Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR

Instructor: STEPHENS, ARTHU

Enrollment: 37 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 393 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | Fre | eaner | ncies | : | | Inst | tructor | Course | Dept | TIMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----------|--------|--------|-------|--------|--------|----|-------|-----------|--------|------|-------|-------|-------|
| Ouestions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | Mean | | Mean | Mean |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 8 | | 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 | | 4.22 | 4.36 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 9 | | 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 | | 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 | | 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 | | 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 | | 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 | | 1056/1436 | | 4.04 | 4.29 | 4.24 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 8 | | 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 | | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | | 0 | 2 0 1 | 1106/1000 | 2 55 | 2 00 | 4 10 | 2 00 | 2 0 0 |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | | 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 | | 1013/1277 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 4.34 | 4.13 | 3.91 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 11 11 | 0 4 | 1 1 | 1 | 1 1 | 5 4 | 3 | | 1047/1269 | 3.86 | 4.15 | 4.31 | 4.04 | 3.73 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | ΤŢ | 4 | Τ | U | Τ | 4 | 1 | 3.5/ | 658/ 854 | 3.35 | 3.80 | 4.02 | 3.87 | 3.5/ |
| 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 | 4.13 | *** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 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 | | ****/ 80 | **** | **** | 4.11 | 3.79 | **** |
| 5 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | ****/ 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 | *** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR

Instructor:

Enrollment: 37 Questionnaires: 22

Baltimore County STEPHENS, ARTHU Spring 2007

Page 393 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

University of Maryland

| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expecte | d 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 | В | 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 | h |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be si | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 10 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR

Title

Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M

Enrollment: 49 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 394 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | Fre | equer | ncies | 3 | | Tngt | tructor | Course | Dent | UMBC | I.evel | Sect |
|--|----|----|-----|-------|-------|----|----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|--------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | Mean | Mean | | Mean |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | _ | _ | | | 404/4500 | | 4 0= | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 23 | 4.68 | 424/1522 | | 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 | | 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 | | 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 | | 4.25 | 604/1381 | | 3.85 | 4.08 | 3.93 | 4.25 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | | 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 |
| 100000000000000000000000000000000000000 | | | | | | | | | , | | | | | |
| 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 | | ****/ 228 | **** | 4.53 | 4.35 | 4.33 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 217 | **** | 4.53 | 4.51 | 4.51 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 216 | **** | 4.75 | 4.42 | 4.41 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 205 | **** | 4.73 | 4.23 | 4.28 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified | 30 | U | U | U | U | U | | 5.00 | / 205 | | 4.33 | 4.23 | 4.20 | |
| 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 | *** |
| The last transfer | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | ****/ 45 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 3.90 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 3.90 | **** |
| 3. Was the Histractor available for consultation | 30 | U | U | U | U | U | 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 | **** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR

Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M

Enrollment: 49
Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 394 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | d 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 | В | 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 | า |
| | | | | P | 1 | | | responses to | be si | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 19 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR

Title BLOCK, DAWN M

Instructor:

Enrollment: 31 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 395 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | Fre | eque | ncie | s | | Ins | tructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-----|------|------|---|-----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | | 1.0 | 4 25 | E01 /1E00 | 4 20 | 4 05 | 4 20 | 4 1 4 | 4 25 |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 4.35 | 791/1522 | | 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 | | 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 | | 4.10 | 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 | | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.09 | 4.47 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 4 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | | 1327/1412 | | 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 | | 4.01 | 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 | | 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 | | | 4.29 | 4.24 | 4.89 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 15 | 4.78 | 327/1432 | | 4.01 | 4.29 | 4.23 | 4.78 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 4.40 | 359/1221 | | | 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 | | 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 | | 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 | | ****/ 217 | **** | 4.53 | 4.51 | 4.51 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 17 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | | ****/ 216 | **** | 4.75 | 4.42 | 4.41 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 17 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | ****/ 205 | **** | 4.33 | 4.23 | 4.28 | **** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Seminar | | _ | _ | | | _ | _ | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 18 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | ****/ 79 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 4.13 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 17 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | , | **** | **** | 4.52 | 4.03 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 17 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | | **** | **** | 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 | | ****/ 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 | , | **** | **** | 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 | | ****/ 23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.19 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 20 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 33 | **** | **** | 4.69 | 4.57 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 20 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | , | **** | **** | 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 | **** |

Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR

Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M

Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 395 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expecte | d Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|---------|----------|---------------------|----|--------------|-------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 4 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 13 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | В | 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 | n |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be si | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 11 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR

Title PROB SOL & COMP

Instructor: BURT, GARY

Enrollment: 37

Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 396 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | Fre | eaner | ncies | | | Inst | tructor | Course | Dept | TIMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-----|-------|-------|---|----|------|------------|--------|------|-------|-------|---------|
| Ouestions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | Mean | | Mean | Mean |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | | 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 | | 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 | | 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | 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 | | 1209/1436 | | 4.04 | 4.29 | 4.24 | 3.77 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 6 | | 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 |
| o. Dia addiovidual commiques cimanes four anacistanding | - | 3 | Ü | | _ | _ | | 3.30 | 0,5,7,1221 | | 3.00 | 3.75 | 3.00 | 3.30 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | ****/ 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 | | ****/ 217 | **** | 4.53 | 4.51 | | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | ****/ 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | ****/ 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 | *** |
| Colf Daged | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Self Paced 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 | **** | **** | 4.63 | 4.53 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 33 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.19 | **** |
| 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 | | ****/ 18 | **** | **** | 4.49 | 4.31 | *** |
| J. Here energy proceeds for all the scudents | 10 | _ | J | J | J | J | _ | 5.00 | , 10 | | | 1.72 | 1.11 | |

Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR

Instructor: BURT, GARY

Enrollment:

37 Questionnaires: 17 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 396 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|----------|--------|---------------------|---|--------------|-------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 5 | 0.00-0.99 | 2 | А | 8 | Required for Majors | 2 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 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 | a |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be si | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 7 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Instructor: FREY, DENNIS

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 13

Baltimore County
Spring 2007
Jun 26, 2007
Job IRBR3029

Page 397

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

| | | | | | | | | | | | | T | | a | 5 | THIPC | T 1 | Qt |
|----------------|-------------|------------------------|----------|----------------------------|--------|--------------|-------|-------------|------------|----------------|----------|------|-----------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------|---------------|----------------|
| | | Ouestion | . a | | MD | NA | 1 | equei 2 | ncies 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | tructor Rank | Course | _ | | Level Mean | Sect Mear |
| | | Question | | | NK. | NA | | | | - 1 | | меап | Railk | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | меаі |
| | | Genera | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you | ı gain ne | ew insights,ski | lls fro | om this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.92 | 141/1522 | 4.62 | 4.05 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.92 |
| | | ctor make clear | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 4.85 | 171/1522 | | 3.97 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.85 |
| 3. Did the | e exam qu | aestions reflec | t the e | expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 4.85 | 196/1285 | 4.60 | 4.10 | 4.30 | 4.36 | 4.85 |
| 1. Did oth | ner evalı | ations reflect | the ex | spected goals | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.78 | 207/1476 | 4.57 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.78 |
| 5. Did ass | signed re | eadings contrib | ute 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 |
| 5. Did wri | itten ass | signments contr | ibute t | 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 | e grading | g system clearl | y expla | ained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 4.50 | 483/1500 | 4.55 | 4.01 | 4.18 | 4.20 | 4.50 |
| 8. How man | ny times | was class cand | elled | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 4.83 | 645/1517 | 4.74 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 4.83 |
| 9. How wou | ıld you g | grade the overa | ll tead | ching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 4.50 | 385/1497 | 4.34 | 3.89 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.50 |
| | | Lectur | ·e | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were th | ne instri | actor's lecture | | prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 5.00 | 1/1440 | 4.90 | 4.22 | 4.45 | 4.42 | 5.00 |
| | | ctor seem inter | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 5.00 | 1/1448 | | 4.63 | 4.71 | 4.78 | 5.00 |
| | | | | explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 4.85 | 179/1436 | | 4.04 | 4.29 | 4.29 | 4.85 |
| | | es contribute t | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 4.69 | 418/1432 | | 4.01 | 4.29 | 4.31 | |
| | | | | your understanding | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | | 572/1221 | | | | 4.02 | |
| | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Did cla | aca diam | Discus | | what you learned | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3.89 | 834/1280 | 4.16 | 3.89 | 4.10 | 4.08 | 3.89 |
| | | | | ed to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4.56 | 560/1277 | | 4.02 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.5 |
| | | _ | _ | nd open discussion | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.63 | 493/1269 | | 4.15 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.63 |
| | | echniques succe | | d open discussion | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 854 | | 3.80 | 4.02 | 4.00 | **** |
| | | _ | | | | | - | _ | _ | - | _ | | , | | | | | |
| ما المام ا | . 1 - 1 - 1 | Labora | _ | | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.29 | 128/ 215 | 4.60 | 4.64 | 4.36 | 4 (2 | 4.29 |
| | | | | of the material | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 2 | <i>5</i> | 4.29 | - , | | | | 4.62 4.56 | 4.71 |
| | | | | ground information | 6 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | | 53/ 228 | | 4.53 | 4.35 | | |
| | | | | for lab activities | 6 | 1 | | | 0 | | 4 | | 91/ 217 | | 4.53 | 4.51 | 4.57 | 4.67 |
| | | structor provid | | stance Learly specified | 6 6 | 1 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 2 | 4.50 | 121/ 216 ****/ 205 | | 4.75 | 4.42 | 4.72 | 4.50 |
| J. WEIE IE | equifemen | ics for fab rep | 01 65 61 | learly specified | O | 5 | U | U | U | U | ۷ | 3.00 | / 203 | | 1.33 | 1.23 | 4.57 | |
| | | Semina | | 2 2 | 1.0 | • | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | F 00 | **** | de de de de | ale ale ale ale | 4 50 | 4 50 | *** |
| | - | _ | | announced theme | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Ţ | | ****/ 79 | | *** | 4.58 | 4.58 | **** |
| _ | | ons contribute | | - | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 78 | | **** | 4.45 | 5.00 | **** |
| o. Were cr | riteria i | for grading mad | le clear | Î | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 80 | **** | **** | 4.11 | 4.00 | *** |
| | | Field | Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | _ | | | what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 47 | | **** | 4.41 | 4.83 | **** |
| 2. Did you | ı clearly | y understand yo | ur eval | luation criteria | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 45 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.58 | **** |
| | | | | Frequ | ency | Dist | crib | ıtioı | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | | | Re: | asons | | | | ጥላን | pe | | | Majors | 3 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 00-27 28-55 | 4 1 | 0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99 | 1 0 | A 7 B 5 | | Rec | quire | ed fo | or Ma | jor | s | 0 | Graduat | е | 0 | Majo | or | 4 |
| 28-55 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C 0 | | Ger | nera: | 1 | | | | 1 | Under-g | rad 1 | .3 | Non- | -major | 9 |
| 84-150 | 4 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D 0 | | GCI | c. a. | - | | | | _ | onder g | 144 1 | | IVOII | , О.Т | , |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F 0 | | $El\epsilon$ | ectiv | <i>r</i> es | | | | 1 | #### - | Means t | here a | are not | enou | ηh |
| | - | 2.23 2.03 | - | P 0 | | | | | | | | • | respons | | | | | . - |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ~ | | | | |
| | | | | I 0 | | Oth | ner | | | | 1 | .0 | | | | | | |

