45	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1448	4.89	4.63	4.71	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1436	4.70	4.04	4.29	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	294/1432	4.61	4.01	4.29	4.31	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	279/1221	4.42	3.86	3.93	4.02	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	988/1280	4.16	3.89	4.10	4.08	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	1	0	0	2	2.80	1251/1277	3.91	4.02	4.34	4.33	2.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	1207/1269	3.97	4.15	4.31	4.33	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 854	4.10	3.80	4.02	4.00	5.00

```
                                         Frequency Distribution
```

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 201  0207                University of Maryland                             Page  404
Title        COMPUTER SCIENCE I                  Baltimore County                               JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  EVANS, SUSAN A                      Spring 2007                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     14
Questionnaires:  7                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                 Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  380/1522  4.62  4.05  4.30  4.34  4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  299/1522  4.61  3.97  4.26  4.29  4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  1  5  4.57  456/1285  4.60  4.10  4.30  4.36  4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  151/1476  4.57  3.96  4.22  4.20  4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  4  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1381  4.78  3.85  4.08  3.97  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  0  3  4  4.57  415/1500  4.55  4.01  4.18  4.20  4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  873/1517  4.74  4.74  4.65  4.63  4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  0  0  0  0  1  3  3  4.29  622/1497  4.34  3.89  4.11  4.11  4.29


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  272/1440  4.90  4.22  4.45  4.42  4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1448  4.89  4.63  4.71  4.78  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  357/1436  4.70  4.04  4.29  4.29  4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  1  2  4  4.43  732/1432  4.61  4.01  4.29  4.31  4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  2  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1221  4.42  3.86  3.93  4.02  5.00


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1280  4.16  3.89  4.10  4.08  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1   0  0  0  1  0  5  4.67  470/1277  3.91  4.02  4.34  4.33  4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  2  0  4  4.33  721/1269  3.97  4.15  4.31  4.33  4.33
4. Were special techniques successful                   1   4  0  1  1  0  0  2.50  832/ 854  4.10  3.80  4.02  4.00  2.50

                                        Frequency Distribution
```

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 202  0101              University of Maryland                                Page  405
Title        COMPUTER SCIENCE II            Baltimore County                                     JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  CHANG, RICHARD                 Spring 2007                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     18
Questionnaires:  3                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
           ------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67   433/1522  4.50  4.05  4.30  4.34  4.67
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   0   2  4.33   787/1522  4.32  3.97  4.26  4.29  4.33
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   1   1   1  4.00   938/1285  4.35  4.10  4.30  4.36  4.00
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   2   1  4.33   703/1476  4.28  3.96  4.22  4.20  4.33
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   2   1   0   0  2.33  1395/1412  2.61  3.40  4.06  4.00  2.33
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   0   2   1   0  3.33  1227/1381  4.03  3.85  4.08  3.97  3.33
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   2   1   0  3.33  1378/1500  4.37  4.01  4.18  4.20  3.33
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00     1/1517  4.86  4.74  4.65  4.63  5.00
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0   0   0   0   2  5.00     1/1497  4.24  3.89  4.11  4.11  5.00

                 Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67   604/1440  4.46  4.22  4.45  4.42  4.67
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67  1001/1448  4.81  4.63  4.71  4.78  4.67
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67   415/1436  4.35  4.04  4.29  4.29  4.67
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67   454/1432  4.33  4.01  4.29  4.31  4.67
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  0   0   0   1   2  4.67   175/1221  4.24  3.86  3.93  4.02  4.67

                 Discussion

 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67   286/1280  4.14  3.89  4.10  4.08  4.67
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0   1   0   2   0  3.33  1183/1277  3.94  4.02  4.34  4.33  3.33
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  0   0   0   1   2  4.67   461/1269  4.27  4.15  4.31  4.33  4.67
 4. Were special techniques successful                  0   0   0   0   1   1   1  4.00   426/ 854  3.33  3.80  4.02  4.00  4.00

                               Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 202  0102                    University of Maryland                                      Page  406
Title       COMPUTER SCIENCE II                    Baltimore County                                         JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:   CHANG, RICHARD                        Spring 2007                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    21
Questionnaires: 12                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  1  2  1  8  4.33  814/1522   4.50  4.05  4.30  4.34  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  1  3  8  4.58  454/1522   4.32  3.97  4.26  4.29  4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  0  4  8  4.67  366/1285   4.35  4.10  4.30  4.36  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  1  3  8  4.58  397/1476   4.28  3.96  4.22  4.20  4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  4  2  1  4  1  0  2.50 1385/1412  2.61  3.40  4.06  4.00  2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0 10  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1381  4.03  3.85  4.08  3.97  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  1  1  2  8  4.42  615/1500   4.37  4.01  4.18  4.20  4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  1 11  4.92  438/1517   4.86  4.74  4.65  4.63  4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  2  0  0  0  1  6  3  4.20  718/1497   4.24  3.89  4.11  4.11  4.20

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  0  0  1  0 11  4.83  304/1440   4.46  4.22  4.45  4.42  4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  1  0 11  4.83  683/1448   4.81  4.63  4.71  4.78  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0  0  0  1  1  2  8  4.42  708/1436   4.35  4.04  4.29  4.29  4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  0  2  2  1  7  4.08 1000/1432  4.33  4.01  4.29  4.31  4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  0  0  0  0  2  3  7  4.42  351/1221   4.24  3.86  3.93  4.02  4.42

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2  0  1  0  2  4  3  3.80  874/1280   4.14  3.89  4.10  4.08  3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  2  0  1  0  1  2  6  4.20  849/1277   3.94  4.02  4.34  4.33  4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  2  0  1  0  4  1  4  3.70 1059/1269  4.27  4.15  4.31  4.33  3.70
4. Were special techniques successful                 2  9  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 854  3.33  3.80  4.02  4.00  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  9  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/ 215   4.67  4.64  4.36  4.62  5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information  9  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/ 228   4.47  4.53  4.35  4.56  5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  9  1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 217  4.50  4.53  4.51  4.57  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          9  0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00  174/ 216   4.80  4.75  4.42  4.72  4.00

                                      Frequency Distribution

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

00-27     3      0.00-0.99    0        A    7       Required for Majors  0     Graduate      0       Major         6
28-55     3      1.00-1.99    0        B    4
56-83     2      2.00-2.99    0        C    0       General              0     Under-grad   12       Non-major     6
84-150    0      3.00-3.49    1        D    0
Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    6        F    0       Electives            1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I    0       Other               11
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 202  0103              University of Maryland                                      Page  407
Title        COMPUTER SCIENCE II            Baltimore County                                          JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  CHANG, RICHARD                 Spring 2007                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     19
Questionnaires:  7                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies         Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  0  3  4  4.57  525/1522  4.50  4.05  4.30  4.34  4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  1  1  5  4.57  465/1522  4.32  3.97  4.26  4.29  4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  318/1285  4.35  4.10  4.30  4.36  4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  2  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1476  4.28  3.96  4.22  4.20  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  2  3  1  3.57 1127/1412  2.61  3.40  4.06  4.00  3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  4  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1381  4.03  3.85  4.08  3.97  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  252/1500  4.37  4.01  4.18  4.20  4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1517  4.86  4.74  4.65  4.63  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  0  0  1  2  3  4.33  573/1497  4.24  3.89  4.11  4.11  4.33

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  3  4  4.57  716/1440  4.46  4.22  4.45  4.42  4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  629/1448  4.81  4.63  4.71  4.78  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  4  3  4.43  696/1436  4.35  4.04  4.29  4.29  4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  1  2  4  4.43  732/1432  4.33  4.01  4.29  4.31  4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  3  0  1  0  0  3  4.25  461/1221  4.24  3.86  3.93  4.02  4.25

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  0  3  2  4.40  477/1280  4.14  3.89  4.10  4.08  4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  1  1  2  1  3.60 1113/1277  3.94  4.02  4.34  4.33  3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  1  2  0  3  3.83  989/1269  4.27  4.15  4.31  4.33  3.83
4. Were special techniques successful                  2  4  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 854  3.33  3.80  4.02  4.00  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  6  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 215  4.67  4.64  4.36  4.62  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 228  4.47  4.53  4.35  4.56  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 217  4.50  4.53  4.51  4.57  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           6  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 216  4.80  4.75  4.42  4.72  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 205  4.33  4.33  4.23  4.37  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 202  0104                    University of Maryland                                    Page  408
Title       COMPUTER SCIENCE II                      Baltimore County                                      JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:    CHANG, RICHARD                          Spring 2007                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     17
Questionnaires:  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  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   1   0   1   3  4.20   959/1522   4.50  4.05  4.30  4.34  4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   1   2   2  4.20   935/1522   4.32  3.97  4.26  4.29  4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   1   0   2   2  4.00   938/1285   4.35  4.10  4.30  4.36  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2   0   0   0   1   2  4.67   316/1476   4.28  3.96  4.22  4.20  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   2   1   2   0   0   0  1.67  1408/1412   2.61  3.40  4.06  4.00  1.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  3   0   1   0   0   1  3.50  1152/1381   4.03  3.85  4.08  3.97  3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80   160/1500   4.37  4.01  4.18  4.20  4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   0   5  5.00     1/1517   4.86  4.74  4.65  4.63  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0   0   0   0   3   2  4.40   506/1497   4.24  3.89  4.11  4.11  4.40

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   0   2   3  4.60   682/1440   4.46  4.22  4.45  4.42  4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80   765/1448   4.81  4.63  4.71  4.78  4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   0   1   2   2  4.20   934/1436   4.35  4.04  4.29  4.29  4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0   1   0   0   4  4.40   758/1432   4.33  4.01  4.29  4.31  4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  1   0   0   0   1   3  4.75   124/1221   4.24  3.86  3.93  4.02  4.75

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   1   2   2   0  3.20  1150/1280   4.14  3.89  4.10  4.08  3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0   0   1   0   2   2   0  3.00  1214/1277   3.94  4.02  4.34  4.33  3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0   0   0   1   2   2  4.20   816/1269   4.27  4.15  4.31  4.33  4.20
4. Were special techniques successful                   0   4   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/ 854   3.33  3.80  4.02  4.00  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   4   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 215   4.67  4.64  4.36  4.62  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 4  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 228   4.47  4.53  4.35  4.56  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 217   4.50  4.53  4.51  4.57  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            4   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/ 216   4.80  4.75  4.42  4.72  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  4   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 205   4.33  4.33  4.23  4.37  ****

                                          Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 202  0105                University of Maryland                                    Page  409
Title      COMPUTER SCIENCE II                   Baltimore County                                      JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:   CHANG, RICHARD                        Spring 2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    19
Questionnaires:   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  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   246/1522  4.50  4.05  4.30  4.34  4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40   702/1522  4.32  3.97  4.26  4.29  4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  4  1  4.20   809/1285  4.35  4.10  4.30  4.36  4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2   1  0  1  0  1  0  3.00  1416/1476  4.28  3.96  4.22  4.20  3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1  0  1  1  1  0  3.00  1327/1412  2.61  3.40  4.06  4.00  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 3 1  0  0  0  0  1.00  ****/1381  4.03  3.85  4.08  3.97  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  1  0  0  1  2  3.75  1183/1500  4.37  4.01  4.18  4.20  3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75   802/1517  4.86  4.74  4.65  4.63  4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0  0  0  3  1  4.25   654/1497  4.24  3.89  4.11  4.11  4.25


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50   798/1440  4.46  4.22  4.45  4.42  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00     1/1448  4.81  4.63  4.71  4.78  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50   601/1436  4.35  4.04  4.29  4.29  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25   884/1432  4.33  4.01  4.29  4.31  4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 1  0  0  1  0  1  4.00   606/1221  4.24  3.86  3.93  4.02  4.00


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0  1  0  0  0  2  3.67   959/1280  4.14  3.89  4.10  4.08  3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0  0  1  0  0  2  4.00   930/1277  3.94  4.02  4.34  4.33  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0  0  1  0  2  4.33   721/1269  4.27  4.15  4.31  4.33  4.33


                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  3   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/ 215  4.67  4.64  4.36  4.62  5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/ 228  4.47  4.53  4.35  4.56  5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/ 217  4.50  4.53  4.51  4.57  5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           3   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/ 216  4.80  4.75  4.42  4.72  5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/ 205  4.33  4.33  4.23  4.37  5.00

                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 202  0201                 University of Maryland                                    Page  410
Title        COMPUTER SCIENCE II               Baltimore County                                         JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  RAOUF, SAAD                       Spring 2007                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     19
Questionnaires:  8                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies       Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                   NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1  0  0  0  1  1  5  4.57  525/1522  4.50  4.05  4.30  4.34  4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  0  1  2  4  4.43  670/1522  4.32  3.97  4.26  4.29  4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  0  0  4  3  4.43  626/1285  4.35  4.10  4.30  4.36  4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  0  0  1  1  1  4  4.14  913/1476  4.28  3.96  4.22  4.20  4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 0  2  1  1  0  2  2.83 1358/1412  2.61  3.40  4.06  4.00  2.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 4 0  0  1  0  2  4.33  519/1381  4.03  3.85  4.08  3.97  4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  134/1500  4.37  4.01  4.18  4.20  4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  1  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  645/1517  4.86  4.74  4.65  4.63  4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 0  0  1  2  0  3.67 1204/1497  4.24  3.89  4.11  4.11  3.67

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  1  4  2  4.14 1124/1440  4.46  4.22  4.45  4.42  4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  629/1448  4.81  4.63  4.71  4.78  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  0  0  2  2  3  4.14  972/1436  4.35  4.04  4.29  4.29  4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  1  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  454/1432  4.33  4.01  4.29  4.31  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 1  0  1  2  2  3.67  832/1221  4.24  3.86  3.93  4.02  3.67

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1280  4.14  3.89  4.10  4.08  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1277  3.94  4.02  4.34  4.33  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0  0  0  2  5  4.71  420/1269  4.27  4.15  4.31  4.33  4.71
4. Were special techniques successful                  1  2  0  2  2  0  1  3.00  779/ 854  3.33  3.80  4.02  4.00  3.00

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  5  0  0  0  1  2  0  3.67  194/ 215  4.67  4.64  4.36  4.62  3.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0 0 1  0  2  0  3.33  219/ 228  4.47  4.53  4.35  4.56  3.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 5 0 0  0  1  0  2  4.33  159/ 217  4.50  4.53  4.51  4.57  4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           5  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/ 216  4.80  4.75  4.42  4.72  5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5  0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00  141/ 205  4.33  4.33  4.23  4.37  4.00

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 7 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  79  ****  ****  4.58  4.58  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 7 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  77  ****  ****  4.52  5.00  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 7 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  65  ****  ****  4.49  5.00  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    7  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  78  ****  ****  4.45  5.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                7  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.11  4.00  ****
```

                                 Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 202  0202              University of Maryland                              Page  411
Title       COMPUTER SCIENCE II             Baltimore County                                    JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:   RAOUF, SAAD                   Spring 2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      18
Questionnaires:   8                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| | | Frequencies | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	899/1522	4.50	4.05	4.30	4.34	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1316/1522	4.32	3.97	4.26	4.29	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	938/1285	4.35	4.10	4.30	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1009/1476	4.28	3.96	4.22	4.20	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	1402/1412	2.61	3.40	4.06	4.00	2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1152/1381	4.03	3.85	4.08	3.97	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	892/1500	4.37	4.01	4.18	4.20	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	873/1517	4.86	4.74	4.65	4.63	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1277/1497	4.24	3.89	4.11	4.11	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1340/1440	4.46	4.22	4.45	4.42	3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1048/1448	4.81	4.63	4.71	4.78	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	0	4	3.75	1212/1436	4.35	4.04	4.29	4.29	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	0	1	4	3.50	1270/1432	4.33	4.01	4.29	4.31	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	899/1221	4.24	3.86	3.93	4.02	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	874/1280	4.14	3.89	4.10	4.08	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1050/1277	3.94	4.02	4.34	4.33	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	816/1269	4.27	4.15	4.31	4.33	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	779/ 854	3.33	3.80	4.02	4.00	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 215	4.67	4.64	4.36	4.62	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	135/ 228	4.47	4.53	4.35	4.56	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	189/ 217	4.50	4.53	4.51	4.57	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 216	4.80	4.75	4.42	4.72	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	141/ 205	4.33	4.33	4.23	4.37	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.58	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	5.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.83	****

```
                                         Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned           Cum. GPA          Expected Grades             Reasons                    Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27       0          0.00-0.99    0      A    1        Required for Majors   0        Graduate      0          Major        4
 28-55       4          1.00-1.99    0      B    3

 56-83       0          2.00-2.99    2      C    2        General               0        Under-grad    8          Non-major    4
 84-150      0          3.00-3.49    1      D    1
 Grad.       0          3.50-4.00    0      F    0        Electives             0        #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    0                                       responses to be significant
                                            I    0        Other                 7
                                            ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 202  0205              University of Maryland                          Page  412
Title       COMPUTER SCIENCE II             Baltimore County                               JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  RAOUF, SAAD                    Spring 2007                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     20
Questionnaires:  11                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course     0   0   0   0   1   2   8  4.64  462/1522  4.50  4.05  4.30  4.34  4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      0   0   1   0   0   2   8  4.45  623/1522  4.32  3.97  4.26  4.29  4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     0   0   0   0   0   2   9  4.82  220/1285  4.35  4.10  4.30  4.36  4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      1   0   0   0   2   1   7  4.50  473/1476  4.28  3.96  4.22  4.20  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   3   1   1   4   1   1  3.00 1327/1412  2.61  3.40  4.06  4.00  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  5   0   0   0   3   3  4.50  331/1381  4.03  3.85  4.08  3.97  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              0   0   0   0   0   1  10  4.91  109/1500  4.37  4.01  4.18  4.20  4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled                    0   0   0   0   0   4   7  4.64  963/1517  4.86  4.74  4.65  4.63  4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  0   0   0   1   3   7  4.55  355/1497  4.24  3.89  4.11  4.11  4.55


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          0   0   0   0   0   3   8  4.73  512/1440  4.46  4.22  4.45  4.42  4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     0   0   0   0   0   2   9  4.82  737/1448  4.81  4.63  4.71  4.78  4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0   0   0   0   0   3   8  4.73  341/1436  4.35  4.04  4.29  4.29  4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       0   0   0   0   1   2   8  4.64  490/1432  4.33  4.01  4.29  4.31  4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  0   0   0   1   1   8  4.70  156/1221  4.24  3.86  3.93  4.02  4.70


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2   0   0   0   2   0   7  4.56  357/1280  4.14  3.89  4.10  4.08  4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  3   0   0   1   0   0   7  4.63  508/1277  3.94  4.02  4.34  4.33  4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0   0   0   2   0   6  4.50  586/1269  4.27  4.15  4.31  4.33  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                    4   5   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 854  3.33  3.80  4.02  4.00  ****


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material    8   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67   63/ 215  4.67  4.64  4.36  4.62  4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8  0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67   61/ 228  4.47  4.53  4.35  4.56  4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8  0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67   91/ 217  4.50  4.53  4.51  4.57  4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance             8   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/ 216  4.80  4.75  4.42  4.72  5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified   8   1   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/ 205  4.33  4.33  4.23  4.37  ****

                                            Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 203  0101            University of Maryland                          Page  413
Title       DISCRETE STRUCTURES              Baltimore County                             JUN 26, 2007
Instructor: YESHA, YAACOV                      Spring 2007                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     34
Questionnaires: 22                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
         Questions                  NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  2  2  7  8  3  3.36 1447/1522  3.67 4.05  4.30 4.34  3.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  2  6  2  8  4  3.27 1435/1522  3.58 3.97  4.26 4.29  3.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1  0  0  2  3  7  9  4.10  887/1285  4.13 4.10  4.30 4.36  4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1  9  1  4  3  2  2  3.00 1416/1476  3.57 3.96  4.22 4.20  3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  1  1  1  3  6  8  4.00  760/1412  3.93 3.40  4.06 4.00  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  8  1  3  1  3  4  3.50 1152/1381  3.69 3.85  4.08 3.97  3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           2  0  2  2  3  4  9  3.80 1147/1500  4.08 4.01  4.18 4.20  3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled                 3  0  0  0  0  1 18  4.95  292/1517  4.85 4.74  4.65 4.63  4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6  1  3  1  4  5  2  3.13 1402/1497  3.19 3.89  4.11 4.11  3.13

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1  0  2  2  3  8  6  3.67 1331/1440  3.67 4.22  4.45 4.42  3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1  0  0  0  2  4 15  4.62 1060/1448  4.33 4.63  4.71 4.78  4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  3  3  3  6  6  3.43 1308/1436  3.50 4.04  4.29 4.29  3.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1  0  2  3  5  5  6  3.48 1280/1432  3.70 4.01  4.29 4.31  3.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  2  4  3  3  2  7  3.26 1008/1221  3.19 3.86  3.93 4.02  3.26

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0  3  0  3  5  2  3.23 1140/1280  3.32 3.89  4.10 4.08  3.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0  1  2  3  4  3  3.46 1150/1277  3.83 4.02  4.34 4.33  3.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9  0  0  0  4  3  6  4.15  832/1269  4.18 4.15  4.31 4.33  4.15
4. Were special techniques successful                 9 11  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 854  **** 3.80  4.02 4.00  ****
```

```
                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                 Type                  Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     3      0.00-0.99   1       A   12        Required for Majors  0      Graduate      1       Major      9
  28-55     4      1.00-1.99   0       B    6                                    Under-grad   21       Non-major 13
  56-83     4      2.00-2.99   2       C    1        General              0
  84-150    1      3.00-3.49   3       D    0                                    #### - Means there are not enough
  Grad.     1      3.50-4.00   4       F    0        Electives            0             responses to be significant
                                       P    0
                                       I    0        Other               19
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 203  0201                    University of Maryland                                      Page  414
Title      DISCRETE STRUCTURES                     Baltimore County                                          JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:    LOMONACO JR, SA                         Spring 2007                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    38
Questionnaires:  25                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| | | Frequencies | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	7	10	7	3.92	1200/1522	3.67	4.05	4.30	4.34	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	9	8	3.88	1200/1522	3.58	3.97	4.26	4.29	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	10	12	4.28	745/1285	4.13	4.10	4.30	4.36	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	629/1476	3.57	3.96	4.22	4.20	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	4	2	13	3.96	826/1412	3.93	3.40	4.06	4.00	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	806/1381	3.69	3.85	4.08	3.97	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	0	9	13	4.24	799/1500	4.08	4.01	4.18	4.20	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	555/1517	4.85	4.74	4.65	4.63	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	12	6	3	3.43	1310/1497	3.19	3.89	4.11	4.11	3.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	9	7	5	3.54	1353/1440	3.67	4.22	4.45	4.42	3.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	4	17	4.58	1089/1448	4.33	4.63	4.71	4.78	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	8	7	4	3.55	1273/1436	3.50	4.04	4.29	4.29	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	3	4	10	6	3.83	1161/1432	3.70	4.01	4.29	4.31	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	18	3	1	1	0	1	2.17	****/1221	3.19	3.86	3.93	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/1280	3.32	3.89	4.10	4.08	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/1277	3.83	4.02	4.34	4.33	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	****/1269	4.18	4.15	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	****	3.80	4.02	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: CMSC 203  0301               University of Maryland                        Page  415
Title      DISCRETE STRUCTURES                  Baltimore County                           JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  STEPHENS, ARTHU                      Spring 2007                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    41

Questionnaires: 16                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  1  0  1  2  2  5  5  3.73 1305/1522  3.67 4.05  4.30 4.34  3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1  0  1  3  2  4  5  3.60 1323/1522  3.58 3.97  4.26 4.29  3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1  0  1  0  3  5  6  4.00  938/1285  4.13 4.10  4.30 4.36  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1  5  3  0  1  3  3  3.30 1370/1476  3.57 3.96  4.22 4.20  3.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 3  1  0  3  4  4  3.83  948/1412  3.93 3.40  4.06 4.00  3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 8 1 0 2 2  2  3.57 1136/1381  3.69 3.85  4.08 3.97  3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1  0  0  1  3  3  8  4.20  839/1500  4.08 4.01  4.18 4.20  4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1  0  0  0  0  4 11  4.73  837/1517  4.85 4.74  4.65 4.63  4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 3 0 5 4 1  3.00 1418/1497  3.19 3.89  4.11 4.11  3.00


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1  0  1  2  2  4  6  3.80 1287/1440  3.67 4.22  4.45 4.42  3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1  0  2  1  3  1  8  3.80 1397/1448  4.33 4.63  4.71 4.78  3.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 3 0 3 4 5  3.53 1275/1436  3.50 4.04  4.29 4.29  3.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1  1  2  0  2  5  5  3.79 1178/1432  3.70 4.01  4.29 4.31  3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 6 2 1 2 0 3  3.13 1048/1221  3.19 3.86  3.93 4.02  3.13


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 1 0 2 0 2  3.40 1081/1280  3.32 3.89  4.10 4.08  3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 0 0 1 2 2  4.20  849/1277  3.83 4.02  4.34 4.33  4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0 0 1 2 2  4.20  816/1269  4.18 4.15  4.31 4.33  4.20
4. Were special techniques successful                 11  2  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/ 854  **** 3.80  4.02 4.00  ****

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15 0 1 0 0 0 0  1.00 ****/  47  **** ****  4.41 4.83  ****
```

```
                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons             Type                Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    1       0.00-0.99   1       A   5       Required for Majors  0     Graduate     0     Major       3
 28-55    4       1.00-1.99   0       B   5
 56-83    1       2.00-2.99   0       C   3       General              0     Under-grad  16     Non-major  13
 84-150   1       3.00-3.49   3       D   0
 Grad.    0       3.50-4.00   4       F   0       Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                      I   0       Other               12
                                      ?   2
```

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

                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  1  0  6  1  3.88 1234/1522   4.00  4.05  4.30  4.34  3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  2  1  3  1  3.43 1396/1522   3.88  3.97  4.26  4.25  3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  1  2  5  4.50  531/1285   4.38  4.10  4.30  4.30  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  1  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  265/1476   4.66  3.96  4.22  4.26  4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  2  1  2  1  1  0  2.40 1393/1412   2.48  3.40  4.06  4.03  2.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1  3  3  4.00  806/1381   4.27  3.85  4.08  4.13  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  2  5  1  3.88 1105/1500   4.00  4.01  4.18  4.13  3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  555/1517   4.90  4.74  4.65  4.62  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 1 2  2  1  3.50 1277/1497   3.70  3.89  4.11  4.13  3.50

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  1  2  2  3  3.88 1262/1440   3.87  4.22  4.45  4.46  3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  629/1448   4.83  4.63  4.71  4.71  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 1  0  3  3  3.75 1212/1436   3.84  4.04  4.29  4.30  3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  1  0  2  2  3  3.75 1191/1432   3.78  4.01  4.29  4.29  3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 0 0 2  1  2  4.00  606/1221   3.58  3.86  3.93  3.94  4.00

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1  0  5  0  3.67  959/1280   3.87  3.89  4.10  4.14  3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0  1  1  4  4.50  594/1277   4.21  4.02  4.34  4.38  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 0  2  4  4.67  461/1269   4.60  4.15  4.31  4.39  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                  2  4  0  0  1  0  1  4.00  426/ 854   4.19  3.80  4.02  4.00  4.00
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 304  0102                    University of Maryland                                      Page  417
Title      ETHICAL ISSUES IN IT                     Baltimore County                                         JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:   WILSON, RICHARD                          Spring 2007                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    22
Questionnaires: 15                             Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

		Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	1022/1522	4.00	4.05	4.30	4.34	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	787/1522	3.88	3.97	4.26	4.25	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	759/1285	4.38	4.10	4.30	4.30	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	378/1476	4.66	3.96	4.22	4.26	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	1	5	1	0	2.56	1382/1412	2.48	3.40	4.06	4.03	2.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	305/1381	4.27	3.85	4.08	4.13	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	2	9	4.13	903/1500	4.00	4.01	4.18	4.13	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	341/1517	4.90	4.74	4.65	4.62	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	1034/1497	3.70	3.89	4.11	4.13	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	4	5	5	3.87	1266/1440	3.87	4.22	4.45	4.46	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	765/1448	4.83	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	6	4	3.93	1127/1436	3.84	4.04	4.29	4.30	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	7	4	3.80	1170/1432	3.78	4.01	4.29	4.29	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	0	5	4	1	3.17	1038/1221	3.58	3.86	3.93	3.94	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	694/1280	3.87	3.89	4.10	4.14	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	996/1277	4.21	4.02	4.34	4.38	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	562/1269	4.60	4.15	4.31	4.39	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	267/ 854	4.19	3.80	4.02	4.00	4.38

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 313  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  418
Title       COMP ORGAN & ASSEMB LA        Baltimore County                                   JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  BURT, GARY                    Spring 2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     31
Questionnaires:  17                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                       NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean   Rank    Mean Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  11   3   2   1   0  1.59 1517/1522  2.29 4.05  4.30 4.34  1.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  11   5   1   0   0  1.41 1520/1522  2.18 3.97  4.26 4.25  1.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   9   4   4   0   0  1.71 1283/1285  2.56 4.10  4.30 4.30  1.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2   6   6   2   1   0  1.87 1475/1476  2.43 3.96  4.22 4.26  1.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  10   3   2   2   0   0  1.86 1405/1412  2.36 3.40  4.06 4.03  1.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  6   5   4   2   0   0  1.73 1372/1381  2.33 3.85  4.08 4.13  1.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   1  14   0   1   1   0  1.31 1497/1500  2.19 4.01  4.18 4.13  1.31
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   2  14   0  3.88 1455/1517  3.97 4.74  4.65 4.62  3.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  11   4   1   0   0  1.38 1496/1497  2.15 3.89  4.11 4.13  1.38