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Instructor: FREY, DENNIS

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 398 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | Fre | equei | ncies | 3 | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-----|-------|-------|---|---|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 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 | | 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 | | 4.10 | 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 | Ο | 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 | | 1114/1448 | | 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 | | 4.04 | 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 | | 4.01 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.22 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 279/1221 | | 3.86 | 3.93 | 4.02 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Λ | E | 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 | | 1201/1277 | 3.91 | 4.02 | 4.10 | 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 | | ****/ 854 | | 3.80 | 4.02 | 4.00 | **** |
| 1. Were appear teermingues autocasarur | - | , | O | O | _ | O | O | 3.00 | / 031 | 1.10 | 3.00 | 1.02 | 1.00 | |
| 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 | **** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expecte | d Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | 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 | В | 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 | 1 |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | mificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 7 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Instructor: FREY, DENNIS

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 399 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

| | | | Fre | equer | ncies | 5 | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-----|-------|-------|---|----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | | 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 | | 3.86 | 3.93 | 4.02 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | ****/ 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 | | ****/ 205 | **** | 4.33 | 4.23 | 4.37 | **** |
| I HILL III III III III III III III III I | | _ | , | , | , | 3 | J | 2.00 | , 200 | | 55 | 20 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Credits E | Credits Earned C | | | Expected | d Grades | Reasons | | Туре | 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 | В | 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 sig | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 1 | Other | 12 | - | _ | | |
| | | | | 2 | Λ | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| 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 | | |

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 6

| Quantitative in | | | | | | | | Fre | equer | ncies | 3 | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|---|------------------|---------|------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|---------|-------|---|---------|--------|-----------|--------|------|--------|-------|------|
| | | Questions | 3 | | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | Mean | | Mean | Mean |
| | | Genera: | L | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you | ı gain ne | ew insights,ski | lls fro | m this cou | rse | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.33 | 814/1522 | 4.62 | 4.05 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.33 |
| _ | - | ctor make clear | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 358/1522 | 4.61 | 3.97 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.67 |
| 3. Did the | e exam qu | uestions reflect | the e | xpected go | als | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 366/1285 | 4.60 | 4.10 | 4.30 | 4.36 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did oth | ner evalı | uations reflect | the ex | pected goa | ls | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 226/1476 | 4.57 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.75 |
| 5. Did ass | signed re | eadings contribu | ate to | what you l | earned | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | 760/1412 | 3.57 | 3.40 | 4.06 | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| | - | signments contr | | _ | | 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 | g system clearly | y expla | ined | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4.17 | 871/1500 | 4.55 | 4.01 | 4.18 | 4.20 | 4.17 |
| 8. How mar | ny times | was class cance | elled | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.50 | 1080/1517 | 4.74 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 4.50 |
| 9. How wou | How would you grade the overall teaching effectivener | | | | tiveness | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | 654/1497 | 4.34 | 3.89 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.25 |
| | Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were th | ne instru | actor's lectures | s well | prepared | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1440 | 4.90 | 4.22 | 4.45 | 4.42 | 5.00 |
| | | ctor seem inter | | | ect. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1448 | | 4.63 | 4.71 | 4.78 | 5.00 |
| | | terial presented | | _ | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | | 188/1436 | | 4.04 | 4.29 | 4.29 | 4.83 |
| | | es contribute to | | _ | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1432 | | 4.01 | 4.29 | | 5.00 |
| | | l techniques en | | - | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | | 99/1221 | | | 3.93 | 4.02 | |
| | | Discus | gion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Did cla | aga diad | ussions contribu | | what vou 1 | earned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | Ω | 2 | 3 | 4.00 | 718/1280 | 4.16 | 3.89 | 4.10 | 4.08 | 4.00 |
| | | nts actively end | | _ | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | | 930/1277 | 3.91 | 4.02 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.00 |
| | | ctor encourage | _ | _ | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | | 875/1269 | 3.97 | 4.15 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.00 |
| | | echniques succes | | a open arb | Cubbion | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 854 | | | | 4.00 | **** |
| | Frac | | | | | ienai | Dis | tri h | ıt i or | 2 | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | rredi | uency | צדת | CLIDI | ucioi | .1 | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades | | | | | | | | Rea | asons | 3 | | | Туј | pe | | | Majors | } | |
| 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 0 | | | | | Re | quir | ed fo | or Ma | jors | 5 | 0 | Graduat | e e | 0 | Majo | r | 4 | | |

| Credits | Credits Earned Cum. GPA | | L | Expected | l 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 | В | 5 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 6 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 0 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 6 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2007

| Course-Section: | CMSC 2 | 01 | 020 |)4 |
|-----------------|--------|----|------|------|
| Title | COMPUT | ER | SCI | ENCE |
| Instructor: | EVANS, | SU | JSAN | А |
| | | | | |

I

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 2

Page 401 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

| | 1 | | | | | Inst | ructor | Course Dept | | t UMBC Level | | Sect | | |
|---|----|----|---|---|---|------|--------|-------------|-----------|--------------|------|------|------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 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 | Ο | 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 | | 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 | | 1117/1269 | 3.97 | 4.15 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 3.50 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Credits E | Credits Earned Cum. GPA | | | Expected | l Grades | Reasons | | Type | Majors | | |
|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|---|----------|----------|---------------------|---|--------------|--------|----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 1 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 1 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | С | 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 | ı |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

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

Baltimore County Spring 2007

| Instructor: | EVANS, | SUSAN A |
|-------------|--------|---------|
| Enrollment: | 20 | |

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 9

Title

Page 402 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

| Student | Course | Evaluation | ı Quest: | ionnaire |
|---------|--------|------------|----------|----------|
|---------|--------|------------|----------|----------|

| | | | | | Fre | eque | ncies | 3 | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|----|------|-------|-------|-------|------|----------|------|-----------|--------|------|------|--------|------|
| | Questions | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new | | rom this source | 0 | 0 | 0 | Λ | 0 | Λ | a | 5.00 | 1/1522 | 4.62 | 4.05 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor | J , | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.44 | 639/1522 | 4.61 | 3.97 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.44 |
| 3. Did the exam ques | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.56 | 478/1285 | 4.60 | 4.10 | 4.30 | 4.36 | 4.56 |
| 4. Did other evaluat | | _ | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 151/1476 | 4.57 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.86 |
| 5. Did assigned read | | 1 3 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | ****/1412 | 3.57 | 3.40 | 4.22 | 4.20 | **** |
| _ | _ | to what you learned | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Τ. | 5.00 | 1/1381 | 4.78 | 3.40 | 4.08 | 3.97 | 5.00 |
| 7. Was the grading s | • | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 4.67 | 312/1500 | 4.76 | 4.01 | 4.18 | 4.20 | 4.67 |
| 8. How many times wa | | Tarned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | | 1037/1517 | 4.74 | 4.74 | 4.10 | 4.63 | 4.56 |
| 9. How would you gra | | abing offostironoss | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4.38 | 534/1497 | | 3.89 | 4.11 | 4.03 | 4.38 |
| 9. HOW WOULD YOU GE | U | 1 | U | U | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4.30 | 334/149/ | 4.34 | 3.09 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 4.30 | | |
| | Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instruct | | l 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 instructo | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.78 | 821/1448 | 4.89 | 4.63 | 4.71 | 4.78 | 4.78 |
| 3. Was lecture mater | | 3 | 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 | - | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4.56 | 579/1432 | 4.61 | 4.01 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.56 |
| 5. Did audiovisual t | | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | n | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 279/1221 | 4.42 | 3.86 | 3.93 | 4.02 | 4.50 |
| J. Dia addiovisual (| eciniiques ciniance | your understanding | O | _ | U | U | _ | 2 | 5 | 1.50 | 2///1221 | 1.12 | 3.00 | 3.73 | 1.02 | 1.50 |
| | Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discuss | sions contribute to | o 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 encourage | ged 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 | | | | 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 | **** |
| Exam | | | | - Di | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Freque | | | | וצוע | _r1Dl | 11101 | [1 | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades | | | | | | Rea | asons | 5 | | | Туј | pe | | | Majors | 1 |

| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expecte | d Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|------------|-------|-----------|---|---------|----------|---------------------|---|--------------|--------|----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 4 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 8 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 6 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 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 | L |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 9 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

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

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 403

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Title Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 5

| | | | | | Frequencies I | | | Inst | tructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect | | | | |
|-----------|---|-----------------|---------|--------------------|---------------|-------|-------|-------|---------|--------|------|------|-----------|---------|--------|---------|--------|-------|
| | | Question | s | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | Genera | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did yo | u gain n | ew insights,ski | lls fro | m this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 492/1522 | 4.62 | 4.05 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.60 |
| 2. Did th | e instru | ctor make clear | the ex | pected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 201/1522 | 4.61 | 3.97 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.80 |
| 3. Did th | e exam q | uestions reflec | t the e | xpected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 228/1285 | 4.60 | 4.10 | 4.30 | 4.36 | 4.80 |
| 4. Did ot | her eval | uations reflect | the ex | pected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 378/1476 | 4.57 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.60 |
| 5. Did as | signed r | eadings contrib | ute to | what you learned | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1412 | 3.57 | 3.40 | 4.06 | 4.00 | **** |
| 6. Did wr | itten as | signments contr | ibute t | o what you learned | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1381 | 4.78 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 3.97 | **** |
| 7. Was th | e gradin | g system clearl | y expla | ined | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.20 | 839/1500 | 4.55 | 4.01 | 4.18 | 4.20 | 4.20 |
| | | was class canc | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1517 | 4.74 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 5.00 |
| 9. How wo | uld you | grade the overa | ll teac | hing 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 t | he instr | uctor's lecture | | prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1440 | 4.90 | 4.22 | 4.45 | 4.42 | 5.00 |
| | | ctor seem inter | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1448 | | 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 | | 4.04 | 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 | | 4.01 | 4.29 | 4.31 | 4.80 |
| | | | | our understanding | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | 279/1221 | 4.42 | 3.86 | 3.93 | 4.02 | 4.50 |
| | | Discus | sion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did cl | ass disc | | | what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.60 | 988/1280 | 4.16 | 3.89 | 4.10 | 4.08 | 3.60 |
| | | | | d to participate | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | 1251/1277 | | 4.02 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 2.80 |
| | | | | d open discussion | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | | 1207/1269 | | 4.15 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 3.00 |
| | | echniques succe | | 01 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | 1/ 854 | | 3.80 | | 4.00 | 5.00 |
| | | | | Frequ | encv | 7 Dis | tribi | ıtioı | n | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | • | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | | | Rea | asons | 3 | | | Ту: | pe | | | Majors | ; |
| 00-27 | 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 | | | | | Re | quire | ed fo | or Ma | ajors | \$ | 0 | Graduat | е | 0 | Majo | or | 1 |
| 28-55 | B-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | | | | | | Ger | nera: | 1 | | | | 0 | Under-g | rad | 5 | Non- | major | 4 |
| 84-150 | 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grad. | | | | | | El | ectiv | ves | | | | 0 | #### - 1 | Means t | here a | are not | enoug | ſh |
| | | | | P 0 | | | | | | | | | respons | es to b | e sign | nificar | ıt | |
| | | | | I 0 | | Ot1 | her | | | | | 4 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

0

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0207 University of Maryland COMPUTER SCIENCE I Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A

Title

Enrollment:

14

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 404

JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

| Ouestionnaires: | 7 | Student | Course | Evaluation | Questionnaire |
|-----------------|---|---------|--------|------------|---------------|
| | | | | | |

| | | | Frequencies | | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect | | |
|---|-------|---------|-------------|------|---|------|--------|--------|----------|------|-------|------|--------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 |
| Frequ | iency | Dis | trib | utio | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades | | Reasons | | | | | | | Ty | pe | | | Majors | 1 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | l Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|------------|-------|-----------|---|----------|----------|---------------------|---|--------------|--------|----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 4 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 4 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 1 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 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 | ı |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 7 | | | | |
| | | | | 2 | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0101 University of Maryland Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II CHANG, RICHARD