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  10   6   1   0   0  1.47 1437/1440  2.24 4.22  4.45 4.46  1.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   2   0   6   6   3  3.47 1422/1448  3.85 4.63  4.71 4.71  3.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  12   4   0   1   0  1.41 1434/1436  2.03 4.04  4.29 4.30  1.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  12   4   1   0   0  1.35 1429/1432  2.26 4.01  4.29 4.29  1.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  3   6   5   2   0   0  1.69 1210/1221  2.32 3.86  3.93 3.94  1.69

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12  0   0   4   1   0   0  2.20 1270/1280  2.60 3.89  4.10 4.14  2.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12  0   2   3   0   0   0  1.60 1274/1277  2.30 4.02  4.34 4.38  1.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13  0   1   2   1   0   0  2.00 ****/1269  3.86 4.15  4.31 4.39  ****
```

```
                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades       Reasons              Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0         A    7      Required for Majors   0      Graduate     0       Major      16
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0         B    5
 56-83      6      2.00-2.99    1         C    2      General               0      Under-grad  17       Non-major   1
 84-150     6      3.00-3.49    5         D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    5         F    0      Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                          I    0      Other                17
                                          ?    3
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 313  0201                    University of Maryland                              Page  419
Title          COMP ORGAN & ASSEMB LA             Baltimore County                                   JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:    BURT, GARY                         Spring 2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     21
Questionnaires: 17                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                               Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  3  2  5  6  1  3.00 1489/1522  2.29  4.05  4.30  4.34  3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  2  2  9  3  1  2.94 1488/1522  2.18  3.97  4.26  4.25  2.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  2  1  5  6  3  3.41 1197/1285  2.56  4.10  4.30  4.30  3.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   2  2  1  8  3  1  3.00 1416/1476  2.43  3.96  4.22  4.26  3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 2  3  1  7  3  1  2.87 1355/1412  2.36  3.40  4.06  4.03  2.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4 3 1 4 4 1  2.92 1310/1381  2.33  3.85  4.08  4.13  2.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   1  2  2  6  5  1  3.06 1425/1500  2.19  4.01  4.18  4.13  3.06
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0  0  0  3  9  4  4.06 1368/1517  3.97  4.74  4.65  4.62  4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 3 1 5 6 0 2.93 1432/1497  2.15  3.89  4.11  4.13  2.93


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  3  3  3  7  1  3.00 1404/1440  2.24  4.22  4.45  4.46  3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  1  1  1  4 10  4.24 1307/1448  3.85  4.63  4.71  4.71  4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  3  3  8  3  0  2.65 1413/1436  2.03  4.04  4.29  4.30  2.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  3  2  5  3  4  3.18 1347/1432  2.26  4.01  4.29  4.29  3.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 3 2 6 5 1  2.94 1090/1221  2.32  3.86  3.93  3.94  2.94


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 2 3 2 0  3.00 1187/1280  2.60  3.89  4.10  4.14  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 2 4 0 1  3.00 1214/1277  2.30  4.02  4.34  4.38  3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 0 3 2 2 3.86  981/1269  3.86  4.15  4.31  4.39  3.86
4. Were special techniques successful                10   5  1  0  1  0  0  2.00 ****/ 854  ****  3.80  4.02  4.00  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/  79  ****  ****  4.58  4.53  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/  77  ****  ****  4.52  4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  65  ****  ****  4.49  4.33  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned  16   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  78  ****  ****  4.45  4.34  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear              16   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.11  3.33  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.41  4.56  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  45  ****  ****  4.30  4.39  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation     16   0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.40  4.68  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 16   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.31  4.26  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.63  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal  16   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  23  ****  ****  4.41  ****  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                Type              Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0        0.00-0.99    1      A    6      Required for Majors  0      Graduate     0      Major      14
 28-55     1        1.00-1.99    0      B    7                                                      
 56-83     4        2.00-2.99    0      C    2      General              0      Under-grad  17      Non-major   3
 84-150    0        3.00-3.49    3      D    0
 Grad.     0        3.50-4.00    4      F    0      Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other               14
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 331  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  420
Title      PRIN OF PROG LANGUAGES          Baltimore County                                  JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  VICK, SHON                     Spring 2007                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    19
Questionnaires:  12                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                               Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  1  1  4  4  2  3.42 1437/1522  3.49  4.05  4.30  4.34  3.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  2  2  6  2  0  2.67 1504/1522  3.06  3.97  4.26  4.25  2.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  1  4  5  1  1  2.75 1268/1285  3.32  4.10  4.30  4.30  2.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1  1  4  4  2  0  2.64 1458/1476  3.32  3.96  4.22  4.26  2.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   7  2  2  1  0  0  1.80 1406/1412  2.34  3.40  4.06  4.03  1.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6  1  1  2  2  0  2.83 1326/1381  3.25  3.85  4.08  4.13  2.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   1  5  1  3  2  0  2.18 1484/1500  3.26  4.01  4.18  4.13  2.18
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  2 10  0  3.83 1461/1517  4.36  4.74  4.65  4.62  3.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  4  1  5  0  0  2.10 1485/1497  2.62  3.89  4.11  4.13  2.10

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  2  4  4  1  0  2.36 1431/1440  3.24  4.22  4.45  4.46  2.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  2  5  3  1  3.27 1436/1448  3.86  4.63  4.71  4.71  3.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  3  2  6  0  0  2.27 1425/1436  2.91  4.04  4.29  4.30  2.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  2  3  6  0  0  2.36 1409/1432  3.29  4.01  4.29  4.29  2.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  2  3  2  4  0  0  2.11 1195/1221  2.93  3.86  3.93  3.94  2.11

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8   0  1  0  3  0  0  2.50 1257/1280  2.50  3.89  4.10  4.14  2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8   0  0  1  3  0  0  2.75 1254/1277  2.75  4.02  4.34  4.38  2.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8  0  0  1  2  0  1  3.25 1174/1269  3.25  4.15  4.31  4.39  3.25
4. Were special techniques successful                   8   2  1  0  1  0  0  2.00 ****/ 854  ****  3.80  4.02  4.00  ****
```

```
                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 331  0201           University of Maryland                         Page  421
Title       PRIN OF PROG LANGUAGES          Baltimore County                         JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:    NIRENBURG, SERG              Spring 2007                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    41
Questionnaires:  9                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                    Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  5  3  1  3.56 1383/1522  3.49  4.05  4.30  4.34  3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  1  4  3  1  3.44 1388/1522  3.06  3.97  4.26  4.25  3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  4  2  3  3.89 1034/1285  3.32  4.10  4.30  4.30  3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  6  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 1009/1476  3.32  3.96  4.22  4.26  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1  2  1  2  2  1  2.88 1354/1412  2.34  3.40  4.06  4.03  2.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6  0  0  2  0  1  3.67 1097/1381  3.25  3.85  4.08  4.13  3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  3  0  6  4.33  700/1500  3.26  4.01  4.18  4.13  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  532/1517  4.36  4.74  4.65  4.62  4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  3  1  2  1  3.14 1400/1497  2.62  3.89  4.11  4.13  3.14

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  2  0  2  5  4.11 1142/1440  3.24  4.22  4.45  4.46  4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  5  4  4.44 1207/1448  3.86  4.63  4.71  4.71  4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0  3  1  2  3  3.56 1271/1436  2.91  4.04  4.29  4.30  3.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  1  0  1  1  6  4.22  907/1432  3.29  4.01  4.29  4.29  4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1  0  1  2  3  2  3.75  786/1221  2.93  3.86  3.93  3.94  3.75

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0  1  0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/1280  2.50  3.89  4.10  4.14  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0  1  0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/1277  2.75  4.02  4.34  4.38  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/1269  3.25  4.15  4.31  4.39  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  7  0  0  0  2  0  0  3.00 ****/ 854  ****  3.80  4.02  4.00  ****
```

```
                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 341  0101                 University of Maryland                                    Page  422
Title          DATA STRUCTURES                 Baltimore County                                         JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:    FREY, DENNIS                     Spring 2007                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    31
Questionnaires: 17                             Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  1  1  0  3  12  4.41   720/1522  4.34  4.05  4.30  4.34  4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  2  3  12  4.59   454/1522  4.43  3.97  4.26  4.25  4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  5  11  4.69   347/1285  4.60  4.10  4.30  4.30  4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2  0  1  1  5   8  4.33   703/1476  4.30  3.96  4.22  4.26  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   3  2  2  3  5   2  3.21  1299/1412  3.42  3.40  4.06  4.03  3.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7  1  0  0  3   6  4.30   556/1381  4.33  3.85  4.08  4.13  4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  0  4  13  4.76   201/1500  4.38  4.01  4.18  4.13  4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   1  0  0  0  1  15  4.94   341/1517  4.80  4.74  4.65  4.62  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  0  0  0  4   9  4.69   240/1497  4.43  3.89  4.11  4.13  4.69


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  2  15  4.88   224/1440  4.66  4.22  4.45  4.46  4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  1  16  4.94   296/1448  4.80  4.63  4.71  4.71  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  1  3  13  4.71   373/1436  4.43  4.04  4.29  4.30  4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  1  3  13  4.71   406/1432  4.47  4.01  4.29  4.29  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  4  0  1  2  5   4  4.00   606/1221  4.23  3.86  3.93  3.94  4.00


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14  0  0  0  0  2   1  4.33  ****/1280  3.81  3.89  4.10  4.14  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14  0  0  0  0  1   2  4.67  ****/1277  4.05  4.02  4.34  4.38  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0  0  0  0  1   2  4.67  ****/1269  4.06  4.15  4.31  4.39  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   14  2  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/ 854  4.14  3.80  4.02  4.00  ****


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   16  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/ 215  ****  4.64  4.36  4.21  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/ 228  ****  4.53  4.35  4.29  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/ 217  ****  4.53  4.51  4.45  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            16  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/ 216  ****  4.75  4.42  4.35  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  16  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/ 205  ****  4.33  4.23  4.26  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  79  ****  ****  4.58  4.53  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  77  ****  ****  4.52  4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  65  ****  ****  4.49  4.33  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     16  0  0  0  1  0   0  3.00  ****/  78  ****  ****  4.45  4.34  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 16  0  0  0  1  0   0  3.00  ****/  80  ****  ****  4.11  3.33  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  16  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  47  ****  ****  4.41  4.56  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  16  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  45  ****  ****  4.30  4.39  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        16  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  39  ****  ****  4.40  4.68  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  16  0  0  0  1  0   0  3.00  ****/  34  ****  ****  4.30  4.12  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  37  ****  ****  4.63  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     16  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  23  ****  ****  4.41  ****  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       16  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  33  ****  ****  4.69  4.75  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        16  0  0  0  1  0   0  3.00  ****/  22  ****  ****  4.54  ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      16  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  18  ****  ****  4.49  ****  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	6
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: CMSC 341  0201                University of Maryland                              Page  423
Title       DATA STRUCTURES                    Baltimore County                                 JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  KARGUPTA, HILLO                    Spring 2007                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     27
Questionnaires: 12                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                    NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   1   2   1   8  4.33  814/1522  4.34  4.05  4.30 4.34  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   1   5   6  4.42  686/1522  4.43  3.97  4.26 4.25  4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   2   9  4.67  366/1285  4.60  4.10  4.30 4.30  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1   0   0   1   5   5  4.36  671/1476  4.30  3.96  4.22 4.26  4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   3   1   0   3   3   2  3.56 1138/1412  3.42  3.40  4.06 4.03  3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 8   0   0   0   2   2  4.50  331/1381  4.33  3.85  4.08 4.13  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   1   2   3   6  4.17  871/1500  4.38  4.01  4.18 4.13  4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   3   9  4.75  802/1517  4.80  4.74  4.65 4.62  4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0   0   0   0   6   6  4.50  385/1497  4.43  3.89  4.11 4.13  4.50


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   1   3   8  4.58  705/1440  4.66  4.22  4.45 4.46  4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   1   1  10  4.75  859/1448  4.80  4.63  4.71 4.71  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   0   3   3   6  4.25  876/1436  4.43  4.04  4.29 4.30  4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0   0   1   6   5  4.33  820/1432  4.47  4.01  4.29 4.29  4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  1   0   0   2   2   7  4.45  319/1221  4.23  3.86  3.93 3.94  4.45


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0   0   1   2   1   4  4.00  718/1280  3.81  3.89  4.10 4.14  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0   1   0   2   0   5  4.00  930/1277  4.05  4.02  4.34 4.38  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0   0   1   1   0   6  4.38  692/1269  4.06  4.15  4.31 4.39  4.38
4. Were special techniques successful                   4   1   0   0   2   2   3  4.14  391/ 854  4.14  3.80  4.02 4.00  4.14


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  11   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 215  ****  4.64  4.36 4.21  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 228  ****  4.53  4.35 4.29  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 11 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 217  ****  4.53  4.51 4.45  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           11   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 216  ****  4.75  4.42 4.35  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 11   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 205  ****  4.33  4.23 4.26  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 11  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  79  ****  ****  4.58 4.53  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 11 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  77  ****  ****  4.52 4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 11  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  65  ****  ****  4.49 4.33  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    11   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  78  ****  ****  4.45 4.34  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                11   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.11 3.33  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 11   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.41 4.56  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 11   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  45  ****  ****  4.30 4.39  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       11   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.40 4.68  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   11   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.31 4.26  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 11   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  34  ****  ****  4.30 4.12  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 11  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.63 5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    11   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  23  ****  ****  4.41 ****  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      11   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.69 4.75  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       11   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  22  ****  ****  4.54 ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     11   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  18  ****  ****  4.49 ****  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 341  0301              University of Maryland                          Page  424
Title       DATA STRUCTURES                   Baltimore County                             JUN 26, 2007
Instructor: EDELMAN, MITCHE                     Spring 2007                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     41
Questionnaires: 25                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

```
General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      0    0    0    2    2    8   13   4.28  869/1522   4.34  4.05  4.30  4.34  4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       0    0    0    0    5    8   12   4.28  844/1522   4.43  3.97  4.26  4.25  4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      0    0    0    0    4    6   15   4.44  602/1285   4.60  4.10  4.30  4.30  4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       0    6    0    0    3    9    7   4.21  838/1476   4.30  3.96  4.22  4.26  4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   0    4    2    4    4    4    7   3.48 1183/1412   3.42  3.40  4.06  4.03  3.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0    8    1    0    3    4    9   4.18  683/1381   4.33  3.85  4.08  4.13  4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained               0    0    0    1    6    5   13   4.20  839/1500   4.38  4.01  4.18  4.13  4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled                     0    1    0    0    0    7   17   4.71  891/1517   4.80  4.74  4.65  4.62  4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4    0    0    1    5    6    9   4.10  839/1497   4.43  3.89  4.11  4.13  4.10

Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           0    0    0    1    1    7   16   4.52  774/1440   4.66  4.22  4.45  4.46  4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      0    0    0    0    1    5   19   4.72  935/1448   4.80  4.63  4.71  4.71  4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   1    0    1    0    3    6   14   4.33  793/1436   4.43  4.04  4.29  4.30  4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        0    0    0    1    2    9   13   4.36  793/1432   4.47  4.01  4.29  4.29  4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  1    2    1    1    0   10   10   4.23  480/1221   4.23  3.86  3.93  3.94  4.23

Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  17    0    1    0    3    1    3   3.63  978/1280   3.81  3.89  4.10  4.14  3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  15    0    0    1    2    2    5   4.10  903/1277   4.05  4.02  4.34  4.38  4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17    0    0    1    3    1    3   3.75 1030/1269   4.06  4.15  4.31  4.39  3.75
4. Were special techniques successful                    17    5    1    0    0    1    1   3.33 ****/ 854   4.14  3.80  4.02  4.00  ****
```

```
                                    Frequency Distribution
```

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	18
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: CMSC 345  0101              University of Maryland                          Page  425
Title      SOFTWARE DESIGN/DEVELO            Baltimore County                               JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  MITCHELL, SUSAN                 Spring 2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    26
Questionnaires:  24                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies         Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   1   3  12   8  4.13 1033/1522  4.28  4.05  4.30  4.34  4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   3  12   9  4.25  874/1522  4.43  3.97  4.26  4.25  4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   5   0   1   4   8   6  4.00  938/1285  4.24  4.10  4.30  4.30  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   0   3  12   8  4.22  838/1476  4.41  3.96  4.22  4.26  4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1   5   4   5   5   3  2.86 1355/1412  3.39  3.40  4.06  4.03  2.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1  1   3   5   6   7  3.68 1086/1381  3.98  3.85  4.08  4.13  3.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   2   5   7  10  4.04  966/1500  4.27  4.01  4.18  4.13  4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   4  20  4.83  645/1517  4.82  4.74  4.65  4.62  4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1  0   0   5   9   6  4.05  865/1497  4.17  3.89  4.11  4.13  4.05


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   1   1  10  12  4.38  953/1440  4.61  4.22  4.45  4.46  4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   1   1   4  18  4.63 1048/1448  4.75  4.63  4.71  4.71  4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   1   4   9  10  4.17  957/1436  4.44  4.04  4.29  4.30  4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   3   3   8  10  4.04 1018/1432  4.36  4.01  4.29  4.29  4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 2  0   3   3   5   9  4.00  606/1221  4.24  3.86  3.93  3.94  4.00


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0   1   1   4   5   7  3.89  834/1280  4.29  3.89  4.10  4.14  3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0   0   1   1   5  11  4.44  652/1277  4.62  4.02  4.34  4.38  4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0  0   3   2   3  10  4.11  848/1269  4.48  4.15  4.31  4.39  4.11
4. Were special techniques successful                  6   1   2   1   2   5   7  3.82  560/ 854  4.28  3.80  4.02  4.00  3.82


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1      0.00-0.99   1      A   16      Required for Majors   0      Graduate      0      Major       21
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0      B    4
  56-83      6      2.00-2.99   1      C    0      General               0      Under-grad   24      Non-major    3
  84-150     7      3.00-3.49   8      D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   4      F    0      Electives             1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                21
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 345  0201            University of Maryland                          Page  426
Title      SOFTWARE DESIGN/DEVELO          Baltimore County                              JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  MITCHELL, SUSAN                 Spring 2007                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     31
Questionnaires:  25                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   2   1   6  16  4.44  681/1522  4.28  4.05  4.30  4.34  4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   3   4  18  4.60  432/1522  4.43  3.97  4.26  4.25  4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   4   0   0   4   3  14  4.48  566/1285  4.24  4.10  4.30  4.30  4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   1   1   5  18  4.60  378/1476  4.41  3.96  4.22  4.26  4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   2   1   2   5   4  10  3.91  892/1412  3.39  3.40  4.06  4.03  3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  2   1   0   3   6  12  4.27  585/1381  3.98  3.85  4.08  4.13  4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   1   2   5  16  4.50  483/1500  4.27  4.01  4.18  4.13  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   5  20  4.80  714/1517  4.82  4.74  4.65  4.62  4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8  0  0   1   2   5   9  4.29  612/1497  4.17  3.89  4.11  4.13  4.29


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   4  21  4.84  288/1440  4.61  4.22  4.45  4.46  4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   3  22  4.88  548/1448  4.75  4.63  4.71  4.71  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   0   2   3  20  4.72  357/1436  4.44  4.04  4.29  4.30  4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   1   1   3  20  4.68  442/1432  4.36  4.01  4.29  4.29  4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  3   0   1   2   4  14  4.48  303/1221  4.24  3.86  3.93  3.94  4.48


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0   0   0   1   4  14  4.68  273/1280  4.29  3.89  4.10  4.14  4.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0   0   0   1   2  16  4.79  340/1277  4.62  4.02  4.34  4.38  4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0   0   0   1   1  17  4.84  288/1269  4.48  4.15  4.31  4.39  4.84
4. Were special techniques successful                  6   4   0   0   1   2  12  4.73  113/ 854  4.28  3.80  4.02  4.00  4.73


                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                      Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0       0.00-0.99   0        A   15        Required for Majors   1       Graduate      0         Major       23
  28-55     0       1.00-1.99   0        B    8
  56-83     2       2.00-2.99   5        C    0        General               0       Under-grad   25         Non-major    2
  84-150   11       3.00-3.49   9        D    0
  Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   4        F    0        Electives             0       #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                      responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                22
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 411  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  427
Title      COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE            Baltimore County                              JUN 26, 2007
Instructor: SQUIRE, JON S                   Spring 2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    35
Questionnaires:  12                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                       Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions              NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  1  0  2  3  6  4.08 1067/1522  4.10  4.05  4.30  4.42  4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  1  0  1  3  7  4.25  874/1522  4.31  3.97  4.26  4.34  4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  1  1  0 10  4.58  446/1285  4.49  4.10  4.30  4.42  4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  2  0  1  0  2  7  4.50  473/1476  4.33  3.96  4.22  4.31  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  1  4  2  1  3  3.09 1319/1412  3.05  3.40  4.06  4.11  3.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  2  0  0  3  2  5  4.20  663/1381  3.96  3.85  4.08  4.21  4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  1  0  2  9  4.58  406/1500  4.48  4.01  4.18  4.25  4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00    1/1517  5.00  4.74  4.65  4.71  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  1  1  0  1  6  3  3.91 1034/1497  3.95  3.89  4.11  4.21  3.91


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2  0  0  1  1  0  8  4.50  798/1440  4.63  4.22  4.45  4.52  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2  0  0  1  0  0  9  4.70  965/1448  4.79  4.63  4.71  4.75  4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  1  1  0  3  5  4.00 1056/1436  4.06  4.04  4.29  4.32  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2  0  1  0  2  1  6  4.10  991/1432  4.02  4.01  4.29  4.34  4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  2  0  0  2  1  5  4.38  380/1221  3.98  3.86  3.93  4.04  4.38


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/1280  ****  3.89  4.10  4.28  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10  0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/1277  ****  4.02  4.34  4.50  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10  0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/1269  ****  4.15  4.31  4.49  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                10  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 854  ****  3.80  4.02  4.31  ****


                                  Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1       0.00-0.99   1          A    9        Required for Majors   0      Graduate      0        Major       9
  28-55      0       1.00-1.99   0          B    3

  56-83      1       2.00-2.99   1          C    0        General               1      Under-grad   12        Non-major   3
  84-150     7       3.00-3.49   3          D    0
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   4          F    0        Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                           I    0        Other                11
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 411  0201                   University of Maryland                                    Page  428
Title      COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE                  Baltimore County                                        JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  SQUIRE, JON S                        Spring 2007                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    34
Questionnaires:  16                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level   Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean   Mean Mean   Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  1  3  5  7  4.13 1033/1522  4.10  4.05  4.30  4.42  4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  0  7  8  4.38  738/1522  4.31  3.97  4.26  4.34  4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  1  0  6  8  4.40  650/1285  4.49  4.10  4.30  4.42  4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   3  1  0  0  7  5  4.15  903/1476  4.33  3.96  4.22  4.31  4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  4  2  0  6  4  0  3.00 1327/1412  3.05  3.40  4.06  4.11  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5 0 1 3 5 2 3.73 1064/1381  3.96  3.85  4.08  4.21  3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  1  2  3 10  4.38  660/1500  4.48  4.01  4.18  4.25  4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   1  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1517  5.00  4.74  4.65  4.71  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 1 1 8 3 4.00  898/1497  3.95  3.89  4.11  4.21  4.00

                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  4 12  4.75  452/1440  4.63  4.22  4.45  4.52  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  1  0 15  4.88  575/1448  4.79  4.63  4.71  4.75  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  2  3  2  9  4.13  987/1436  4.06  4.04  4.29  4.32  4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   1  2  0  3  2  8  3.93 1099/1432  4.02  4.01  4.29  4.34  3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3 2 1 2 2 5 3.58  867/1221  3.98  3.86  3.93  4.04  3.58

                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 ****/1280 ****  3.89  4.10  4.28  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 0 0 2 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1277 ****  4.02  4.34  4.50  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 2 0 0 1 3.00 ****/1269 ****  4.15  4.31  4.49  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  13   2  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 854 ****  3.80  4.02  4.31  ****
```

```
                                         Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA           Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0        0.00-0.99   0        A  10      Required for Majors  0     Graduate     0      Major      11
  28-55     0        1.00-1.99   0        B   4
  56-83     4        2.00-2.99   3        C   1      General              0     Under-grad  16      Non-major   5
  84-150    4        3.00-3.49   4        D   0
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   2        F   0      Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                         I   0      Other               15
                                         ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 421  0101                University of Maryland                                        Page  429
Title       PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS             Baltimore County                                             JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:   YESHA, YELENA                   Spring 2007                                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    40
Questionnaires: 20                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                  Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                  NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   1   4  10   3   2  3.05 1485/1522  3.38  4.05  4.30 4.42  3.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   4   5   9   0   2  2.55 1507/1522  3.15  3.97  4.26 4.34  2.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   3   7   5   3   2  2.70 1270/1285  3.17  4.10  4.30 4.42  2.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   3   6   4   2   4   1  2.41 1464/1476  2.77  3.96  4.22 4.31  2.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  1  2  1  2  7  3  4  3.41 1219/1412  3.41  3.40  4.06 4.11  3.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2  6  3  5  1  2  2.41 1360/1381  2.79  3.85  4.08 4.21  2.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0   4   2   6   4   3  3.00 1430/1500  3.37  4.01  4.18 4.25  3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 2   3   1   0   0   5   9  4.40 1161/1517  4.31  4.74  4.65 4.71  4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  3  6  7  1  1  2.50 1476/1497  3.21  3.89  4.11 4.21  2.50


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   2   7   4   4   3  2.95 1411/1440  3.49  4.22  4.45 4.52  2.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   1   2   8   6   3  3.40 1432/1448  3.97  4.63  4.71 4.75  3.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  4  3  9  3  1  2.70 1409/1436  3.37  4.04  4.29 4.32  2.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   9   3   3   3   2  2.30 1412/1432  3.13  4.01  4.29 4.34  2.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1  5  0  7  5  1  2.83 1117/1221  3.36  3.86  3.93 4.04  2.83


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  14  0  1  2  1  2  0  2.67 1250/1280  3.19  3.89  4.10 4.28  2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  15  0  1  1  1  2  0  2.80 1251/1277  2.80  4.02  4.34 4.50  2.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15  0  0  3  0  2  0  2.80 1238/1269  2.80  4.15  4.31 4.49  2.80
4. Were special techniques successful                 15   3   2   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 854  ****  3.80  4.02 4.31  ****


                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 19   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 215  ****  4.64  4.36 4.47  ****

2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 228  ****  4.53  4.35 4.32  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  19 0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 217  ****  4.53  4.51 4.55  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          19   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 216  ****  4.75  4.42 4.20  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 19  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 205  ****  4.33  4.23 3.85  ****


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  19  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  79  ****  ****  4.58 4.67  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 19  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  77  ****  ****  4.52 4.60  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  19  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  65  ****  ****  4.49 4.65  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   19   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  78  ****  ****  4.45 4.58  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               19   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.11 4.14  ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.41 4.51  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 19  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  45  ****  ****  4.30 4.22  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      19   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.40 4.03  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  19   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.31 4.13  ****