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Instructor: Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 405

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

| | Frequencies | | | | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect | | |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|------|--------|--------|-----------|------|-------|------|------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | | 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 | | 3.80 | 4.02 | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Credits E | Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons | | | | Reasons | | Туре | | 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 | В | 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 | 1 |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sid | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 3 | - | - | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Instructor: CHANG, RICHARD

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 406 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

| Student Co | urse Evalua | ation Ques | tionnaire |
|------------|-------------|------------|-----------|
|------------|-------------|------------|-----------|

| | | Frequencies | | | | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect | |
|---|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------|--------|-----------|------|------|-------|------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 0 | 0 | _ | _ | - | _ | | 4 00 | 204/1440 | 4 46 | 4 00 | 4 45 | 4 40 | 4 00 |
| 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 | | 4.83 |
| 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 | Τ | 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 | | 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 | | 1059/1269 | 4.27 | 4.15 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 3.70 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ 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 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | d Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | 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 | В | 4 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | С | 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 a | are not enough | 1 |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sign | nificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 11 | - | _ | | |
| | | | | 2 | 1 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0103 Uni Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Instructor: CHANG, RICHARD

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 407 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | | _ | ncies | | _ | | ructor | Course | _ | | | |
|--|------|------|--------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------------|----------------------|--------------|------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| 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 | ^ | 0 | 0 | ^ | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 57 | 716/1440 | 1 10 | 4 00 | 4 45 | 4 40 | 4 57 |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.57 4.86 | 716/1440 629/1448 | 4.46 4.81 | 4.22 | 4.45 4.71 | 4.42 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 4 | 6 | 4.86 | 629/1448 | | 4.63 | 4.71 | 4.78 4.29 | 4.86 4.43 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 4 | | 732/1432 | | 4.04 | 4.29 | 4.29 | 4.43 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.45 | 461/1221 | | | 3.93 | 4.02 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | U | 3 | U | Τ | U | U | 3 | 4.25 | 401/1221 | 4.24 | 3.00 | 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 | | ****/ 228 | 4.47 | 4.53 | 4.35 | 4.56 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 217 | 4.50 | 4.53 | 4.51 | 4.57 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 216 | 4.80 | 4.75 | 4.42 | 4.72 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 205 | | 4.33 | 4.23 | 4.37 | **** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Execus | onar | Diat | - wihi | 1+102 | 2 | | | | | | | | | |

| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | d Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | Majors | |
|------------|-------|-----------|---|----------|----------|---------------------|---|--------------|--------|----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 4 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 4 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 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 sig | mificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 7 | - | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0104 Title

COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Instructor: CHANG, RICHARD

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 5 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 408 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | Frequencies | | | | | | ructor | Course | - | UMBC | | Sect | | |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|--------|--------|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 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 | Ο | 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 | | ****/ 228 | 4.47 | 4.53 | 4.35 | 4.56 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 217 | 4.50 | 4.53 | 4.51 | 4.57 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ 216 | 4.80 | 4.75 | 4.42 | 4.72 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 205 | 4.33 | 4.33 | 4.23 | 4.37 | **** |
| <u> </u> | | | | | | | | | , | | | | | |

| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | d Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | 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 | В | 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 | L |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | nificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 5 | - | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Instructor: CHANG, RICHARD

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 409 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | Frequencies | | | | Inst | cructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect | | | |
|--|-------------|----|---|--------|------|---------|--------|------|-----------|-------|------|------|------|--------------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 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 | 4.80 | 702/1522 | | 3.97 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.80 |
| · · · | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4.40 | 809/1285 | | 4.10 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.40 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | U | | 1416/1476 | | 3.96 | 4.30 | 4.36 | 3.00 |
| · · · | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | | , | | 3.40 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 3.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 3 | 1 | U T | Τ | Ţ | 0 | | 1327/1412 | | | | | 3.00 **** |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | _ | _ | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | | ****/1381 | | 3.85 | 4.08 | 3.97 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 1183/1500 | | 4.01 | 4.18 | 4.20 | 3.75 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | , - | 4.86 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 4.75 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | Τ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | Τ | 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 | | 3.93 | 4.02 | 4.00 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | 959/1280 | | 3.89 | 4.10 | 4.08 | 3.67 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | 930/1277 | 3.94 | | 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 | | 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/ 21/ | 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/ 216 | 4.33 | 4.75 | 4.42 | 4.72 | 5.00 |
| 5. Were requirements for tab reports creatry specified | 3 | U | U | U | U | U | ۷ | 5.00 | 1/ 205 | 4.33 | 4.33 | 4.43 | 4.3/ | 5.00 |

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | d Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | 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 | В | 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 | ı |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | nificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 5 | _ | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 410 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Ouestions | | | Fro | equei 2 | ncies | 5 | 5 | Inst Mean | ructor Rank | Course | Dept Mean | | Level | Sect |
|---|------|------|------|------------|-------|---|---|--------------|----------------|--------|--------------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | | | | | | меап | Ralik | | 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 | , | **** | **** | 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 | | ****/ 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 | **** |
| Frequ | encv | Dist | trib | ut i ou | n | | | | | | | | | |

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | l 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 | В | 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 | ι |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 7 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 411 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | | | Frequencies | | | Ins | tructo | r | Course | e Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect | | | | |
|------------|---|-------------------------|---------|--------------------|-------------|------|------|------|--------|------|--------|--------|---------|--------|---------|-------|------|--------|------|
| | | Question | s | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rar | nk | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | Genera | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did yo | u gain ne | w insights,ski | | m this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.25 | 899/1 | 1522 | 4.50 | 4.05 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.25 |
| _ | | tor make clear | | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | | 1316/1 | | 4.32 | 3.97 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 3.63 |
| | | estions reflec | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4.00 | 938/1 | | 4.35 | 4.10 | 4.30 | 4.36 | 4.00 |
| | _ | ations reflect | | _ | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 1009/1 | | 4.28 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.00 |
| | | | | what you learned | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 1402/1 | | 2.61 | 3.40 | 4.06 | 4.00 | 2.00 |
| | | | | o what you learned | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | | 1152/1 | | 4.03 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 3.97 | 3.50 |
| | | system clearl | | _ | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | | 892/1 | | 4.37 | | 4.18 | 4.20 | 4.14 |
| | | was class cand | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | | | 4.86 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 4.71 |
| | - | | | hing effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | | 1277/1 | | 4.24 | 3.89 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 3.50 |
| | | Lectur | e | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were ti | he instru | ctor's lecture | | prepared | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3.63 | 1340/1 | 1440 | 4.46 | 4.22 | 4.45 | 4.42 | 3.63 |
| | | tor seem inter | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | | 1048/1 | | 4.81 | 4.63 | 4.71 | 4.78 | 4.63 |
| | | | | xplained clearly | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | | 1212/1 | | 4.35 | 4.04 | 4.29 | 4.29 | 3.75 |
| | | s contribute t | | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | | | 1270/1 | | 4.33 | 4.01 | 4.29 | | 3.50 |
| | | | | our understanding | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | | | 899/1 | | | | | 4.02 | |
| | Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | _ | | | | _ | _ | | | 0.7.4.4 | | | | | | |
| | | | | what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.80 | 874/1 | | 4.14 | 3.89 | 4.10 | 4.08 | 3.80 |
| | ere all students actively encouraged to participate id the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | | | | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | | 1050/1 | | 3.94 | | 4.34 | | 3.80 |
| | | | | d open discussion | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4.20 | 816/1 | | 4.27 | 4.15 | 4.31 | | 4.20 |
| 4. Were s | pecial te | chniques succe | ssful | | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 779/ | 854 | 3.33 | 3.80 | 4.02 | 4.00 | 3.00 |
| | | Labora | tory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the | e lab inc | rease understa | nding o | f the material | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | | 215 | 4.67 | 4.64 | 4.36 | 4.62 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were ye | ou provid | ed with adequa | te back | ground information | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | 135/ | 228 | 4.47 | 4.53 | 4.35 | 4.56 | 4.33 |
| 3. Were n | ecessary | materials avai | lable f | or 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 | e lab ins | tructor provid | e assis | tance | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/ | 216 | 4.80 | 4.75 | 4.42 | 4.72 | 5.00 |
| 5. Were r | equiremen | ts for lab rep | orts cl | early specified | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | 141/ | 205 | 4.33 | 4.33 | 4.23 | 4.37 | 4.00 |
| | | Semina | r | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were a | ssigned t | opics relevant | to the | announced theme | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ | 79 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 4.58 | **** |
| | | | | ividual attention | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ | 77 | **** | **** | 4.52 | 5.00 | **** |
| | | | | what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ | 65 | **** | **** | 4.49 | 5.00 | **** |
| | _ | ns contribute | | _ | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ | 78 | **** | **** | 4.45 | 5.00 | **** |
| _ | | or grading mad | | - | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ | 80 | **** | **** | 4.11 | 4.00 | **** |
| | | | , | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did fi | eld exper | Field ience contribu | | hat you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ | 47 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.83 | *** |
| | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Frequ | ency | Dist | trib | utio | n | | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits E | Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades | | | | | | | Rea | asons | | | | | Тур | pe | | | Majors | 3 |
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 1 | | Red | quir | ed f | or Ma | jors | 5 | 0 | Grad | duate | e | 0 | Majo | or | 4 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | , | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C 2 | General | | | | 0 | Unde | er-gi | rad | 8 | Non- | -major | 4 | | | |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D 1 | General | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | |
| Grad. | | | | Ele | ecti | ves | | | | 0 | #### | # - N | Means t | here a | are not | enoug | jh | | |
| | | | | P 0 | | | | | | | | | | | es to k | | | _ | |
| | | | | I 0 | | Ot.1 | ner | | | | | 7 | _ | | | 3 | | | |
| | | | | 2 0 | | 0.01 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

0

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 412 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Frequencies | | | | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect | | | |
|---|----|----|---|--------|------|--------|--------|------|-----------|-------|------|------|------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 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 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4.63 | 508/1277 | 3.94 | 4.02 | 4.10 | 4.08 | 4.50 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 4.50 | 586/1269 | 4.27 | 4.02 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.50 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | ****/ 854 | 3.33 | 3.80 | 4.02 | 4.33 | **** |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 5 | U | U | U | U | 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 | | | 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 | **** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | l Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|----------|----------|---------------------|----|--------------|--------|----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 5 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 6 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 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 sig | mificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 10 | - | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 203 0101 University of Maryland Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES Baltimore County Instructor: YESHA, YAACOV Spring 2007

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 22

34

University of Maryland Page 413
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

| | Ouestionnaire |
|--|---------------|
| | |
| | |
| | |

| | 1 | | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect | | | | |
|---|----|----|---|------|--------|--------|------|------|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 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 | | 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 | | 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 | | 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 | | 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 | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | | 1150/1277 | 3.83 | 4.02 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 3.46 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | | | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 4.15 | 832/1269 | 4.18 | 4.15 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.15 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 854 | | 3.80 | 4.02 | 4.00 | **** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | 1 | Expecte | ed Grades | Reasons | Type | | Majors | | |
|------------|-------|-----------|---|---------|-----------|---------------------|------|--------------|--------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 3 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | А | 12 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 1 | Major | 9 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 1 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 21 | Non-major | 13 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 1 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | n |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 19 | _ | _ | | |
| | | | | 2 | 0 | | | | | | |

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

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Instructor: LOMONACO JR, SA Enrollment: 38