                Self Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  19  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.63 4.33  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   19   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  23  ****  ****  4.41 4.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     19   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.69 4.92  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      19   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  22  ****  ****  4.54 4.25  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    19   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  18  ****  ****  4.49 4.25  ****
```

                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	4
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	9	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: CMSC 421  0201                   University of Maryland                                    Page  430
Title      PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS                    Baltimore County                                       JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:   PERICH, FILIP                            Spring 2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    46
Questionnaires:  28                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                             Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0   2  10  10   6  3.71 1315/1522  3.38  4.05  4.30  4.42  3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   4   8   7   9  3.75 1267/1522  3.15  3.97  4.26  4.34  3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   0   4  10   6   8  3.64 1129/1285  3.17  4.10  4.30  4.42  3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   3   2   4  10   7   2  3.12 1406/1476  2.77  3.96  4.22  4.31  3.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  2   2   5   5   7   6  3.40 1225/1412  3.41  3.40  4.06  4.11  3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2   1   6   8   8   2  3.16 1265/1381  2.79  3.85  4.08  4.21  3.16
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0   2   3   4   9   9  3.74 1190/1500  3.37  4.01  4.18  4.25  3.74
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0   0   0   1  19   7  4.22 1284/1517  4.31  4.74  4.65  4.71  4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0   0   0   7  13   5  3.92 1006/1497  3.21  3.89  4.11  4.21  3.92

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0   2   6   9  11  4.04 1174/1440  3.49  4.22  4.45  4.52  4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0   0   2   9  17  4.54 1131/1448  3.97  4.63  4.71  4.75  4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0   0   1   7  10  10  4.04 1040/1436  3.37  4.04  4.29  4.32  4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   0   1  10   6  11  3.96 1072/1432  3.13  4.01  4.29  4.34  3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1   1   1   6  11   8  3.89  707/1221  3.36  3.86  3.93  4.04  3.89

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21 0   0   0   4   1   2  3.71  934/1280  3.19  3.89  4.10  4.28  3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22 0   0   0   2   0   4  4.33 ****/1277  2.80  4.02  4.34  4.50  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0   0   0   1   0   5  4.67 ****/1269  2.80  4.15  4.31  4.49  ****

4. Were special techniques successful                 22  2   0   0   2   0   2  4.00 ****/ 854  ****  3.80  4.02  4.31  ****

                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 26  0   1   0   1   0   0  2.00 ****/ 215  ****  4.64  4.36  4.47  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 27 0  1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 228  ****  4.53  4.35  4.32  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 27 0  1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 217  ****  4.53  4.51  4.55  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          27  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 216  ****  4.75  4.42  4.20  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 27  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 205  ****  4.33  4.23  3.85  ****

                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                   Type               Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0          0.00-0.99   0      A    2       Required for Majors   0    Graduate    0        Major      16
 28-55      0          1.00-1.99   0      B   19
 56-83      2          2.00-2.99   3      C    5       General               0    Under-grad  28       Non-major  12
 84-150    14          3.00-3.49   8      D    0
 Grad.      0          3.50-4.00   7      F    0       Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                26
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 421H 0101            University of Maryland                        Page  431
Title                                       Baltimore County                           JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:    JOSHI, ANUPAM                 Spring 2007                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     9
Questionnaires:  9                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions               NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  0  0  0  3  6 4.67  433/1522 4.67  4.05  4.30  4.42  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  2  7 4.78  233/1522 4.78  3.97  4.26  4.34  4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  2  5  2 4.00  938/1285 4.00  4.10  4.30  4.42  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  2  0  0  1  4  2 4.14  913/1476 4.14  3.96  4.22  4.31  4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  0  1  2  3  2 3.75 1013/1412 3.75  3.40  4.06  4.11  3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  3  3  3 4.00  806/1381 4.00  3.85  4.08  4.21  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  2  0  7 4.56  435/1500 4.56  4.01  4.18  4.25  4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  2  7 4.78  767/1517 4.78  4.74  4.65  4.71  4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  0  0  3  3 4.50  385/1497 4.50  3.89  4.11  4.21  4.50


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  0  2  7 4.78  412/1440 4.78  4.22  4.45  4.52  4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  0  9 5.00    1/1448 5.00  4.63  4.71  4.75  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  2  7 4.78  263/1436 4.78  4.04  4.29  4.32  4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  0  2  7 4.78  327/1432 4.78  4.01  4.29  4.34  4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0  0  0  0  4  4 4.50  279/1221 4.50  3.86  3.93  4.04  4.50


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  0  2  1 4.33  530/1280 4.33  3.89  4.10  4.28  4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  0  1  0  2 4.33  743/1277 4.33  4.02  4.34  4.50  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0  0  0  1  0  1 4.00 ****/1269 ****  4.15  4.31  4.49  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   7  1  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 854 ****  3.80  4.02  4.31  ****

                            Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 433  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page  432
Title        SCRIPTING LANGUAGES            Baltimore County                                     JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  HOOD, DANIEL J                 Spring 2007                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      60
Questionnaires:  42                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  1  3 38  4.88  190/1522  4.88  4.05  4.30  4.42  4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  3 39  4.93  102/1522  4.93  3.97  4.26  4.34  4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   2  0  0  0  3 37  4.93  120/1285  4.93  4.10  4.30  4.42  4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   8  0  0  0  4 30  4.88  135/1476  4.88  3.96  4.22  4.31  4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  13  0  1  1  4 22  4.68  222/1412  4.68  3.40  4.06  4.11  4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 18 0  0  0  3 21  4.88   95/1381  4.88  3.85  4.08  4.21  4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  4 38  4.90  109/1500  4.90  4.01  4.18  4.25  4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1  0  0  0  2 39  4.95  244/1517  4.95  4.74  4.65  4.71  4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1  2  1  1  1 31  4.61  304/1497  4.61  3.89  4.11  4.21  4.61


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  1 41  4.98   58/1440  4.98  4.22  4.45  4.52  4.98
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  3 39  4.93  395/1448  4.93  4.63  4.71  4.75  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  5 37  4.88  141/1436  4.88  4.04  4.29  4.32  4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  2  2  3 35  4.69  418/1432  4.69  4.01  4.29  4.34  4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  4  1  0  0  3 32  4.81   99/1221  4.81  3.86  3.93  4.04  4.81


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 38 0  0  0  2  1  1  3.75 ****/1280  ****  3.89  4.10  4.28  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 38 0  0  0  0  3  1  4.25 ****/1277  ****  4.02  4.34  4.50  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 38 0 0  0  1  2  1  4.00 ****/1269  ****  4.15  4.31  4.49  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  39   2  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 854  ****  3.80  4.02  4.31  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0      0.00-0.99    0       A   18      Required for Majors   2    Graduate     1      Major        38
 28-55     0      1.00-1.99    0       B   16
 56-83     3      2.00-2.99    6       C    5      General              24    Under-grad  41      Non-major     4
 84-150   22      3.00-3.49   11       D    0
 Grad.     1      3.50-4.00   13       F    0      Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                13
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 441  0101            University of Maryland                    Page  433
Title      ALGORITHMS                       Baltimore County                        JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  YESHA, YAACOV                      Spring 2007                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    37
Questionnaires:  10                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                     Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions            NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   1   0   2   3   4  3.90 1220/1522  4.23  4.05  4.30  4.42  3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   1   0   3   1   5  3.90 1190/1522  4.12  3.97  4.26  4.34  3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   2   0   1   7  4.30  731/1285  4.48  4.10  4.30  4.42  4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   3   0   2   1   1   3  3.71 1217/1476  4.16  3.96  4.22  4.31  3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1   1   1   3   2   2  3.33 1257/1412  3.61  3.40  4.06  4.11  3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0   1   1   2   5  4.22  633/1381  4.36  3.85  4.08  4.21  4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   1   1   3   5  4.20  839/1500  4.27  4.01  4.18  4.25  4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0  10  5.00    1/1517  4.61  4.74  4.65  4.71  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  1   0   2   4   2  3.67 1204/1497  4.21  3.89  4.11  4.21  3.67

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   1   0   1   4   4  4.00 1186/1440  4.39  4.22  4.45  4.52  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   1   0   2   7  4.50 1157/1448  4.75  4.63  4.71  4.75  4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   1   0   3   5   1  3.50 1282/1436  3.81  4.04  4.29  4.32  3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   1   1   1   1   6  4.00 1036/1432  4.39  4.01  4.29  4.34  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 6  1   0   1   0   2  3.50  899/1221  3.50  3.86  3.93  4.04  3.50

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0   0   1   1   0   1  3.33 1106/1280  3.50  3.89  4.10  4.28  3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0   0   1   1   0   1  3.33 1183/1277  3.67  4.02  4.34  4.50  3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0  0   0   3   0   0  3.00 1207/1269  3.17  4.15  4.31  4.49  3.00

                                     Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 441  0201                University of Maryland                                    Page  434
Title     ALGORITHMS                             Baltimore County                                      JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  KALPAKIS, KONST                        Spring 2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    24
Questionnaires:  10                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                 Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level   Sect
              Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank     Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  1   0  0  0  1  2  6  4.56  548/1522  4.23  4.05  4.30  4.42  4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1   0  0  0  1  4  4  4.33  787/1522  4.12  3.97  4.26  4.34  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1   0  0  0  1  1  7  4.67  366/1285  4.48  4.10  4.30  4.42  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1   4  0  0  1  0  4  4.60  378/1476  4.16  3.96  4.22  4.31  4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  1  2  3  3  3.89  908/1412  3.61  3.40  4.06  4.11  3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 3 0  0  1  1  4  4.50  331/1381  4.36  3.85  4.08  4.21  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0  0  0  1  4  4  4.33  700/1500  4.27  4.01  4.18  4.25  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0  0  0  0  7  2  4.22 1284/1517  4.61  4.74  4.65  4.71  4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 0  0  0  2  6  4.75  189/1497  4.21  3.89  4.11  4.21  4.75

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  412/1440  4.39  4.22  4.45  4.52  4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1448  4.75  4.63  4.71  4.75  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0  0  2  4  3  4.11  995/1436  3.81  4.04  4.29  4.32  4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  327/1432  4.39  4.01  4.29  4.34  4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 7 0 0  2  0  0  3.00 ****/1221  3.50  3.86  3.93  4.04  ****

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0  0  2  0  1  3.67  959/1280  3.50  3.89  4.10  4.28  3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0  0  1  1  1  4.00  930/1277  3.67  4.02  4.34  4.50  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0  2  1  0  3.33 1156/1269  3.17  4.15  4.31  4.49  3.33
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 445  0101           University of Maryland                        Page  435
Title      SOFTWARE ENGINEERING          Baltimore County                             JUN 26, 2007
Instructor: SEGALL, ZARY                 Spring 2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    24
Questionnaires: 21                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                     Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  1   0   0  3  3 10  4  3.75 1295/1522  3.75  4.05  4.30 4.42  3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   2  1  8  6  4  3.43 1396/1522  3.43  3.97  4.26 4.34  3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1  17   0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/1285  ****  4.10  4.30 4.42  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   6   2  1  5  2  5  3.47 1334/1476  3.47  3.96  4.22 4.31  3.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  2  2  3  8  3  2  3.00 1327/1412  3.00  3.40  4.06 4.11  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4  3  4  3  5  2  2.94 1304/1381  2.94  3.85  4.08 4.21  2.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   9   0  2  6  2  1  3.18 1408/1500  3.18  4.01  4.18 4.25  3.18
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0  0  0 14  7  4.33 1217/1517  4.33  4.74  4.65 4.71  4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 2  0  0  4  9  3  3.94  993/1497  3.94  3.89  4.11 4.21  3.94


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0   1  0  7  6  6  3.80 1287/1440  3.80  4.22  4.45 4.52  3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0  0  1  4 16  4.71  935/1448  4.71  4.63  4.71 4.75  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  1  0  7  6  6  3.80 1197/1436  3.80  4.04  4.29 4.32  3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0   1  1  8  4  6  3.65 1227/1432  3.65  4.01  4.29 4.34  3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2  0  1  4  5  9  4.16  532/1221  4.16  3.86  3.93 4.04  4.16


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/1280  ****  3.89  4.10 4.28  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 19 0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1277  ****  4.02  4.34 4.50  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/1269  ****  4.15  4.31 4.49  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                 19   0   1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/ 854  ****  3.80  4.02 4.31  ****


                                 Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades           Reasons                 Type                 Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1      0.00-0.99   0       A   11      Required for Majors   1      Graduate     1       Major      19
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0       B    3                                                       
 56-83      2      2.00-2.99   2       C    1      General               7      Under-grad  20       Non-major   2
 84-150     9      3.00-3.49   9       D    0
 Grad.      1      3.50-4.00   3       F    0      Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                12
                                       ?    6
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 451  0101          University of Maryland                                Page  436
Title       AUTOMATA THRY& FORM LA       Baltimore County                                     JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  CHANG, RICHARD              Spring 2007                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     34
Questionnaires:  20                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions              NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean Mean Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  0  0  1 12  7 4.30  849/1522  4.30 4.05 4.30 4.42 4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  1  1  6 12 4.45  639/1522  4.45 3.97 4.26 4.34 4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  1  0  0  1  4 14 4.68  347/1285  4.68 4.10 4.30 4.42 4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  8  0  0  2  4  6 4.33  703/1476  4.33 3.96 4.22 4.31 4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2  1  1  4  9  3 3.67 1077/1412  3.67 3.40 4.06 4.11 3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 7  0  1  0  5  6 4.33  519/1381  4.33 3.85 4.08 4.21 4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1  0  0  0  1  5 13 4.63  349/1500  4.63 4.01 4.18 4.25 4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  0  0  0  0  0 19 5.00    1/1517  5.00 4.74 4.65 4.71 5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  1  0  7 10 4.44  457/1497  4.44 3.89 4.11 4.21 4.44

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  1  6 13 4.60  682/1440  4.60 4.22 4.45 4.52 4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  2 18 4.90  494/1448  4.90 4.63 4.71 4.75 4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  3  6 11 4.40  720/1436  4.40 4.04 4.29 4.32 4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  3  6 11 4.40  758/1432  4.40 4.01 4.29 4.34 4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 13 1  2  0  1  3 3.43  944/1221  3.43 3.86 3.93 4.04 3.43

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15 0  1  0  0  4  0 3.40 1081/1280  3.40 3.89 4.10 4.28 3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15 0  0  0  2  1  2 4.00  930/1277  4.00 4.02 4.34 4.50 4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 0  0  1  1  3 4.40  671/1269  4.40 4.15 4.31 4.49 4.40
4. Were special techniques successful                   15 4  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/ 854  **** 3.80 4.02 4.31 ****

                                  Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type                Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0        A    6       Required for Majors  0    Graduate     0      Major      18
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0        B    9
 56-83      1      2.00-2.99   1        C    4       General             10    Under-grad  20      Non-major   2
 84-150     8      3.00-3.49   2        D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   6        F    0       Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                9
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 461  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  437
Title      DATABASE MANGMT SYSTEM              Baltimore County                              JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:   KARGUPTA, HILLO                    Spring 2007                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    34
Questionnaires:  14                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  2  7  5  4.21  939/1522  3.13  4.05  4.30  4.42  4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  3  7  4  4.07 1042/1522  2.81  3.97  4.26  4.34  4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  8  6  4.43  626/1285  3.19  4.10  4.30  4.42  4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  6  6  2  3.71 1217/1476  2.83  3.96  4.22  4.31  3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  0  5  5  3  3.64 1088/1412  2.97  3.40  4.06  4.11  3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  4  6  4  4.00  806/1381  3.08  3.85  4.08  4.21  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  4  6  4  4.00  988/1500  3.41  4.01  4.18  4.25  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  6  8  4.57 1019/1517  4.76  4.74  4.65  4.71  4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0  3  7  4  4.07  852/1497  2.74  3.89  4.11  4.21  4.07

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  8  6  4.43  904/1440  3.24  4.22  4.45  4.52  4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  3  3  8  4.36 1262/1448  3.64  4.63  4.71  4.75  4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  1  9  3  4.15  965/1436  2.81  4.04  4.29  4.32  4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  3  4  6  4.23  899/1432  2.84  4.01  4.29  4.34  4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0  0  2  6  5  4.23  474/1221  3.01  3.86  3.93  4.04  4.23

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  1  4  3  4.25  585/1280  4.25  3.89  4.10  4.28  4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  0  2  4  2  4.00  930/1277  4.00  4.02  4.34  4.50  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0  0  1  5  2  4.13  844/1269  4.13  4.15  4.31  4.49  4.13
4. Were special techniques successful                  6   2  1  0  0  3  2  3.83  555/ 854  3.83  3.80  4.02  4.31  3.83
```

```
                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1     0.00-0.99   0        A    5        Required for Majors  0    Graduate     0    Major      8
 28-55      0     1.00-1.99   0        B    9
 56-83      3     2.00-2.99   3        C    0        General      6            Under-grad  14    Non-major  6
 84-150     8     3.00-3.49   6        D    0
 Grad.      0     3.50-4.00   4        F    0        Electives    0            #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I    0        Other        7
                                       ?    0
```

```
Enrollment:      35
Questionnaires:  24                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

			Freq	uenci	es			Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	9	9	3	2	1	2.04	1516/1522	3.13	4.05	4.30	4.42	2.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	14	7	3	0	0	1.54	1519/1522	2.81	3.97	4.26	4.34	1.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	10	7	5	2	0	1.96	1280/1285	3.19	4.10	4.30	4.42	1.96
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	9	5	2	3	0	1.95	1471/1476	2.83	3.96	4.22	4.31	1.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	9	1	3	1	3	2.29	1396/1412	2.97	3.40	4.06	4.11	2.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	8	4	4	2	1	2.16	1369/1381	3.08	3.85	4.08	4.21	2.16
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	4	5	8	1	2.83	1453/1500	3.41	4.01	4.18	4.25	2.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	244/1517	4.76	4.74	4.65	4.71	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	15	5	2	0	0	1.41	1496/1497	2.74	3.89	4.11	4.21	1.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	9	5	8	1	0	2.04	1434/1440	3.24	4.22	4.45	4.52	2.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	4	6	5	4	4	2.91	1445/1448	3.64	4.63	4.71	4.75	2.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	16	5	3	0	0	1.46	1434/1436	2.81	4.04	4.29	4.32	1.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	16	5	3	0	0	1.46	1427/1432	2.84	4.01	4.29	4.34	1.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	10	5	3	0	1	1.79	1207/1221	3.01	3.86	3.93	4.04	1.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	****/1280	4.25	3.89	4.10	4.28	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	****/1277	4.00	4.02	4.34	4.50	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	2	1	0	1	0	2.00	****/1269	4.13	4.15	4.31	4.49	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	12	General	6	Under-grad	24	Non-major	4
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: CMSC 477  0101              University of Maryland                              Page  439
Title      AGNT ARCH/MLTI-AGNT SY           Baltimore County                                   JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  DESJARDINS, MAR                Spring 2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     15
Questionnaires:  14                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies           Instructor     Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions               NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   0   3  11  4.79  275/1522   4.79  4.05  4.30  4.42  4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   4   9  4.57  465/1522   4.57  3.97  4.26  4.34  4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   1   0   2  11  4.64  336/1476   4.64  3.96  4.22  4.31  4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   2   1  11  4.64  248/1412   4.64  3.40  4.06  4.11  4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0   0   0   1   2  11  4.71  174/1381   4.71  3.85  4.08  4.21  4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   1   1  12  4.79  180/1500   4.79  4.01  4.18  4.25  4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0  14  5.00    1/1517   5.00  4.74  4.65  4.71  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0   0   2   1  10  4.62  304/1497   4.62  3.89  4.11  4.21  4.62


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   1   0   1   1   9  4.42  917/1440   4.42  4.22  4.45  4.52  4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   1   1  12  4.79  802/1448   4.79  4.63  4.71  4.75  4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   1   0   1   2   8  4.33  793/1436   4.33  4.04  4.29  4.32  4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   1   2   0   1   8  4.08 1000/1432   4.08  4.01  4.29  4.34  4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 7   0   0   0   1   3  4.75  124/1221   4.75  3.86  3.93  4.04  4.75


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0   0   0   0   1   9  4.90  138/1280   4.90  3.89  4.10  4.28  4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0   0   0   0   0  10  5.00    1/1277   5.00  4.02  4.34  4.50  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0   0   0   0   1   9  4.90  223/1269   4.90  4.15  4.31  4.49  4.90
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   0   0   0   1   2   7  4.60  166/ 854   4.60  3.80  4.02  4.31  4.60


                                      Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 481  0101          University of Maryland                                    Page  440
Title      COMPUTER NETWORKS                 Baltimore County                                     JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  GREEN, FRANK E.                    Spring 2007                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    50
Questionnaires:  25                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   3   2   4   6  10  3.72 1310/1522  3.72  4.05  4.30  4.42  3.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   3   2   5   7   8  3.60 1323/1522  3.60  3.97  4.26  4.34  3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   2   1   5   7  10  3.88 1034/1285  3.88  4.10  4.30  4.42  3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   3   5   3   6   3   5  3.00 1416/1476  3.00  3.96  4.22  4.31  3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   2   2   4   6   3   8  3.48 1183/1412  3.48  3.40  4.06  4.11  3.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 6   3   5   5   3   2  2.78 1335/1381  2.78  3.85  4.08  4.21  2.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   1   1   4   9  10  4.04  966/1500  4.04  4.01  4.18  4.25  4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   1   0   0   1  22   1  4.00 1389/1517  4.00  4.74  4.65  4.71  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1  2   2   6  10   2  3.36 1337/1497  3.36  3.89  4.11  4.21  3.36


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   6   5  14  4.32  991/1440  4.32  4.22  4.45  4.52  4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   1   2   2   3  17  4.32 1275/1448  4.32  4.63  4.71  4.75  4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   3   8   5   9  3.80 1197/1436  3.80  4.04  4.29  4.32  3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   1   4   0   8   3   9  3.54 1259/1432  3.54  4.01  4.29  4.34  3.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  4   1   2   9   2   7  3.57  871/1221  3.57  3.86  3.93  4.04  3.57


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18  0   1   1   3   1   1  3.00 1187/1280  3.00  3.89  4.10  4.28  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18  0   1   0   1   0   5  4.14  879/1277  4.14  4.02  4.34  4.50  4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0   2   0   1   1   3  3.43 1138/1269  3.43  4.15  4.31  4.49  3.43
4. Were special techniques successful                   18  6   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 854  ****  3.80  4.02  4.31  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades           Reasons                 Type                  Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1       0.00-0.99    0      A    7          Required for Majors   1    Graduate      0      Major       20
  28-55     0       1.00-1.99    0      B   12
  56-83     2       2.00-2.99    6      C    6          General              10    Under-grad   25      Non-major    5
  84-150   18       3.00-3.49   14      D    0
  Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    3      F    0          Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                        I    0          Other                14
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 484  0101          University of Maryland                              Page  441
Title        JAVA SERVER TECHNOLOGI         Baltimore County                             JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  TARR, ROBERT M                 Spring 2007                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     32
Questionnaires:  8                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63  472/1522  4.63  4.05  4.30  4.42  4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  5  3  4.38  738/1522  4.38  3.97  4.26  4.34  4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  4  4  4.50  531/1285  4.50  4.10  4.30  4.42  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  2  5  4.50  473/1476  4.50  3.96  4.22  4.31  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  5  0  0  0  2  1  4.33  493/1412  4.33  3.40  4.06  4.11  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 0 0 1 1 3  4.40  434/1381  4.40  3.85  4.08  4.21  4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63  362/1500  4.63  4.01  4.18  4.25  4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  1  1  4  2  3.88 1455/1517  3.88  4.74  4.65  4.71  3.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 1 0 4 1  3.83 1089/1497  3.83  3.89  4.11  4.21  3.83


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  1  3  4  4.38  953/1440  4.38  4.22  4.45  4.52  4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  1  1  6  4.63 1048/1448  4.63  4.63  4.71  4.75  4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  1  2  5  4.50  601/1436  4.50  4.04  4.29  4.32  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  1  3  4  4.38  784/1432  4.38  4.01  4.29  4.34  4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 1 0 3 4  4.25  461/1221  4.25  3.86  3.93  4.04  4.25


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1280  ****  3.89  4.10  4.28  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1277  ****  4.02  4.34  4.50  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/1269  ****  4.15  4.31  4.49  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  7   0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 854  ****  3.80  4.02  4.31  ****


                                   Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 491M 0101          University of Maryland                          Page  442
Title       SEMANTIC WEB                    Baltimore County                          JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:   FININ, TIMOTHY                  Spring 2007                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      19
Questionnaires:  13                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   1   1   2   9  4.46  656/1522  4.46  4.05  4.30  4.42  4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   3   1   9  4.46  607/1522  4.46  3.97  4.26  4.34  4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  10   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/1285  ****  4.10  4.30  4.42  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   0   4   4   4  4.00 1009/1476  4.00  3.96  4.22  4.31  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   0   1   2   9  4.67  231/1412  4.67  3.40  4.06  4.11  4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3   0   0   2   3   5  4.30  556/1381  4.30  3.85  4.08  4.21  4.30

7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   1   1   1   4   4   2  3.42 1351/1500  3.42  4.01  4.18  4.25  3.42
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   1  12  4.92  389/1517  4.92  4.74  4.65  4.71  4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1  0   0   0   6   6  4.50  385/1497  4.50  3.89  4.11  4.21  4.50

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   2   3   8  4.46  851/1440  4.46  4.22  4.45  4.52  4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0  13  5.00    1/1448  5.00  4.63  4.71  4.75  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   0   7   6  4.46  648/1436  4.46  4.04  4.29  4.32  4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   1   5   7  4.46  682/1432  4.46  4.01  4.29  4.34  4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0  0   1   3   3   5  4.00  606/1221  4.00  3.86  3.93  4.04  4.00

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0   0   1   0   1   6  4.50  390/1280  4.50  3.89  4.10  4.28  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0   0   0   1   3   5  4.44  652/1277  4.44  4.02  4.34  4.50  4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0  0   0   2   2   5  4.33  721/1269  4.33  4.15  4.31  4.49  4.33
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   6   0   0   1   1   1  4.00  ****/ 854  ****  3.80  4.02  4.31  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 11  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/  79  ****  ****  4.58  4.67  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 11 0  0   0   1   0   1  4.00  ****/  77  ****  ****  4.52  4.60  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 11  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/  65  ****  ****  4.49  4.65  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    11   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/  78  ****  ****  4.45  4.58  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                11   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/  80  ****  ****  4.11  4.14  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                 Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1      0.00-0.99    0       A   11        Required for Majors  1   Graduate      5      Major        6
  28-55     1      1.00-1.99    0       B    1
  56-83     0      2.00-2.99    0       C    0        General              9   Under-grad    8      Non-major    7
  84-150    2      3.00-3.49    3       D    0
  Grad.     5      3.50-4.00    3       F    0        Electives            2   #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other                1
                                        ?    1
```

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	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	0	2	24	4.92	141/1522	4.92	4.05	4.30	4.42	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	142/1522	4.88	3.97	4.26	4.34	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	337/1285	4.70	4.10	4.30	4.42	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	167/1476	4.83	3.96	4.22	4.31	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	2	6	12	4.27	547/1412	4.27	3.40	4.06	4.11	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	4	5	15		4.46	382/1381	4.46	3.85	4.08	4.21	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	9	17	4.65	325/1500	4.65	4.01	4.18	4.25	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.74	4.65	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1497	5.00	3.89	4.11	4.21	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	224/1440	4.88	4.22	4.45	4.52	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.63	4.71	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	217/1436	4.80	4.04	4.29	4.32	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	24	4.85	240/1432	4.85	4.01	4.29	4.34	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	134/1221	4.73	3.86	3.93	4.04	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/1280	****	3.89	4.10	4.28	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/1277	****	4.02	4.34	4.50	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/1269	****	4.15	4.31	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 854	****	3.80	4.02	4.31	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	22	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	19	Under-grad	23	Non-major	15
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: CMSC 491S 0101          University of Maryland                              Page  444
Title      SENSOR NETWORKS              Baltimore County                                   JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:    YOUNIS, MOHAMED          Spring 2007                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     26
Questionnaires:  20                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean  Rank    Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   1   8  11  4.50  605/1522  4.50  4.05  4.30  4.42  4.50
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   2   2   5  11  4.25  874/1522  4.25  3.97  4.26  4.34  4.25
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   1   2   2   4  11  4.10  882/1285  4.10  4.10  4.30  4.42  4.10
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   0   5   6   8  4.16  903/1476  4.16  3.96  4.22  4.31  4.16
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  3   0   0   3   4  10  4.41  420/1412  4.41  3.40  4.06  4.11  4.41
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   2   2   9   7  4.05  779/1381  4.05  3.85  4.08  4.21  4.05
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   1   2   3  14  4.50  483/1500  4.50  4.01  4.18  4.25  4.50
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0  20  5.00    1/1517  5.00  4.74  4.65  4.71  5.00
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1  0   0   2   4  10  4.50  385/1497  4.50  3.89  4.11  4.21  4.50


            Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   1   5  14  4.65  617/1440  4.65  4.22  4.45  4.52  4.65
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   1  19  4.95  296/1448  4.95  4.63  4.71  4.75  4.95
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   1   2   6  11  4.35  772/1436  4.35  4.04  4.29  4.32  4.35
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   1   0   4  15  4.65  466/1432  4.65  4.01  4.29  4.34  4.65
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1  0   0   2   5  12  4.53  265/1221  4.53  3.86  3.93  4.04  4.53


            Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0  0   0   1   0   6  4.71  253/1280  4.71  3.89  4.10  4.28  4.71
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0  0   0   1   0   6  4.71  421/1277  4.71  4.02  4.34  4.50  4.71
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0   0   0   1   6  4.86  277/1269  4.86  4.15  4.31  4.49  4.86
 4. Were special techniques successful                  13   3  0   0   0   0   4  5.00  ****/ 854  ****  3.80  4.02  4.31  ****


            Laboratory
 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  19   0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 215  ****  4.64  4.36  4.47  ****
 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0 0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 228  ****  4.53  4.35  4.32  ****
 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 19 0  0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/ 217  ****  4.53  4.51  4.55  ****
 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           19   0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 216  ****  4.75  4.42  4.20  ****
 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 19   0  0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/ 205  ****  4.33  4.23  3.85  ****


            Seminar
 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19  0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  79  ****  ****  4.58  4.67  ****
 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 19 0 0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  77  ****  ****  4.52  4.60  ****
 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 19  0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  65  ****  ****  4.49  4.65  ****
 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    19   0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  78  ****  ****  4.45  4.58  ****
 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                19   0  0   1   0   0   0  2.00  ****/  80  ****  ****  4.11  4.14  ****


            Field Work
 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19   0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  47  ****  ****  4.41  4.51  ****
 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 19   0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  45  ****  ****  4.30  4.22  ****
 3. Was the instructor available for consultation       19   0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  39  ****  ****  4.40  4.03  ****
 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   19   0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  35  ****  ****  4.31  4.13  ****
 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 19   0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  34  ****  ****  4.30  4.11  ****


            Self  Paced
 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19  0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  37  ****  ****  4.63  4.33  ****
 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    19   0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  23  ****  ****  4.41  4.00  ****
 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      19   0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  33  ****  ****  4.69  4.92  ****
```

                                       Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   1   0.00-0.99   0   A   9   Required for Majors   4   Graduate   6   Major   3
 28-55   0   1.00-1.99   0   B   6
 56-83   0   2.00-2.99   3   C   1   General   10   Under-grad 14   Non-major   17
 84-150   6   3.00-3.49   6   D   0
 Grad.   6   3.50-4.00   4   F   0   Electives   1   #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P   0   responses to be significant
                                           I   0   Other   4
                                           ?   2