Questionnaires: 25

Page 414 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

| C+ | a | The second second second | 0 |
|---------|----------|--------------------------|---------------|
| Student | course | Evaluation | Ouestionnaire |

| | | | | | Fre | eque | ncie | s | | Ins | tructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|-------------------------------------|---|-----------|------|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|----------|------------------------|--------------|------|----------------|--------------|--------------|
| | Questions | NR | N | 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 | Ω | 1 | 7 | 10 | 7 | 3 92 | 1200/1522 | 3.67 | 4.05 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 3.92 |
| 1 5 | or make clear the expected goals | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 9 | 8 | | 1200/1522 | 3.58 | 3.97 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 3.88 |
| | stions 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 |
| _ | tions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4.40 | 629/1476 | 3.57 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.40 |
| | dings contribute to what you learne | d 0 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 13 | 3.96 | 826/1412 | 3.93 | 3.40 | 4.06 | 4.00 | 3.96 |
| 6. Did written assignment | gnments contribute to what you lear | ned 0 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4.00 | 806/1381 | 3.69 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 3.97 | 4.00 |
| 7. Was the grading s | 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 wa | as 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 gra | ade the overall teaching effectiven | less 2 | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 6 | 3 | 3.43 | 1310/1497 | 3.19 | 3.89 | 4.11 | 4.11 | 3.43 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Wassa tha danatasan | Lecture | 1 | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 7 | _ | 2 54 | 1252/1440 | 2 67 | 4 22 | 4 45 | 4 40 | 2 [4 |
| | tor's lectures well prepared | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 5 17 | | 1353/1440 1089/1448 | 3.67 4.33 | 4.22 | 4.45 | 4.42 | 3.54 |
| | Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear | | | | | | | 4 7 | 4 | | 1089/1448 | 3.50 | 4.03 | $4.71 \\ 4.29$ | 4.78 4.29 | 4.58 3.55 |
| | Was lecture material presented and explained clear! Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | | | | | | | 10 | 6 | | 1161/1432 | 3.70 | 4.04 | 4.29 | 4.29 | 3.83 |
| | <u>-</u> | 1 na 1 | 1 | 1 18 | 0 3 | 3 1 | 4 1 | 10 | 1 | | ****/1221 | 3.19 | 3.86 | 3.93 | 4.02 | **** |
| 5. Did audiovisual (| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | | | | | | | U | 1 | 2.1/ | /1221 | 3.19 | 3.00 | 3.93 | 4.02 | |
| | Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discuss | sions contribute to what you learne | ed 20 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.60 | ****/1280 | 3.32 | 3.89 | 4.10 | 4.08 | **** |
| Were all students | s actively encouraged to participat | .e 19 | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.17 | ****/1277 | 3.83 | 4.02 | 4.34 | 4.33 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructo | or encourage fair and open discussi | on 19 | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.33 | ****/1269 | 4.18 | 4.15 | 4.31 | 4.33 | **** |
| 4. Were special tech | nniques successful | 20 | | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 854 | **** | 3.80 | 4.02 | 4.00 | **** |
| | Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced sy | d 24 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 00 | ****/ 37 | **** | **** | 4.63 | **** | **** | |
| 2. Did study question | 24 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | **** | **** | |
| 3. Were your contact | 24 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 33 | **** | **** | 4.69 | **** | **** | |
| 4. Was the feedback | 24 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ 22 | **** | **** | 4.54 | **** | **** | |
| , | | | | | | | | | | , | | | | | | |
| | requenc | уΙ | Dist | ribu | ıtio | n | | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Earned | redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad | | | | | | | | | | Туј | pe | | | Majors | |

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expecte | d Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|---------|----------|---------------------|----|--------------|-------|---------------|----|
| 00-27 | 3 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 10 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 13 |
| 28-55 | 6 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 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 enoug | h |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be si | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 23 | _ | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 415

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: CMSC 203 0301 University of Maryland Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES Instructor: STEPHENS, ARTHU Enrollment: 41

Questionnaires: 16

| | | | | | | Fre | eauer | ncies | : | | Inst | tructor | Course | . Dept. | UMBC | Level | Sect | |
|---|-----------|----------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|--------|------|-----------|-----------|---------|--------|--------|--------|------|
| | | Question | S | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | Genera | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Did von | ı gəin ne | Genera w insights,ski | | m this source | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 2 72 | 1305/1522 | 3.67 | 4.05 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 3.73 |
| | | w insignes,ski tor make clear | | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 5 | | 1303/1522 | | 3.97 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 3.60 |
| | | estions reflec | | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 4.00 | 938/1285 | | 4.10 | 4.30 | 4.36 | 4.00 |
| | | ations reflect | | | 1 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | | 1370/1476 | | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 3.30 |
| | | | | what you learned | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | - | | 948/1412 | | 3.40 | 4.06 | 4.00 | 3.83 |
| | | | | o what you learned | 1 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 1136/1381 | | 3.85 | 4.08 | 3.97 | 3.57 |
| | | system clearl | | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 8 | | 839/1500 | | 4.01 | 4.18 | 4.20 | 4.20 |
| | | was class canc | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 11 | | 837/1517 | | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 4.73 |
| | _ | | | hing effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 4 | | | 1418/1497 | | 3.89 | 4.11 | | 3.00 |
| | | | | 3 | | | | | | | | | -, | | | | | |
| | | Lectur | е | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were th | ne instru | ctor's lecture | s 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 | e instruc | tor seem inter | ested i | n 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 led | cture mat | erial presente | d and e | xplained 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 | e lecture | s contribute t | o 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 aud | diovisual | techniques en | our understanding | 2 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3.13 | 1048/1221 | 3.19 | 3.86 | 3.93 | 4.02 | 3.13 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| !. | | Discus | | | | | _ | | _ | _ | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | what you learned | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | | 1081/1280 | | 3.89 | 4.10 | 4.08 | 3.40 |
| | | _ | _ | d to participate | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4.20 | 849/1277 | | 4.02 | 4.34 | 4.33 | 4.20 |
| | | _ | | d open discussion | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4.20 | 816/1269 | | 4.15 | 4.31 | 4.33 | 4.20 |
| 4. Were sp | pecial te | chniques succe | ssiul | | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/ 854 | **** | 3.80 | 4.02 | 4.00 | **** |
| | | Field | Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did fie | eld exper | | | hat you learned | 15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 47 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.83 | **** |
| I. Dia lie | cra caper | rence concriba | CC CO W | nac you rearned | | Ü | _ | O | Ü | Ü | Ü | 1.00 | , 1, | | | | 1.05 | |
| | | | | Frequ | ency | Dist | ribu | ution | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | | | Rea | asons | ; | | | Ту | ре | | | Majors | \$ |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 00-27 | | | | | | | | ed fo | or Ma | jor | S | 0 | Graduat | е | 0 | Majo | r | 3 |
| 28-55 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | | | | | | | neral | L | | | | 0 | Under-g | rad 1 | .6 | Non- | major | 13 |
| 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grad. | F 0 | | El∈ | ectiv | res | | | | 0 | #### - | | | | _ | jh | | | |
| | | | | P 0 | | | | | | | | | respons | es to b | e sign | ifican | ıt | |
| | | | I 0 | | Oth | ıer | | | | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | |

| Course-Section | : CMSC 304 0101 | University of Maryland | Page 416 |
|----------------|----------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Title | ETHICAL ISSUES IN IT | Baltimore County | JUN 26, 2007 |
| Instructor: | WILSON, RICHARD | Spring 2007 | Job IRBR3029 |
| Enrollment: | 8 | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questionnaires: 8

| | | | | | | | | _ | ncies | 3 | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|-----------|---|-----------------|---------|--------------------|------|--------|-------|------|-------|------|---|------|-----------|---------|--------|---------|--------|----------|
| | | Question | S | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | Genera | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did yo | u gain n | ew insights,ski | | m this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 3.88 | 1234/1522 | 4.00 | 4.05 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 3.88 |
| | | ctor make clear | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3.43 | 1396/1522 | 3.88 | 3.97 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 3.43 |
| | | uestions reflec | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 531/1285 | 4.38 | 4.10 | 4.30 | 4.30 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did ot | her eval | uations reflect | the ex | pected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 265/1476 | 4.66 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 4.71 |
| 5. Did as | signed r | eadings contrib | ute 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 wr | itten as | signments contr | ibute t | o 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 th | e gradin | g system clearl | y expla | ined | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 3.88 | 1105/1500 | 4.00 | 4.01 | 4.18 | 4.13 | 3.88 |
| 8. How ma | ny times | was class canc | elled | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 555/1517 | 4.90 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.62 | 4.88 |
| 9. How wo | uld you | grade the overa | ll tead | hing effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3.50 | 1277/1497 | 3.70 | 3.89 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 3.50 |
| | | Lectur | e | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were t | he instr | uctor's lecture | s 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 th | e instru | ctor seem inter | ested i | n 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 le | cture ma | terial presente | d and e | 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 th | Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | | | | | | | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3.75 | 1191/1432 | 3.78 | 4.01 | 4.29 | 4.29 | 3.75 |
| 5. Did au | diovisua | l techniques en | hance y | our understanding | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | 606/1221 | 3.58 | 3.86 | 3.93 | 3.94 | 4.00 |
| | | Discus | sion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did cl | ass disc | ussions contrib | ute 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 a | ll stude | nts actively en | courage | ed 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 th | e instru | ctor encourage | fair ar | d 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 s | pecial to | echniques succe | ssful | | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | 426/ 854 | 4.19 | 3.80 | 4.02 | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| | | | | Frequ | ency | / Dist | trib | atio | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | | | Rea | asons | 1 | | | Ту | pe | | | Majors | . |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A 7 | | Red | quire | ed f | or Ma | jors | 3 | 2 | Graduat | e | 0 | Majo | or | 6 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | в 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C 0 | | Ger | nera: | l | | | | 2 | Under-g | rad | 8 | Non- | -major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 4 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F 0 | | Ele | ecti | ves | | | | 2 | #### - 1 | | | | | ıh |
| | | | | P 0 | | | her | | | | | | respons | es to b | e sign | nificar | ıt | |
| | I 0 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| | | | | ? 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: CMSC 304 0102 University of Maryland ETHICAL ISSUES IN IT Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD

Enrollment: 22

Questionnaires: 15

Title

Page 417 JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

| | Frequencies | | | | | | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | d Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|----------|----------|---------------------|---|--------------|--------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | А | 8 | Required for Majors | 2 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 5 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 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 | n |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 6 | _ | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 313 0101 University of Maryland Title COMP ORGAN & ASSEMB LA Baltimore County

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Instructor: BURT, GARY

Enrollment: 31
Ouestionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 418

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 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 12 0 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 3 0 0 0 1.60 1274/1277 2.30 4.02 4.34 4.38 1.60

Frequency Distribution

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 ****

| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | d Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | 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 | В | 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 | h |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | nificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 17 | _ | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |

Title COMP ORGAN & ASSEMB LA

Instructor: BURT, GARY

Enrollment:

21 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 419 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 3 2 5 6 1 3.00 1489/1522 2.29 4.05 4.30 4.34 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 2 2 9 9 3 1 2.94 1488/1522 2.18 3.97 4.26 4.25 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 | Sect |
|--|------|
| 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 | Mean |
| 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 | |
| 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 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 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 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 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 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 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 3 9 4 4.06 1368/1517 3.97 4.74 4.65 4.62 | 3.00 |
| 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 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 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 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 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 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 3 9 4 4.06 1368/1517 3.97 4.74 4.65 4.62 | 2.94 |
| 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 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 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 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 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 3 9 4 4.06 1368/1517 3.97 4.74 4.65 4.62 | 3.41 |
| 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 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 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 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 3 9 4 4.06 1368/1517 3.97 4.74 4.65 4.62 | 3.00 |
| 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 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 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 | 2.87 |
| 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 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 | 2.92 |
| 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 | 3.06 |
| | 4.06 |
| J. Now would fou grade the overall teaching effectiveness I I J I J V V 2.75 1132/117/ 2.15 3.05 1.11 1.15 | |
| | 2.75 |
| 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 | 2 00 |
| 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 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 |
| the state of the s | 3.00 |
| | 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 | **** |
| 1. Did little experience contribute to what you realised to 0 0 1 0 0 5.00 / 17 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16 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 E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|----------|--------|---------------------|----|--------------|--------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | А | 6 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 14 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 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 | n |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 14 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 331 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 420

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Title PRIN OF PROG LANGUAGES Instructor: VICK, SHON Spring 2007

Enrollment: 19

Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | Fre | equer | ncie | s | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-----|------|----------|-------|------|----|---|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 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 | | 1436/1448 | | 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 | Ο | 3 | 0 | Ο | 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 | | 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 | | 1174/1269 | 3.25 | 4.15 | 4.31 | 4.39 | 3.25 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 8 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ 854 | | 3.80 | 4.02 | 4.00 | **** |
| Frequ | ona | Diat | - r i bı | 1+101 | 2 | | | | | | | | | |

| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | d 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 | В | 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 sig | nificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 9 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

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

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 421

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: NIRENBURG, SERG Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 9 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | | | | | Frequencies | | | | Instructor | | Course Dept | | ept UMBC Level | | Sect | |
|--|-----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|-------|----------|-------------------|------|-------|-------|------------|----------|-------------|---------|----------------|--------|--------|------|
| | Questions | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | | |
| | | Genera | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did yo | ou gain n | ew insights,ski | lls fro | om this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 3.56 | 1383/1522 | 3.49 | 4.05 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 3.56 |
| | | ctor make clear | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3.44 | 1388/1522 | 3.06 | 3.97 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 3.44 |
| | | uestions reflec | | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3.89 | 1034/1285 | 3.32 | 4.10 | 4.30 | 4.30 | 3.89 |
| | _ | uations reflect | | | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 1009/1476 | 3.32 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did as | ssigned r | eadings contrib | ute 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 wr | ritten as | signments contr | ibute t | 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 th | ne gradin | g system clearl | y expla | ained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 4.33 | 700/1500 | 3.26 | 4.01 | 4.18 | 4.13 | 4.33 |
| 8. How ma | any times | was class cand | elled | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 532/1517 | 4.36 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.62 | 4.89 |
| 9. How wo | ould you | grade the overa | ll tead | ching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.14 | 1400/1497 | 2.62 | 3.89 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 3.14 |
| | | Lectur | e | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were t | the instr | uctor's lecture | s 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 th | ne instru | ctor seem inter | ested i | 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 le | ecture ma | terial presente | d and e | 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 th | ne lectur | es contribute t | o 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 | |
| | | Discus | sion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did cl | lass disc | ussions contrib | ute to | what you learned | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/1280 | 2.50 | 3.89 | 4.10 | 4.14 | **** |
| 2. Were a | all stude | nts actively en | courage | ed to participate | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/1277 | 2.75 | 4.02 | 4.34 | 4.38 | **** |
| 3. Did th | ne instru | ctor encourage | fair ar | nd open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1269 | 3.25 | 4.15 | 4.31 | 4.39 | **** |
| 4. Were s | special t | echniques succe | ssful | | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 854 | **** | 3.80 | 4.02 | 4.00 | **** |
| | | | | Frequ | iency | / Dis | trib | utio | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades | | | | | | | | Re | ason | 3 | | | Туј | pe | | | Majors | 5 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 2 | | ке | quir | ea i | or Ma | ajors | 5 | 0 | Graduat | e | 0 | Majo | r | 6 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 5 C 1 | | a | | , | | | | 0 | TT | | 0 | Mari | | 2 |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | | | Ge | nera | Т | | | | 0 | Under-g | rad | 9 | Non- | -major | 3 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | = * | | | | | | | | 0 | шшшш , | Maana + | . h | | | -la |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F 0 P 0 | | ET. | ecti [.] | ves | | | | 0 | #### - 1 | | | | _ | ltt. |
| | | | | I 0 | | 0+1 | la a | | | | | 8 | respons | es lo I | be sign | iiican | 11 | |
| | | | | Ι Ο | | Ut. | her | | | | | Ö | | | | | | |

Title DATA STRUCTURES

Instructor: FREY, DENNIS

Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 422 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | Frequencies | | cies | | | Tnst | tructor | Course Dept | | UMBC Level | | Sect | | |
|----|--|-------------|----|------|---|---|------|---------|-------------|-----------|------------|------|------|------|------|
| | Ouestions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | Mean | | Mean | Mean |
| | ~~~~~ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 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 |
| | 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 |
| | 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 |
| | 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 |
| | How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 4.94 | 341/1517 | | 4.74 | | 4.62 | 4.94 |
| | How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 4.69 | 240/1497 | | 3.89 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.69 |
| | 1 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 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 |
| | 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 |
| | 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 |
| | 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 |
| | Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 4.00 | 606/1221 | | 3.86 | | | 4.00 |
| ٥. | bia additivibual teemingaes emanee jour anacistanaing | _ | - | O | _ | - | 3 | - | 1.00 | 000/1221 | 1.25 | 3.00 | 3.75 | 3.71 | 1.00 |
| | 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 | **** |
| | Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | | ****/1277 | 4.05 | 4.02 | 4.34 | 4.38 | **** |
| | Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | | ****/1269 | | 4.15 | 4.31 | 4.39 | **** |
| | Were special techniques successful | 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 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 | **** |
| | Were you provided with adequate background information | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 228 | **** | 4.53 | 4.35 | 4.29 | **** |
| | Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 217 | **** | 4.53 | 4.51 | 4.45 | **** |
| | Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 216 | **** | 4.75 | 4.42 | 4.35 | **** |
| | Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | **** | 4.63 | 5.00 | **** |
| | Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | *** | **** |
| | Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 33 | **** | **** | 4.69 | 4.75 | **** |
| | 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 | *** | **** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0101
Title DATA STRUCTURES
Instructor: FREY, DENNIS

31

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 422 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Credits E | Earned | ed Cum. GPA | | | Grades | Reasons | | Туре | Majors | | |
|-----------|--------|-------------|---|-------|--------|---------------------|----|--------------|-----------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 5 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 11 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 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 | h |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | gnificant | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 15 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

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

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Instructor: KARGUPTA, HILLO Enrollment: 27

Questionnaires: 12

Page 423 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

| - | | | | |
|----------|----------|------------|----------|-----------|
| Ctudant | ('Ollred | Evaluation | Ougetion | ם אינ כמו |
| | | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Fre | equer 2 | ncies 3 | 4 | 5 | Inst Mean | ructor Rank | Course Mean | Dept Mean | | Level Mean | Sect 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 | | 4.65 | 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 4 | 0 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 2 | 2 | 6 3 | 4.38 | 692/1269 391/ 854 | 4.06 4.14 | 4.15 | 4.31 | 4.39 | 4.38 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 1 | U | U | 4 | ۷ | 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 | | ****/ 215 | **** | 4.64 | 4.36 | 4.21 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 228 | **** | 4.53 | 4.35 | 4.29 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 217 | **** | 4.53 | 4.51 | 4.45 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ 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 | | | | | | _ | | | | | | 4 = 0 | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 79 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 4.53 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 77 | **** | | 4.52 | 4.30 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 11 11 | 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 1 0 | 0 | 0 1 | 3.00 | ****/ 65 ****/ 78 | **** | **** | 4.49 4.45 | 4.33 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 80 | *** | **** | 4.11 | 3.33 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made crear | 11 | U | U | U | U | | U | 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 | | ****/ 47 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.56 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 45 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.39 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.40 | 4.68 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 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 | ^^^ | * * * * * |

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0201
Title DATA STRUCTURES
Instructor: KARGUPTA, HILLO

27

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 423 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Credits E | Carned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | l Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | 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 | В | 4 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 1 | General | | 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 | 1 |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 10 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| 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 |

| | | | Fre | equei | ncie | s | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------|------|------|-------|------|----|----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 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 | | 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 | | 1030/1269 | 4.06 | 4.15 | 4.31 | 4.39 | 3.75 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 17 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | ****/ 854 | | 3.80 | 4.02 | 4.00 | **** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Frequ | iency | Dist | ribı | atio | 1 | | | | | | | | | |

| Credits E | Carned | Cum. GPA | | Expecte | d Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|-----------|--------|-----------|---|---------|----------|---------------------|----|--------------|--------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 9 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 7 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 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 | n |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 22 | _ | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

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

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Instructor: MITCHELL, SUSAN Enrollment: 26

Questionnaires: 24

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 425 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

| Overtions | | | | | | | Fre | eque: | ncie | :S | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|------------|---|-----------------|---------|--------------------|------|--------|-------|-------|------|------|-------|------|-----------|---------|--------|--------|--------|------|
| | | Question | S | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | Genera | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Did voi | n gain ne | ew insights,ski | | m this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 8 | 4 13 | 1033/1522 | 4.28 | 4.05 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.13 |
| | | ctor make clear | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 9 | 4.25 | 874/1522 | 4.43 | 3.97 | 4.26 | 4.25 | 4.25 |
| | | uestions reflec | | | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 4.00 | 938/1285 | 4.24 | 4.10 | 4.30 | 4.30 | 4.00 |
| | _ | uations reflect | | _ | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 8 | 4.22 | | 4.41 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 4.22 |
| | | | | what you learned | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3 | | 1355/1412 | | 3.40 | 4.06 | 4.03 | 2.86 |
| | | | | o what you learned | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | 1086/1381 | | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 3.68 |
| | | g system clearl | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 10 | | 966/1500 | | 4.01 | 4.18 | 4.13 | 4.04 |
| | | was class canc | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 20 | 4.83 | | | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.62 | 4.83 |
| | | | | hing effectiveness | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 6 | 4.05 | 865/1497 | | 3.89 | 4.11 | 4.13 | 4.05 |
| | - | | | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Lectur | е | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were th | he instr | uctor's lecture | s 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 | e instru | ctor seem inter | ested i | n 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 led | cture mat | terial presente | d and e | xplained 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 | Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | | | | | | | 3 | 3 | 8 | 10 | 4.04 | 1018/1432 | 4.36 | 4.01 | 4.29 | 4.29 | 4.04 |
| 5. Did aud | . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | | | | | | | 3 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 4.00 | 606/1221 | 4.24 | 3.86 | 3.93 | 3.94 | 4.00 |
| | | - | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Discus | sion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did cla | ass disc | ussions contrib | ute 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 al | ll stude | nts actively en | courage | d 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 | e instru | ctor encourage | fair an | d 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 sp | pecial te | echniques succe | ssful | | 6 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 3.82 | 560/ 854 | 4.28 | 3.80 | 4.02 | 4.00 | 3.82 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Frequ | ency | / Dist | crib | utio | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Ea | arned | Expected Grades | | | | Re | ason | ıs | | | Ту | pe | | | Majors | | | |
| 00-27 | 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 16 | | | | | | | ed f | or M | ajor | s | 0 | Graduat | e | 0 | Majo | or | 21 |
| 28-55 | | | | | | | | | | , | | - | | - | - |) - | | |
| 56-83 | 56-83 6 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 | | | | | Ger | nera: | 1 | | | | 0 | Under-q | rad 2 | 4 | Non- | -major | 3 |
| 84-150 | 84-150 7 3.00-3.49 8 D 0 | | | | | | | | | | | - | 2 | | | | 5 | - |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F 0 | | Ele | ectiv | ves | | | | 1 | #### - 1 | Means t | here a | re not | enou | h |
| | - | | | P 0 | | | | | | | | | respons | | | | _ | |
| | | | | I O | | Oth | ner | | | | 2 | :1 | | | 5 | | | |
| | ? 1 | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 426