```
Course-Section: CMSC 491U 0101             University of Maryland                          Page  445
Title       UNIX SECURITY ADMIN PO          Baltimore County                              JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  WEISS, GEOFFREY (Instr. A)      Spring 2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     24
Questionnaires: 13                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0   3   5   3   2  3.31 1456/1522  3.31  4.05  4.30 4.42  3.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   1   3   4   3   2  3.15 1465/1522  3.15  3.97  4.26 4.34  3.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   1   2   3   4   3  3.46 1176/1285  3.46  4.10  4.30 4.42  3.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   1   0   2   6   3   1  3.25 1380/1476  3.25  3.96  4.22 4.31  3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   8   1   1   2   0   1  2.80 1362/1412  2.80  3.40  4.06 4.11  2.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0   5   0   2   3   1   2  3.38 1210/1381  3.38  3.85  4.08 4.21  3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0   1   0   5   4   2  3.50 1298/1500  3.50  4.01  4.18 4.25  3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                 2   1   0   0   0   1   9  4.90  487/1517  4.90  4.74  4.65 4.71  4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  0   0   2   2   6   3   0  2.77 1456/1497  3.38  3.89  4.11 4.21  3.38


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0   1   1   2   3   5  3.83 1276/1440  4.29  4.22  4.45 4.52  4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0   0   0   1   4   7  4.50 1157/1448  4.50  4.63  4.71 4.75  4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  1   0   2   2   3   3   2  3.08 1374/1436  3.79  4.04  4.29 4.32  3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0   2   3   2   3   2  3.00 1364/1432  3.88  4.01  4.29 4.34  3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  1   2   2   2   1   0   5  3.40  956/1221  3.45  3.86  3.93 4.04  3.45


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  12   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/1280  ****  3.89  4.10 4.28  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  12   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/1277  ****  4.02  4.34 4.50  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  12   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/1269  ****  4.15  4.31 4.49  ****


                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0     0.00-0.99    0        A    2      Required for Majors  1      Graduate     0      Major        12
 28-55      0     1.00-1.99    0        B    8
 56-83      1     2.00-2.99    1        C    1      General              6      Under-grad  13      Non-major     1
 84-150     9     3.00-3.49    9        D    0
 Grad.      0     3.50-4.00    1        F    0      Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                5
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 491U 0101                  University of Maryland                                    Page  446
Title        UNIX SECURITY ADMIN PO             Baltimore County                                         JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:                    (Instr. B)       Spring 2007                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      24
Questionnaires:  13                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank       Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  3  5  3  2  3.31 1456/1522   3.31  4.05  4.30  4.42  3.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  3  4  3  2  3.15 1465/1522   3.15  3.97  4.26  4.34  3.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  1  2  3  4  3  3.46 1176/1285   3.46  4.10  4.30  4.42  3.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  2  6  3  1  3.25 1380/1476   3.25  3.96  4.22  4.31  3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   8  1  1  2  0  1  2.80 1362/1412   2.80  3.40  4.06  4.11  2.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5  0  2  3  1  2  3.38 1210/1381   3.38  3.85  4.08  4.21  3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  1  0  5  4  2  3.50 1298/1500   3.50  4.01  4.18  4.25  3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   1  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  487/1517   4.90  4.74  4.65  4.71  4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0  0  0  1  4  1  4.00  898/1497   3.38  3.89  4.11  4.21  3.38


                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        9   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  452/1440   4.29  4.22  4.45  4.52  4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   9   0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50 1157/1448   4.50  4.63  4.71  4.75  4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 9  0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50  601/1436   3.79  4.04  4.29  4.32  3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     9   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  350/1432   3.88  4.01  4.29  4.34  3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 1  0  1  1  1  1  3.50  899/1221   3.45  3.86  3.93  4.04  3.45


                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/1280   ****  3.89  4.10  4.28  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/1277   ****  4.02  4.34  4.50  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/1269   ****  4.15  4.31  4.49  ****
```

```
                                           Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons              Type               Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0       0.00-0.99   0         A    2       Required for Majors  1     Graduate      0      Major      12
 28-55      0       1.00-1.99   0         B    8
 56-83      1       2.00-2.99   1         C    1       General              6     Under-grad   13      Non-major   1
 84-150     9       3.00-3.49   9         D    0
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   1         F    0       Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                          I    0       Other                5
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 491V 0101              University of Maryland                           Page 447
Title      ELECTRONIC VOTING SYS              Baltimore County                              JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:   SHERMAN, ALAN                      Spring 2007                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     5

Questionnaires:   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  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  246/1522  4.80  4.05  4.30  4.42  4.80
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40  702/1522  4.40  3.97  4.26  4.34  4.40
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   4  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1285  ****  4.10  4.30  4.42  ****
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  1  0  0  3  4.25  792/1476  4.25  3.96  4.22  4.31  4.25
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  137/1412  4.80  3.40  4.06  4.11  4.80
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40  434/1381  4.40  3.85  4.08  4.21  4.40
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   1  0  1  1  2  0  3.25 1396/1500  3.25  4.01  4.18  4.25  3.25
 8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1517  5.00  4.74  4.65  4.71  5.00
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  2  0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00  898/1497  4.00  3.89  4.11  4.21  4.00


                 Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50  798/1440  4.50  4.22  4.45  4.52  4.50
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1448  5.00  4.63  4.71  4.75  5.00
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0  0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40  720/1436  4.40  4.04  4.29  4.32  4.40
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60  527/1432  4.60  4.01  4.29  4.34  4.60
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  1  0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50  279/1221  4.50  3.86  3.93  4.04  4.50


                 Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1280  5.00  3.89  4.10  4.28  5.00
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  2  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1277  5.00  4.02  4.34  4.50  5.00
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  2  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1269  5.00  4.15  4.31  4.49  5.00
 4. Were special techniques successful                 2   2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 854  ****  3.80  4.02  4.31  ****

                                 Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 491W 0101          University of Maryland                                    Page  448
Title       WEARABLE  COMPUTING          Baltimore County                                        JUN 26, 2007
Instructor: SEGALL, ZARY                 Spring 2007                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    14
Questionnaires: 13                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   0   0   4   9  4.69  404/1522  4.69  4.05  4.30  4.42  4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   2   2   9  4.54  511/1522  4.54  3.97  4.26  4.34  4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1  11   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/1285  ****  4.10  4.30  4.42  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0   0   2   5   6  4.31  735/1476  4.31  3.96  4.22  4.31  4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   2   1   1   3   0   6  3.82  964/1412  3.82  3.40  4.06  4.11  3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  1   0   1   6   2   3  3.58 1134/1381  3.58  3.85  4.08  4.21  3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   5   0   1   1   2   4  4.13  913/1500  4.13  4.01  4.18  4.25  4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   8   5  4.38 1177/1517  4.38  4.74  4.65  4.71  4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0   0   0   0   2   7  4.78  172/1497  4.78  3.89  4.11  4.21  4.78

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   0   1  12  4.92  153/1440  4.92  4.22  4.45  4.52  4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   0   0  13  5.00    1/1448  5.00  4.63  4.71  4.75  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   0   0   3  10  4.77  279/1436  4.77  4.04  4.29  4.32  4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0   0   1   2  10  4.69  418/1432  4.69  4.01  4.29  4.34  4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0   0   0   0   0  13  5.00    1/1221  5.00  3.86  3.93  4.04  5.00

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7   0   0   0   0   1   5  4.83  170/1280  4.83  3.89  4.10  4.28  4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7   0   0   0   0   0   6  5.00    1/1277  5.00  4.02  4.34  4.50  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7  0   0   0   0   2   4  4.67  461/1269  4.67  4.15  4.31  4.49  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                   7   1   0   0   2   0   3  4.20  363/ 854  4.20  3.80  4.02  4.31  4.20


                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades           Reasons                   Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
   00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0       A   11          Required for Majors  1     Graduate      2        Major       12
   28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0       B    1
   56-83      0       2.00-2.99    1       C    0          General              4     Under-grad   11        Non-major    1
   84-150     7       3.00-3.49    5       D    0
   Grad.      2       3.50-4.00    4       F    0          Electives            1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                           I    0          Other                5
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 601  0101          University of Maryland                         Page  449
Title       RESEARCH SKILLS FOR CS      Baltimore County                              JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  SIVALINGAM, KRI            Spring 2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    13
Questionnaires: 12                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  1  0  0  4  7 4.33  814/1522  4.33  4.05  4.30 4.45  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  1  4  7 4.50  545/1522  4.50  3.97  4.26 4.29  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  0  0  0  1  5  6 4.42  613/1476  4.42  3.96  4.22 4.31  4.42

5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  3  2  3  2  2 2.83 1358/1412  2.83  3.40  4.06 4.25  2.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0  0  4  8 4.67  207/1381  4.67  3.85  4.08 4.25  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  0  7  5 4.42  615/1500  4.42  4.01  4.18 4.22  4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  1 11 4.92  438/1517  4.92  4.74  4.65 4.73  4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0  2  8  0 3.80 1113/1497  3.80  3.89  4.11 4.21  3.80

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2  0  0  0  2  7  1 3.90 1252/1440  3.90  4.22  4.45 4.48  3.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2  0  0  0  3  3  4 4.10 1342/1448  4.10  4.63  4.71 4.80  4.10
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  3  5  2 3.90 1158/1436  3.90  4.04  4.29 4.37  3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2  0  1  1  3  3  2 3.40 1305/1432  3.40  4.01  4.29 4.33  3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 4 0 0  3  3  0 3.50  899/1221  3.50  3.86  3.93 3.83  3.50

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  0  2  2  1 3.80  874/1280  3.80  3.89  4.10 4.24  3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  0  0  1  5 4.83  290/1277  4.83  4.02  4.34 4.52  4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 1 0  0  1  4 4.17  828/1269  4.17  4.15  4.31 4.51  4.17
4. Were special techniques successful                   6  3  0  1  2  0  0 2.67  824/ 854  2.67  3.80  4.02 4.08  2.67


                                  Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type              Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     4       0.00-0.99   0      A   10      Required for Majors   2     Graduate     5      Major      12
  28-55     0       1.00-1.99   0      B    1
  56-83     0       2.00-2.99   0      C    0      General              11     Under-grad   7      Non-major   0
  84-150    1       3.00-3.49   1      D    0
  Grad.     5       3.50-4.00   7      F    0      Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                 0
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 635  0101          University of Maryland                                      Page  450
Title      ADV COMP GRAPHICS              Baltimore County                                          JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:   OLANO, MARC                   Spring 2007                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    11
Questionnaires: 11                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

General

1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	176/1522	4.91	4.05	4.30	4.45	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	288/1522	4.73	3.97	4.26	4.29	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.10	4.30	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	285/1476	4.70	3.96	4.22	4.31	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	384/1412	4.45	3.40	4.06	4.25	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	382/1381	4.45	3.85	4.08	4.25	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	670/1500	4.36	4.01	4.18	4.22	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.74	4.65	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	172/1497	4.78	3.89	4.11	4.21	4.78

Lecture

1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	643/1440	4.64	4.22	4.45	4.48	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.63	4.71	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	207/1436	4.82	4.04	4.29	4.37	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	793/1432	4.36	4.01	4.29	4.33	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	156/1221	4.70	3.86	3.93	3.83	4.70

Discussion

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1280	****	3.89	4.10	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1277	****	4.02	4.34	4.52	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1269	****	4.15	4.31	4.51	****

```
                                          Frequency Distribution
```

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 641  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page  451
Title       DESIGN & ANALY ALGORTH          Baltimore County                                         JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:   SHERMAN, ALAN                 Spring 2007                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     29
Questionnaires: 27                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies         Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                    NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5 Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   1   7  19  4.67  433/1522  4.67  4.05  4.30  4.45  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   4  14   8  4.07 1042/1522  4.07  3.97  4.26  4.29  4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   7  13   7  4.00  938/1285  4.00  4.10  4.30  4.31  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   3  12  12  4.33  703/1476  4.33  3.96  4.22  4.31  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   1   1  12  13  4.37  457/1412  4.37  3.40  4.06  4.25  4.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   0   2  12  13  4.41  434/1381  4.41  3.85  4.08  4.25  4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   1   1   7   8  10  3.93 1068/1500  3.93  4.01  4.18  4.22  3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   4  23  4.85  600/1517  4.85  4.74  4.65  4.73  4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1  0   1   3  15   2  3.86 1073/1497  3.86  3.89  4.11  4.21  3.86

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   1   1   4  10  11  4.07 1159/1440  4.07  4.22  4.45  4.48  4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   6  21  4.78  821/1448  4.78  4.63  4.71  4.80  4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   1   2  12   9   3  3.41 1315/1436  3.41  4.04  4.29  4.37  3.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   1   5   4  12   5  3.56 1256/1432  3.56  4.01  4.29  4.33  3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 5  3   4   5   5   3  3.05 1058/1221  3.05  3.86  3.93  3.83  3.05

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0  2   1   4   3   4  3.43 1071/1280  3.43  3.89  4.10  4.24  3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0  0   0   3   6   5  4.14  879/1277  4.14  4.02  4.34  4.52  4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0  0  1   2   4   7  4.21  805/1269  4.21  4.15  4.31  4.51  4.21
4. Were special techniques successful                  14   6  3   0   2   2   0  2.43  841/ 854  2.43  3.80  4.02  4.08  2.43

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  26   0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 215  ****  4.64  4.36  4.72  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 26 0 0  0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 228  ****  4.53  4.35  4.39  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 26 0 0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 217  ****  4.53  4.51  4.61  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           26   0  0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 216  ****  4.75  4.42  4.76  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 26   0  0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 205  ****  4.33  4.23  4.40  ****

                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 26 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  79  ****  ****  4.58  4.76  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 26 0 0  0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  77  ****  ****  4.52  4.70  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 26 0  0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  65  ****  ****  4.49  4.71  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    26   0  0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  78  ****  ****  4.45  4.66  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                26   0  0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.11  4.38  ****

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 26   0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.41  4.40  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 26   0  0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  45  ****  ****  4.30  4.49  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       26   0  0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.40  4.78  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   26   0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.31  4.71  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 26   0  0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  34  ****  ****  4.30  4.82  ****

                Self Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 26 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.63  4.82  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    26   0  0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  23  ****  ****  4.41  4.68  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      26   0  0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.69  4.79  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       26   0  0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  22  ****  ****  4.54  4.83  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     26   0  0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  18  ****  ****  4.49  4.92  ****
```