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

0 1 2 12 4.73 113/ 854 4.28 3.80 4.02 4.00 4.73

Instructor: MITCHELL, SUSAN Enrollment: 31

Ouestionnaires: 25

4. Were special techniques successful

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 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 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 4 0 0 4 3 14 4.48 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 5 18 4.60 432/1522 4.43 3.97 4.26 4.25 4.60 566/1285 4.24 4.10 4.30 4.30 4.48 378/1476 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 3.91 585/1381 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 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 8012594.29 612/1497 4.17 3.89 4.11 4.13 4.29 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 Ω Ω Ω 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 1 273/1280 4.29 3.89 4.10 4.14 4.68 4 14 4.68 2 16 4.79 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 0 1 340/1277 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

Frequency Distribution

6 4

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | d Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | 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 | В | 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 | n |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be si | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 22 | _ | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 411 0101 University of Maryland
Title COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE Baltimore County
Instructor: SQUIRE, JON S Spring 2007

University of Maryland Page 427
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Frequencies

| Enrollment: | 35 | | | | |
|-----------------|----|-----------|--------|------------|---------------|
| Questionnaires: | 12 | Student (| Course | Evaluation | Questionnaire |

| | | | 111 | -quc. | | ٠. | _ | | - Luctor | COULDC | _ | | псист | |
|---|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----|----------|-----------|----------|--------|--------|--------|----------------|
| 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 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | | | | | | 4.34 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | | 0 | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 10 | | 446/1285 | 4.49 | | | | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | | | | | | | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | | 1 | | 2 | 1 | | | 1319/1412 | | 3.40 | | 4.11 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | | 2 | 0 | - | 3 | | | | 663/1381 | | | | 4.21 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | . 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | 406/1500 | | | | | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 5.00 | | | | | | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | - | • | 1 | 0 | 1 | | | | 1034/1497 | | | | | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 0 | Τ | 1 | U | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3.91 | 1034/149/ | 3.95 | 3.09 | 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 | | 0 | | 1 | 0 | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | | | | | | | | | 1056/1436 | | | | 4.32 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | | 0 | 1 | | 2 | | | | 991/1432 | | | | | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | | 2 | 0 | 0 | | 1 | | | 380/1221 | | | | | |
| 5. Did dadiovibadi ecomiques emanee your anderseanding | _ | | O | O | _ | _ | 5 | 1.50 | 300/1221 | 3.50 | 3.00 | 3.75 | 1.01 | 1.50 |
| 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 | **** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Freq | quency | y Dis | tribu | utio | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades | | | | ъ- | | _ | | | П | | | | Majors | |
| credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades | ; | | | | ason | 5 | | | Туј | ,e | | | Majors | |
| 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 9 | | Re | auire | ed f | or Ma | aior | s | 0 | Graduate | <u> </u> | 0 | Majo | r | 9 |
| 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 | | | 1 | | | 5 | _ | - | | _ | - | | _ | _ |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 | | Ge | nera | l | | | | 1 | Under-g | rad 1 | 2 | Non- | major | 3 |
| 84-150 7 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 | | | | | | | | | 3 | | | | - | |
| Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 | | El | ectiv | ves | | | | 0 | #### - 1 | Means t | here a | re not | enoug | _j h |
| Р 0 | | | | | | | | response | | | | _ | | |
| I O | | Ot. | her | | | | 1 | 1 | <u>-</u> | | | | - | |
| ? 0 | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | | |
| · | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 411 0201 University of Maryland Title COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE

Baltimore County Instructor: SQUIRE, JON S Spring 2007

Enrollment: 34 Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 428

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

| 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 3.01d 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 4.01 d.0 do ther evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 3 1 0 0 7 5 4.15 903/1476 4.33 3.96 4.22 4.31 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 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 7.00 0 0 0 1 2 3 10 4.38 660/1500 4.48 4.01 4.18 4.25 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 8 3 4.00 898/1497 3.95 3.89 4.11 4.21 1.00 0 0 0 1 1 8 3 4.00 898/1497 3.95 3.89 4.11 4.21 1.00 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 8 3 4.00 898/1497 3.95 3.89 4.11 4.21 1.00 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 8 3 4.00 898/1497 3.95 3.89 4.11 4.21 1.00 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 8 5.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 | Q.,,,,, | | | | | | | Fr | eque | ncies | 3 | | Inst | cructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|---------------------------------------|--------------|------------------|---------|---------------------|-------|----------|------|------|-------|------|----------|------|----------------|--------|------|------|--------|----------|
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 3 5 7 4.13 1033/1522 4.10 4.05 4.30 4.42 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 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. 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 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 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 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 2 3 10 4.38 660/1500 4.48 4.01 4.18 4.25 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 3 10 4.38 660/1500 4.48 4.01 4.18 4.25 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 1 1 1 8 3 4.00 898/1497 3.95 3.89 4.11 4.21 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 2 4.50 6.71446 4.63 4.22 4.45 4.52 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 15 4.88 575/1448 4.79 4.63 4.71 4.75 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. 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 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 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 1 3.00 ****/1280 **** 3.89 4.10 4.28 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 0 0 2 0 0 1 3.00 ****/1269 **** 4.15 4.31 4.49 4.04 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 | | | Questions | s | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 0 7 8 4.38 738/1522 4.31 3.97 4.26 4.34 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. 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 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 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 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 2 3 10 4.38 660/1500 4.48 4.01 4.18 4.25 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 5.00 1/1517 5.00 4.74 4.65 4.71 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 1 1 1 8 3 4.00 898/1497 3.95 3.89 4.11 4.21 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 2. Did the instructor's seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5 4.88 575/1448 4.79 4.63 4.71 4.75 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 2 3 3 2 9 4.13 987/1436 4.06 4.04 4.29 4.32 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 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 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 0 2.00 ***/1280 **** 4.02 4.34 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 2 0 0 1 3.00 ****/1280 **** 4.15 4.31 4.49 4.04 4.05 4.04 4.02 4.31 4.05 4.06 4.04 4.04 4.09 4.06 4.04 4.09 4.06 4.06 4.06 4.06 4.06 4.06 4.06 4.06 | | | Genera | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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. 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 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 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 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 2 3 10 4.38 660/1500 4.48 4.01 4.18 4.25 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 4 5.00 1/1517 5.00 4.74 4.65 4.71 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 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 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 15 4.88 575/1448 4.79 4.63 4.71 4.75 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. 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 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 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 1.00 ****/1280 **** 4.15 4.31 4.50 4.04 4.09 4.32 4.04 4.09 4.32 4.04 4.09 4.34 4.50 4.06 4.04 4.29 4.34 4.50 4.06 4.04 4.29 4.34 4.50 4.06 4.04 4.29 4.34 4.50 4.06 4.04 4.29 4.34 4.50 4.06 4.04 4.29 4.34 4.50 4.06 4.04 4.29 4.34 4.50 4.06 4.04 4.29 4.34 4.50 4.06 4.04 4.29 4.34 4.50 4.06 4.06 4.06 4.06 4.06 4.06 4.06 4.0 | . Did | you gain ne | ew insights,ski | lls fro | om this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 4.13 | 1033/1522 | 4.10 | 4.05 | 4.30 | 4.42 | 4.13 |
| 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 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 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 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 2 3 10 4.38 660/1500 4.48 4.01 4.18 4.25 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 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 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 452/1440 4.63 4.22 4.45 4.52 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 15 4.88 575/1448 4.79 4.63 4.71 4.75 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. 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 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 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 4.59 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02 | 2. Did | the instru | ctor make clear | the ex | xpected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 4.38 | 738/1522 | 4.31 | 3.97 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.38 |
| 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 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 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 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 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 1 1 1 8 3 4.00 898/1497 3.95 3.89 4.11 4.21 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 452/1440 4.63 4.22 4.45 4.52 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 2. 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 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 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 4.99 4. Were special techniques successful 13 2 1 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/854 **** 3.80 4.02 4.31 4.99 4. Were special techniques successful 13 2 1 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/854 **** 3.80 4.02 4.31 | 3. Did ' | the exam qu | estions reflect | t the e | expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 4.40 | 650/1285 | 4.49 | 4.10 | 4.30 | 4.42 | 4.40 |
| 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 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 2 3 10 4.38 660/1500 4.48 4.01 4.18 4.25 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 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 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 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 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. 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 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 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 4.50 3. Did the instructor 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 4.50 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 4.50 4.50 3. Distribution | . Did | other evalu | uations reflect | the ex | xpected goals | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 4.15 | 903/1476 | 4.33 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.31 | 4.15 |
| 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 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 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 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 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 15 4.88 575/1448 4.79 4.63 4.71 4.75 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 4.34 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 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 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 | . Did | assigned re | eadings contrib | ute 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 |
| 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 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 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 452/1440 4.63 4.22 4.45 4.52 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 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. 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 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 Discussion 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 | . Did | written ass | signments contr | ibute t | 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 |
| 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 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 452/1440 4.63 4.22 4.45 4.52 4.02 4.01 4.75 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 2 3 2 9 4.13 987/1436 4.06 4.04 4.29 4.32 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 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 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0 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 | 7. Was | the grading | g system clearly | y expla | ained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 4.38 | 660/1500 | 4.48 | 4.01 | 4.18 | 4.25 | 4.38 |
| Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Did the instructor encouraged to participate 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Discussion 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discu | . How i | many times | was class cance | elled | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1517 | 5.00 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.71 | 5.00 |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 452/1440 4.63 4.22 4.45 4.52 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 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. 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 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 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 |). How t | would you | grade the overa | ll tead | ching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 4.00 | 898/1497 | 3.95 | 3.89 | 4.11 | 4.21 | 4.00 |
| 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 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. 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 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 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 Frequency Distribution | | | Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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. 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 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 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 | . Were | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 4.75 | 452/1440 | 4.63 | 4.22 | 4.45 | 4.52 | 4.75 |
| 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 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 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 | 2. Did ' | the instruc | in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 4.88 | 575/1448 | 4.79 | 4.63 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.88 | | |
| 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 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 | 3. Was | lecture mat | terial presented | d and e | explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 4.13 | 987/1436 | 4.06 | 4.04 | 4.29 | 4.32 | 4.13 |
| 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 | . Did | the lecture | es contribute to | o what | you learned | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 3.93 | 1099/1432 | 4.02 | 4.01 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 3.93 |
| 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 | . Did a | audiovisua | l techniques enl | hance y | your understanding | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 3.58 | 867/1221 | 3.98 | 3.86 | 3.93 | 4.04 | 3.58 |
| 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 | | | Discus | sion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | . Did | class disc | ussions contrib | ute to | what you learned | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1280 | **** | 3.89 | 4.10 | 4.28 | **** |
| 4. Were special techniques successful 13 2 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 854 **** 3.80 4.02 4.31 Frequency Distribution | 2. Were | e all studer | nts actively end | courage | ed to participate | 14 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/1277 | **** | 4.02 | 4.34 | 4.50 | **** |
| Frequency Distribution | 3. Did ' | the instruc | ctor encourage : | fair ar | nd open discussion | 13 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/1269 | **** | 4.15 | 4.31 | 4.49 | **** |
| | l. Were | e special to | echniques succes | ssful | | 13 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 854 | **** | 3.80 | 4.02 | 4.31 | **** |
| Guadita Dannad Gum GDA Dannastad Guadan Dannas Branca Maian | | | | | Frequ | iency | / Dist | trib | utio | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major | Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad | | | | | | | | Rea | asons | 3 | | | Ty | pe | | | Majors | ; |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | |
| 00-27 | | | | | | | Red | quir | ed f | or Ma | ajor | s | 0 | Graduat | е | 0 | Majo | or | 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 | | - | | U | - | | a | | 1 | | | | 0 | TT-s el ser su | | _ | Man | | _ |

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expecte | d Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|---------|----------|---------------------|----|--------------|-------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 10 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 11 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 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 | h |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be si | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 15 | _ | | | |
| | | | | 2 | Λ | | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 421 0101

Title PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS

Instructor: YESHA, YELENA

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 429 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | Fre | eane | ncies | . | | Inst | tructor | Course | Dept. | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-----|------|-------|----------|---|------|-----------|--------|-------|------|-------|------|
| Ouestions | NR | NA | 1 | _ | 3 | 4 | 5 | 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 | | 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 | | | 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 | | 1412/1432 | | | 4.29 | 4.34 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 1 | | 1117/1221 | | 3.86 | 3.93 | 4.04 | |
| J. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding | | _ | J | U | , | J | _ | 2.03 | 111//1221 | 3.30 | 3.00 | 3.93 | 1.01 | 2.03 |
| 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 | | 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 | | ****/ 35 | **** | **** | 4.31 | 4.13 | **** |
| 1. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | | J | Ü | O | J | - | Ü | 1.00 | , 33 | | | 1.31 | 1.15 | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | , - | **** | **** | 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 | **** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 421 0101

Title PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS

Instructor: YESHA, YELENA

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 20

YESHA, YELENA

Spring 2007

Page 429 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

| Credits E | Earned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | Majors | |
|-----------|--------|-----------|---|----------|--------|---------------------|----|--------------|-------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 6 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 16 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 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 | n |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be si | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 19 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 421 0201

PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS

Title Instructor: PERICH, FILIP

Enrollment: 46

Questionnaires: 28

Spring 2007

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 430 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | Fre | eque | ncie | s | | Ins | tructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|--------|----------|------|----------|----|----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 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 | | 1267/1522 | | 3.97 | 4.26 | 4.34 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 6 | 8 | | 1129/1285 | | 4.10 | 4.30 | 4.42 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 7 | 2 | | 1406/1476 | | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.31 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 6 | | 1225/1412 | | 3.40 | 4.06 | 4.11 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 8 | 8 | | | 1265/1381 | | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.21 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 9 | | | 1190/1500 | | | 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 | | | | 1174/1440 | | | | 4.52 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 17 | | | | | 4.71 | | 4.54 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | | 10 | | 1040/1436 | | 4.04 | 4.29 | 4.32 | 4.04 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 6 | 11 | | 1072/1432 | | | 4.29 | 4.34 | |
| 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 | **** |
| Evor | | . Diat | - w i bı | .+ . | 5 | | | | | | | | | |

| Credits E | Carned | Cum. GPA | | Expecte | d Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | 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 | В | 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 | n |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | nificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 26 | - | | | |
| | | | | 2 | Ο | | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 421H 0101 University of Maryland Page 431 Title Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| 11010 | | Balelmore country |
|-------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Instructor: | JOSHI, ANUPAM | Spring 2007 |
| Enrollment: | 9 | |

Questionnaires: 9

| | | | Fre | equei | ncies | 3 | | Inst | tructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-----|-------|-------|---|---|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | **** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | d Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|----------|----------|---------------------|---|--------------|--------|----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 2 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 9 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 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 | |
| | | | | Р | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | nificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 7 | - | _ | | |
| | | | | 2 | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 433 0101 University of Maryla Title SCRIPTING LANGUAGES Baltimore County Instructor: HOOD, DANIEL J Spring 2007

I 0

? 1

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 42

60

University of Maryland Page 432
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

13

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

| | | | | Fre | equer | ncies | 3 | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect | | | |
|----------------|-----------|-----------------|----------|--------------------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|--------|--------|------|-----------|---------|--------|--------|---------|---------|
| | | Question | ns | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | Genera | al | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did yo | ou gain n | ew insights,sk: | ills fro | m 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 th | he instru | ctor make clear | r the ex | pected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 39 | 4.93 | 102/1522 | 4.93 | 3.97 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.93 |
| 3. Did th | he exam q | uestions reflec | ct the e | 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 ot | ther eval | uations reflect | t the ex | pected goals | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 30 | 4.88 | 135/1476 | 4.88 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.31 | 4.88 |
| 5. Did as | ssigned r | eadings contril | bute 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 wr | ritten as | signments conti | ribute t | o 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 th | he gradin | g system clear | ly expla | ined | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 38 | 4.90 | 109/1500 | 4.90 | 4.01 | 4.18 | 4.25 | 4.90 |
| 8. How ma | any times | was class cand | celled | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 39 | 4.95 | 244/1517 | 4.95 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.71 | 4.95 |
| 9. How wo | ould you | grade the over | all tead | hing effectiveness | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 31 | 4.61 | 304/1497 | 4.61 | 3.89 | 4.11 | 4.21 | 4.61 |
| | | Lectu | re | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were t | the instr | uctor's lecture | es 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 th | he instru | ctor seem inter | rested i | n 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 le | ecture ma | terial presente | ed and e | xplained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 37 | 4.88 | 141/1436 | 4.88 | 4.04 | 4.29 | 4.32 | 4.88 |
| 4. Did th | he lectur | es contribute t | 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 au | udiovisua | l techniques en | nhance y | our understanding | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 32 | 4.81 | 99/1221 | 4.81 | 3.86 | 3.93 | 4.04 | 4.81 |
| | | Discus | ssion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did cl | lass disc | ussions contrib | bute to | what you learned | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.75 | ****/1280 | **** | 3.89 | 4.10 | 4.28 | *** |
| 2. Were a | all stude | nts actively en | ncourage | d to participate | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | ****/1277 | **** | 4.02 | 4.34 | 4.50 | * * * * |
| 3. Did th | he instru | ctor encourage | fair ar | d open discussion | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/1269 | **** | 4.15 | 4.31 | 4.49 | **** |
| 4. Were s | special t | echniques succe | essful | | 39 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 854 | **** | 3.80 | 4.02 | 4.31 | **** |
| | | | | Frequ | ency | Dist | trib | ıtior | ı | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits E | Earned | Cum. GPA | A | Expected Grades | | | | Rea | asons | 3 | | | Туј | pe | | | Majors | 1 |
| 00-27 | | 0.00-0.99 | | A 18 | | | | | | | | | Cwadust | | 1 | | | 20 |
| 00-27 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | A 18 B 16 | | кес | 4uire | eu ro | or Ma | Jor | S | 2 | Graduat | e | 1 | Majo |)T | 38 |
| 28-55 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 6 | C 5 | | Gor | nera: | 1 | | | - | 24 | Under-g | rad 1 | 1 | Non | major | 4 |
| 84-150 | 22 | 3.00-2.99 | 11 | D 0 | | Gel | ici d. | L | | | 2 | . 1 | onder -g. | rau 4 | τ | NOII- | iia jul | 4 |
| Grad. | 1 | 3.50-4.00 | 13 | F 0 | | בוק | ectiv | 700 | | | | 1 | #### - 1 | Meane + | here a | re not | enous | h |
| Grau. | Τ. | 3.30-4.00 | 13 | P 0 | | 11.17 | LULL | a o | | | | _ | respons | | | | _ | 11 |

Other

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: CMSC 441 0101

ALGORITHMS

37

YESHA, YAACOV

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 10

Page 433 JUN 26, 2007 Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

| C+ | a | The second second second | A |
|---------|----------|--------------------------|---------------|
| Student | course | Evaluation | Ouestionnaire |

| | | | Fre | equei | ncies | 3 | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|------------|-----|----------|-------|-------|---|--------|------|-------------------|--------|-------|---------|--------|--------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| . Did you gain new insights, skills from this cour | rse 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3.90 | 1220/1522 | 4.23 | 4.05 | 4.30 | 4.42 | 3.9 |
| . Did the instructor make clear the expected goal | ls 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 3.90 | 1190/1522 | 4.12 | 3.97 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 3.9 |
| . Did the exam questions reflect the expected goa | als 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.30 | 731/1285 | 4.48 | 4.10 | 4.30 | 4.42 | 4.3 |
| . Did other evaluations reflect the expected goal | ls 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3.71 | 1217/1476 | 4.16 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.31 | 3.7 |
| . Did assigned readings contribute to what you le | earned 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3.33 | 1257/1412 | 3.61 | 3.40 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 3.3 |
| . 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 | 4.2 |
| . 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 | 4.2 |
| . 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 | 5.0 |
| . How would you grade the overall teaching effect | tiveness 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3.67 | 1204/1497 | 4.21 | 3.89 | 4.11 | 4.21 | 3.6 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| . 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 | 4.0 |
| . Did the instructor seem interested in the subje | ect 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.50 | 1157/1448 | 4.75 | 4.63 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.5 |
| . Was lecture material presented and explained cl | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 3.50 | 1282/1436 | 3.81 | 4.04 | 4.29 | 4.32 | 3. |
| . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | _ | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.00 | 1036/1432 | 4.39 | 4.01 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4. |
| . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your underst | | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3.50 | 899/1221 | 3.50 | 3.86 | 3.93 | 4.04 | 3. |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| . Did class discussions contribute to what you le | earned 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.33 | 1106/1280 | 3.50 | 3.89 | 4.10 | 4.28 | 3. |
| . Were all students actively encouraged to partic | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.33 | 1183/1277 | 3.67 | 4.02 | 4.34 | 4.50 | 3. |
| . Did the instructor encourage fair and open disc | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 1207/1269 | 3.17 | 4.15 | 4.31 | 4.49 | 3. |
| | Frequency | Dis | trib | utio | ı | | | | | | | | | |
| redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected | d Grades | | | Rea | asons | 3 | | | Ту | pe | | | Majors | |
| redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected | | | quir | Rea | asons | | :s | 0 | Ty Graduat | | 0 | Maj | - | Majors |

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|----------|--------|---------------------|----|--------------|--------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 8 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 10 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 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 | n |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | mificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 10 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 434 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

Course-Section: CMSC 441 0201

ALGORITHMS

24

KALPAKIS, KONST

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 10

| | | | Fre | equer | ncies | 5 | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-----|-------|-------|---|--------|------|--------------------|--------|------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 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 |
| T a mbuusa | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lecture | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4 70 | 410/1440 | 4 20 | 4 22 | 4 4 5 | 4 50 | 4 70 |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 9 | 1 | 412/1440 1/1448 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.45 4.71 | 4.52 4.75 | 4.78 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4.11 | 995/1436 | 3.81 | 4.03 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.11 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 7 | | 327/1430 | | 4.04 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.11 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | • | | - , - | | | | | 4.78 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | / | U | U | 2 | U | 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 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | l Grades | Reasons | | Type | Majors | | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|----------|----------|---------------------|---|--------------|--------|----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 3 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 1 | Major | 9 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 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 | ı |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | nificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 9 | | | | |
| | | | | 2 | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 445 0101 University of Maryland Title SOFTWARE ENGINEERING Baltimore County SEGALL, ZARY