```
Title          DESIGN & ANALY ALGORTH              Baltimore County                         JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:    SHERMAN, ALAN                       Spring 2007                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    29
Questionnaires: 27                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	10	Major	25
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: CMSC 643  0101                University of Maryland                                    Page  452
Title       QUANTUM COMPUTATION               Baltimore County                                        JUN 26, 2007
Instructor: LOMONACO JR, SA                   Spring 2007                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     5
Questionnaires:  4                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                               Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                    General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  899/1522  4.25  4.05  4.30  4.45  4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  1  0  1  2  4.00 1080/1522  4.00  3.97  4.26  4.29  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   2  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  531/1285  4.50  4.10  4.30  4.31  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  0  0  3  4.25  792/1476  4.25  3.96  4.22  4.31  4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  0  1  2  4.00  760/1412  4.00  3.40  4.06  4.25  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 0 2  4.33  519/1381  4.33  3.85  4.08  4.25  4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   1  0  1  0  0  2  4.00  988/1500  4.00  4.01  4.18  4.22  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  1  0  2  1  3.75 1471/1517  3.75  4.74  4.65  4.73  3.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 1 2  4.67  264/1497  4.67  3.89  4.11  4.21  4.67


                    Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  452/1440  4.75  4.22  4.45  4.48  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  859/1448  4.75  4.63  4.71  4.80  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 2 2  4.50  601/1436  4.50  4.04  4.29  4.37  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50  632/1432  4.50  4.01  4.29  4.33  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0 0 0 1 2  4.67  175/1221  4.67  3.86  3.93  3.83  4.67


                    Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 0 3  4.50  390/1280  4.50  3.89  4.10  4.24  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 1 3  4.75  375/1277  4.75  4.02  4.34  4.52  4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 1 3  4.75  381/1269  4.75  4.15  4.31  4.51  4.75
4. Were special techniques successful                 0   1  0  1  0  0  2  4.00  426/ 854  4.00  3.80  4.02  4.08  4.00
```

```
                                      Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 661  0101              University of Maryland                         Page  453
Title          PRIN OF DATABASE SYS         Baltimore County                              JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:    KALPAKIS, KONST              Spring 2007                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    15
Questionnaires:  9                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  0  0  0  1  8 4.89  190/1522  4.89  4.05  4.30 4.45  4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  1  3  5 4.44  639/1522  4.44  3.97  4.26 4.29  4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  1  3  5 4.44  602/1285  4.44  4.10  4.30 4.31  4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  3  6 4.67  316/1476  4.67  3.96  4.22 4.31  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  1  8 4.89  108/1412  4.89  3.40  4.06 4.25  4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 1 1 1 5 4.25 604/1381  4.25  3.85  4.08 4.25  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  1  0  3  5 4.33  700/1500  4.33  4.01  4.18 4.22  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  4  5 4.56 1037/1517  4.56  4.74  4.65 4.73  4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 385/1497  4.50  3.89  4.11 4.21  4.50


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  0  3  6 4.67  604/1440  4.67  4.22  4.45 4.48  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  0  9 5.00    1/1448  5.00  4.63  4.71 4.80  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  4  5 4.56  539/1436  4.56  4.04  4.29 4.37  4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  0  1  8 4.89  187/1432  4.89  4.01  4.29 4.33  4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0 0 2 1 5 4.38 380/1221  4.38  3.86  3.93 3.83  4.38


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  0  2  4 4.67  286/1280  4.67  3.89  4.10 4.24  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  0  0  1  5 4.83  290/1277  4.83  4.02  4.34 4.52  4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 299/1269  4.83  4.15  4.31 4.51  4.83
4. Were special techniques successful                   3  2  0  0  1  1  2 4.25  330/ 854  4.25  3.80  4.02 4.08  4.25


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   7  0  0  0  0  1  1 4.50 ****/ 215  ****  4.64  4.36 4.72  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 228  ****  4.53  4.35 4.39  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 217  ****  4.53  4.51 4.61  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            7  0  0  0  1  0  1 4.00 ****/ 216  ****  4.75  4.42 4.76  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  7  0  0  0  0  1  1 4.50 ****/ 205  ****  4.33  4.23 4.40  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 7  0  0  0  1  0  1 4.00 ****/  79  ****  ****  4.58 4.76  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 7 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/  77  ****  ****  4.52 4.70  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  0  1  0  1 4.00 ****/  65  ****  ****  4.49 4.71  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     7  0  0  0  0  1  1 4.50 ****/  78  ****  ****  4.45 4.66  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 7  0  0  0  1  1  0 3.50 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.11 4.38  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  8  0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.41 4.40  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  8  0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  45  ****  ****  4.30 4.49  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    8  0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.31 4.71  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  8  0  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/  34  ****  ****  4.30 4.82  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  0  0  1  1 4.50 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.63 4.82  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     7  0  0  0  1  0  1 4.00 ****/  23  ****  ****  4.41 4.68  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       7  0  0  0  0  1  1 4.50 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.69 4.79  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        7  0  0  0  1  0  1 4.00 ****/  22  ****  ****  4.54 4.83  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      7  1  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  18  ****  ****  4.49 4.92  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 676  0101                University of Maryland                            Page  454
Title         INFORMATION RETRIEVAL            Baltimore County                                JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:   NICHOLAS, CHARL                  Spring 2007                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   18
Questionnaires: 16                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  4  6  6  4.13 1033/1522  4.13  4.05  4.30  4.45  4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  1  4  6  5  3.94 1157/1522  3.94  3.97  4.26  4.29  3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  13  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/1285  ****  4.10  4.30  4.31  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  3  7  6  4.19  871/1476  4.19  3.96  4.22  4.31  4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  3  0  5  7  4.07  722/1412  4.07  3.40  4.06  4.25  4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0  7  9  4.56  280/1381  4.56  3.85  4.08  4.25  4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   1  0  3  4  4  3  3.50 1298/1500  3.50  4.01  4.18  4.22  3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  3 13  4.81  691/1517  4.81  4.74  4.65  4.73  4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 0 0 2 5 5  4.25  654/1497  4.25  3.89  4.11  4.21  4.25

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  2  2  6  6  4.00 1186/1440  4.00  4.22  4.45  4.48  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  0  3 13  4.81  737/1448  4.81  4.63  4.71  4.80  4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0  1  1  6  8  4.31  814/1436  4.31  4.04  4.29  4.37  4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  2  2  5  7  4.06 1009/1432  4.06  4.01  4.29  4.33  4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0  1  9  6  4.31  422/1221  4.31  3.86  3.93  3.83  4.31

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0  0  0  2  5  2  4.00  718/1280  4.00  3.89  4.10  4.24  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0  0  0  1  2  6  4.56  560/1277  4.56  4.02  4.34  4.52  4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0  1  8  4.89  244/1269  4.89  4.15  4.31  4.51  4.89
4. Were special techniques successful                 7   7  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 854  ****  3.80  4.02  4.08  ****

                Seminar
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  65  ****  ****  4.49  4.71  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   15   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  78  ****  ****  4.45  4.66  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               15   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.11  4.38  ****

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.41  4.40  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  45  ****  ****  4.30  4.49  ****

                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.63  4.82  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   15   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  23  ****  ****  4.41  4.68  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     15   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.69  4.79  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      15   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  22  ****  ****  4.54  4.83  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    15   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  18  ****  ****  4.49  4.92  ****
```

```
                             Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons            Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     2        0.00-0.99    0      A   13        Required for Majors  3    Graduate    9      Major     15
 28-55     0        1.00-1.99    0      B    1
 56-83     0        2.00-2.99    0      C    0        General             11    Under-grad  7      Non-major  1
 84-150    0        3.00-3.49    2      D    0
 Grad.     9        3.50-4.00    6      F    0        Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other                1
                                        ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 687  0101          University of Maryland                                Page  455
Title       INTRO NETWORK SECURITY      Baltimore County                                     JUN 26, 2007
Instructor: SIDHU, DEEPINDE             Spring 2007                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    24
Questionnaires: 17                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0  1  0  7  6  2  3.50 1402/1522  3.50  4.05  4.30  4.45  3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  1 10  2  3  3.44 1392/1522  3.44  3.97  4.26  4.29  3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  1  4  4  7  4.06  904/1285  4.06  4.10  4.30  4.31  4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   3  0  1  6  3  3  3.62 1275/1476  3.62  3.96  4.22  4.31  3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  4  2  0  2  5  3  3.58 1122/1412  3.58  3.40  4.06  4.25  3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  2  3  2  6  3  3.31 1235/1381  3.31  3.85  4.08  4.25  3.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   1  0  2  2  4  7  4.07  956/1500  4.07  4.01  4.18  4.22  4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  4 12  4.75  802/1517  4.75  4.74  4.65  4.73  4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0  0  6  3  2  3.64 1221/1497  3.64  3.89  4.11  4.21  3.64

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  1  7  3  4  3.67 1331/1440  3.67  4.22  4.45  4.48  3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0  0  0  2  7  5  4.21 1313/1448  4.21  4.63  4.71  4.80  4.21
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  0  8  2  4  3.71 1224/1436  3.71  4.04  4.29  4.37  3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0  0  2  6  3  3  3.50 1270/1432  3.50  4.01  4.29  4.33  3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1  1  1  5  3  2  3.33  983/1221  3.33  3.86  3.93  3.83  3.33

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0  2  0  1  1  1  2.80 1235/1280  2.80  3.89  4.10  4.24  2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0  1  0  2  2  0  3.00 1214/1277  3.00  4.02  4.34  4.52  3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0  0  0  3  1  4.25 ****/1269  ****  4.15  4.31  4.51  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  13   3  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 854  ****  3.80  4.02  4.08  ****
```

```
                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    1       0.00-0.99   0         A    4       Required for Majors  0     Graduate     1      Major      14
  28-55    0       1.00-1.99   0         B    8                                  Under-grad  16      Non-major   3
  56-83    1       2.00-2.99   2         C    3       General              8
  84-150   9       3.00-3.49   9         D    0
  Grad.    1       3.50-4.00   3         F    0       Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                7
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 691U 0101           University of Maryland                            Page  456
Title      UNIX SECURITY ADMIN PO         Baltimore County                            JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:   SHERMAN, ALAN  (Instr. A)   Spring 2007                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    3
Questionnaires:  3                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  2  1  0  0  0  1.33 1520/1522  1.33  4.05  4.30  4.45  1.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  2  0  1  0  0  1.67 1517/1522  1.67  3.97  4.26  4.29  1.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  2  1  0  0  2.33 1277/1285  2.33  4.10  4.30  4.31  2.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  1  1  1  0  0  2.00 1467/1476  2.00  3.96  4.22  4.31  2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  0  2  1  0  0  0  1.33 1380/1381  1.33  3.85  4.08  4.25  1.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  1  1  0  0  2.00 1485/1500  2.00  4.01  4.18  4.22  2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1517  5.00  4.74  4.65  4.73  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  1  0  1  1  0  0  0  1.50 1494/1497  2.50  3.89  4.11  4.21  2.50


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  1  1  0  0  0  1.50 1437/1440  2.83  4.22  4.45  4.48  2.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 1157/1448  4.50  4.63  4.71  4.80  4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  2  0  0  0  0  1.00 1435/1436  2.78  4.04  4.29  4.37  2.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  2  0  0  0  0  1.00 1430/1432  2.22  4.01  4.29  4.33  2.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  0  1  1  0  0  0  1.50 1214/1221  1.61  3.86  3.93  3.83  1.61


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons               Type                 Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0        A    2        Required for Majors  0     Graduate      0      Major        2
  28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0        B    0
  56-83      0       2.00-2.99    0        C    0        General              2     Under-grad    3      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 there are not enough
                                           P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                           I    0        Other                0
                                           ?    0
```

```
Enrollment:     3
Questionnaires:  3                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  2  1  0  0  0  1.33 1520/1522  1.33  4.05  4.30  4.45  1.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  2  0  1  0  0  1.67 1517/1522  1.67  3.97  4.26  4.29  1.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  2  1  0  0  2.33 1277/1285  2.33  4.10  4.30  4.31  2.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  1  1  1  0  0  2.00 1467/1476  2.00  3.96  4.22  4.31  2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  0  2  1  0  0  0  1.33 1380/1381  1.33  3.85  4.08  4.25  1.33

7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  1  1  1  0  0  2.00 1485/1500  2.00  4.01  4.18  4.22  2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1517  5.00  4.74  4.65  4.73  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  0  0  0  0  0  3  0  4.00  898/1497  2.50  3.89  4.11  4.21  2.50

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 1186/1440  2.83  4.22  4.45  4.48  2.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1448  4.50  4.63  4.71  4.80  4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33  793/1436  2.78  4.04  4.29  4.37  2.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  1  0  1  1  3.67 1224/1432  2.22  4.01  4.29  4.33  2.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  0  0  1  0  2  0  0  2.33 1188/1221  1.61  3.86  3.93  3.83  1.61


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades         Reasons               Type                  Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0        0.00-0.99   0        A    2        Required for Majors  0       Graduate     0        Major        2
 28-55      0        1.00-1.99   0        B    0
 56-83      0        2.00-2.99   0        C    0        General              2       Under-grad   3        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 there are not enough
                                          P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                          I    0        Other                0
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 691U 0101              University of Maryland                         Page  458
Title      UNIX SECURITY ADMIN PO           Baltimore County                               JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:               (Instr. C)        Spring 2007                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     3
Questionnaires: 3                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                 NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  2  1  0  0  0 1.33 1520/1522  1.33  4.05  4.30 4.45  1.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  2  0  1  0  0 1.67 1517/1522  1.67  3.97  4.26 4.29  1.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  2  1  0  0 2.33 1277/1285  2.33  4.10  4.30 4.31  2.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  1  1  1  0  0 2.00 1467/1476  2.00  3.96  4.22 4.31  2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  2  1  0  0  0 1.33 1380/1381  1.33  3.85  4.08 4.25  1.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  1  1  1  0  0 2.00 1485/1500  2.00  4.01  4.18 4.22  2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0  3 5.00    1/1517  5.00  4.74  4.65 4.73  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0  0  1  0  0  0 2.00 1486/1497  2.50  3.89  4.11 4.21  2.50


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2  0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 1404/1440  2.83  4.22  4.45 4.48  2.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2  0  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 1353/1448  4.50  4.63  4.71 4.80  4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 1378/1436  2.78  4.04  4.29 4.37  2.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2  0  0  1  0  0  0 2.00 1418/1432  2.22  4.01  4.29 4.33  2.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0  1  0  0  0  0 1.00 1216/1221  1.61  3.86  3.93 3.83  1.61


                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades           Reasons                    Type                    Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0         0.00-0.99    0        A    2         Required for Majors  0      Graduate     0      Major       2
  28-55      0         1.00-1.99    0        B    0
  56-83      0         2.00-2.99    0        C    0         General              2      Under-grad   3      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 there are not enough
                                             P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                             I    0         Other                0
                                             ?    0
```