Spring 2007

Instructor: Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 21

Page 435 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

| - | | | | |
|----------|----------|------------|----------|-----------|
| Ctudant | ('Ollred | Evaluation | Ougetion | ם אינ כמר |
| | | | | |

| | | | Fre | equei | ncie | s | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------|------|-----|---------|------|-----|----|------|-----------|--------------|------|------|-------|--------------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 4 | 2 75 | 1295/1522 | 2 75 | 4 05 | 4.30 | 4.42 | 3.75 |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | Τ | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 4 | | 1396/1522 | | 3.97 | 4.30 | 4.42 | 3.75 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | | ****/1285 | 3.43 **** | 4.10 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 3.43 **** |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | Τ | | 2 | 1 | Τ. | 0 | | | , | | | | | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 6 | _ | Τ | 5 | 2 | 5 | | 1334/1476 | | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.31 | 3.47 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | Ţ | 2 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 2 | | 1327/1412 | | 3.40 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 3.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 2 | | 1304/1381 | | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.21 | 2.94 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | Τ | 9 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 2 | Ţ | | 1408/1500 | | 4.01 | 4.18 | 4.25 | 3.18 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 7 | | 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 | Λ | 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 | | 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 | | 1197/1436 | | 4.04 | 4.29 | 4.32 | 3.80 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 6 | | 1227/1432 | | 4.01 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 3.65 |
| - | 0 | 2 | U | 1 | 4 | - 1 | 9 | | 532/1221 | | 3.86 | 3.93 | 4.04 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | U | 2 | U | 1 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 4.16 | 532/1221 | 4.10 | 3.80 | 3.93 | 4.04 | 4.10 |
| 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 | | ****/1277 | **** | 4.02 | 4.34 | 4.50 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | | ****/1269 | **** | 4.15 | 4.31 | 4.49 | **** |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 19 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 854 | **** | 3.80 | 4.02 | 4.31 | **** |
| 1. Here Spectar committaes Successivat | | J | _ | 3 | Ü | Ü | _ | 3.00 | , 031 | | 3.00 | 1.02 | 1.31 | |
| From | ionai | Diat | rib | ı+ i 01 | _ | | | | | | | | | |

| 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 | В | 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 | h | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be si | gnificant | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 12 | | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 6 | | | | | | | |

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

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 436

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: CHANG, RICHARD Enrollment: 34

Questionnaires: 20

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

| | | | Fre | equei | ncie | s | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----------|--------|-----|-------|------|----|----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | | 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 | | 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 15 | 0 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 671/1269 | 4.40 | 4.15 | 4.31 | 4.49 | 4.40 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 854 | **** | 3.80 | 4.02 | 4.31 | **** |
| _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Credits E | Carned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | | |
|-----------|--------|-----------|---|----------|--------|---------------------|----|--------------|-------|---------------|----|--|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 6 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 18 | |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 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 enoug | h | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be si | gnificant | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 9 | - | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 461 0101 University of Maryland Title DATABASE MANGMT SYSTEM

Baltimore County Spring 2007 KARGUPTA, HILLO

Instructor: Enrollment: 34 Questionnaires: 14

| Ctudent | Course | Fralustion | Ouestionnaire |
|---------|--------|------------|---------------|
| | | | |

Page 437

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

| | | | | | | | Fre | equei | ncies | 3 | | Inst | cructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|--|------------------|---------|--------------------|-------|-------|-------------|-------|-------|------|-------|----------|-----------|--------|--------|------------|--------|------|
| | | Questions | 3 | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | Genera | l | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did yo | ou gain ne | ew insights,ski | lls fro | m 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 th | ne instruc | ctor make clear | the ex | pected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 4.07 | 1042/1522 | 2.81 | 3.97 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.07 |
| 3. Did th | ne exam qu | estions reflect | the e | xpected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 4.43 | 626/1285 | 3.19 | 4.10 | 4.30 | 4.42 | 4.43 |
| 4. Did ot | her evalu | ations reflect | the ex | pected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 3.71 | 1217/1476 | 2.83 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.31 | 3.71 |
| 5. Did as | ssigned re | eadings contribu | ate 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 wr | ritten ass | signments contr | ibute t | o 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 th | ne grading | g system clearly | y expla | ined | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 4.00 | 988/1500 | 3.41 | 4.01 | 4.18 | 4.25 | 4.00 |
| 8. How ma | any times | was class cance | elled | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 4.57 | 1019/1517 | 4.76 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.71 | 4.57 |
| 9. How wo | ould you g | grade the overa | ll teac | hing 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 t | . Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 4.43 | 904/1440 | 3.24 | 4.22 | 4.45 | 4.52 | 4.43 |
| 2. Did th | 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | | | | | 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 |
| | | es contribute to | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 4.23 | 899/1432 | 2.84 | 4.01 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.23 |
| 5. Did au | udiovisual | l techniques enl | nance y | our understanding | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 4.23 | 474/1221 | 3.01 | 3.86 | 3.93 | 4.04 | 4.23 |
| | | Discus | sion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did cl | ass disc | | | what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4.25 | 585/1280 | 4.25 | 3.89 | 4.10 | 4.28 | 4.25 |
| | | | | d to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | | 4.00 | , | | 4.02 | | | 4.00 |
| | | | | d open discussion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | | 4.13 | , | 4.13 | | 4.31 | | 4.13 |
| | | echniques succes | | a open arroadbron | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | | 3.83 | . , | | | | 4.31 | |
| | | | | Frequ | 0000 | . Dia | - wib. | .+ | _ | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | riequ | lency | DIS | CLID | 10101 | 11 | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits E | Earned | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | | | Rea | asons | 3 | | | Туј | pe | | | Majors | } |
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 5 | | Red | quir | ed fo | or Ma | jors | 3 | 0 | Graduat | e | 0 | Majo | or | 8 |
| 28-55 | | | | | | | - | | | _ | | | | | | J - | | |
| 56-83 | | | | | Ger | nera: | L | | | | 6 | Under-g | rad 1 | .4 | Non- | -major | 6 | |
| 84-150 | 84-150 8 3.00-3.49 6 D 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | |
| Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 | | | | | Ele | ecti | <i>r</i> es | | | | 0 | #### - 1 | Means t | here a | re not | enoug | rh | |
| P 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | respons | es to b | e sign | ificar | ıt | | |
| I O | | | | | Otl | her | | | | | 7 | - | | | | | | |
| ? 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| f U | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 461 0201 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County DATABASE MANGMT SYSTEM Instructor: NAMJOSHI, PARAG

Page 438 JUN 26, 2007 Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

| Enrollment: | 35 | | - |
|-----------------|----|---------------|----------------------------|
| Questionnaires: | 24 | Student Cours | e Evaluation Questionnaire |

| | | | Fr | eque: | ncies | 3 | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-----------|------|-------|-------|-------|---|----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|--------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 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 | ed 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 lear | rned 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 effectiver | ness 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 clear! | Ly 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 understandi | ing 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 | ed 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 participat | | 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 discussi | ion 20 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/1269 | 4.13 | 4.15 | 4.31 | 4.49 | **** |
| F | Frequency | / Di | strib | utio | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra | ades | | | Re | asons | 5 | | | Ту | pe | | | Majors | 3 |

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expecte | ed Grades | Reasons | | Type | Majors | | |
|----------------|----|-----------|---|---------|-----------|---------------------|----|--------------|--------|---------------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 5 | Required for Majors | 2 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 20 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 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 enoug | h |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | nificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 16 | _ | | | |
| | | | | 2 | Ω | | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 477 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County AGNT ARCH/MLTI-AGNT SY

Spring 2007

Page 439

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: DESJARDINS, MAR Enrollment:

Grad.

84-150

1

4

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00 10

1

D

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

1

| DIII OI I IIICIIC . | 19 | | | | |
|---------------------|----|---------|--------|------------|---------------|
| Questionnaires: | 14 | Student | Course | Evaluation | Questionnaire |

| | | | | | Frequenci | | | ncies | 3 | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect | |
|----------|---|-----------------|---------|---------------------|------------------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|---------|---------|-----------|--------|------|--------|--------|------|
| | | Question | s | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | Genera | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did | you gain ne | ew insights,ski | lls fro | m 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 t | the instru | ctor make clear | the ex | pected 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 eval | uations reflect | the ex | pected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 4.64 | 336/1476 | 4.64 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.31 | 4.64 |
| 5. Did a | assigned re | eadings contrib | ute 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 v | written as: | signments contr | ibute t | o 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 t | the grading | g system clearl | v expla | ined | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 4.79 | 180/1500 | 4.79 | 4.01 | 4.18 | 4.25 | 4.79 |
| 8. How r | many times | was class canc | elled | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1517 | 5.00 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.71 | 5.00 |
| | - | | | hing effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 4.62 | 304/1497 | 4.62 | 3.89 | 4.11 | 4.21 | 4.62 |
| | | Lectur | е | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were | the instr | uctor's lecture | s well | prepared | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 4.42 | 917/1440 | 4.42 | 4.22 | 4.45 | 4.52 | 4.42 |
| | 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 |
| | | | | explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 4.33 | 793/1436 | | 4.04 | 4.29 | 4.32 | 4.33 |
| | | es contribute t | | | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 8 | | 1000/1432 | 4.08 | 4.01 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.08 |
| | | | | our understanding | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 124/1221 | 4.75 | 3.86 | 3.93 | 4.04 | 4.75 |
| | | Discus | sion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did | class disc | | | what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 138/1280 | 4.90 | 3.89 | 4.10 | 4.28 | 4.90 |
| | | | | d to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1277 | 5.00 | 4.02 | 4.34 | 4.50 | 5.00 |
| | | | | d open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 223/1269 | 4.90 | 4.15 | 4.31 | 4.49 | 4.90 |
| | | echniques succe | | | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.60 | 166/ 854 | | 3.80 | 4.02 | 4.31 | |
| | | | | Frequ | ency | Dist | trib | ution | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Q | | G GD3 | | Towns at a d day do | | | | D | | | | | | | | | 20 | |
| credits | Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade | | | | | | | Rea | asons | ; | | | Ту] | pe | | | Majors | |
| 00-27 | 3 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 12 | Required for Mag | | | jor | s | 1 | Graduat | e | 4 | Majo | or | 12 | | |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | в 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C 0 | General | | | | | | 9 | Under-g | rad 1 | 0 | Non- | -major | 2 | |

Other

Electives

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

0

3

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: CMSC 481 0101

50

COMPUTER NETWORKS

GREEN, FRANK E.

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 25

Spring 2007

Page 440 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

| Student | Course | Evaluation | on Questi | lonnai | ire |
|---------|--------|------------|-----------|--------|-----|
|---------|--------|------------|-----------|--------|-----|

| | | | Fre | equer | ncie | S | | Inst | tructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----------------|------|-------|---------|------|----|----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 10 | | 1310/1522 | | | 4.30 | 4.42 | 3.72 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 8 | | 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 | | 1034/1285 | | 4.10 | 4.30 | 4.42 | 3.88 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 5 | | 1416/1476 | | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.31 | 3.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 8 | | 1183/1412 | | 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 |
| Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 10 | | 966/1500 | | 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 | | 991/1440 | | 4.22 | 4.45 | 4.52 | 4.32 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 17 | | 1275/1448 | | 4.63 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.32 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 9 | | 1197/1436 | | 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 | | 1187/1280 | | 3.89 | 4.10 | 4.28 | 3.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 18 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | | 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 | | 1138/1269 | | 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 | **** |
| Freq | ien <i>c</i> v | Diet | rib | 1+ i 01 | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| t Tedr | rency | ומוע | -1100 | 10101 | 1 | | | | | | | | | |

| Credits E | Earned | Cum. GPA | A | Expecte | ed Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|-----------|--------|-----------|----|---------|-----------|---------------------|----|--------------|-------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 7 | Required for Majors | 1 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 20 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 12 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 6 | С | 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 | n |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be si | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 14 | - | | | |
| | | | | 2 | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 484 0101

Title JAVA SERVER TECHNOLOGI

Instructor: TARR, ROBERT M

Enrollment: 32
Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 441 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | Fre | equer | ncies | 3 | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-----|-------|-------|---|---|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | Λ | Λ | Λ | 0 | 1 | Λ | 4 00 | ****/1280 | **** | 3.89 | 4.10 | 4.28 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/1277 | **** | 4.02 | 4.34 | 4.50 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/1269 | **** | 4.15 | 4.31 | 4.49 | **** |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ 854 | **** | 3.80 | 4.02 | 4.31 | **** |
| 1. Note apostar occuminguos successitui | , | O | _ | 5 | 5 | 3 | O | 1.00 | , 031 | | 3.00 | 1.02 | 1.51 | |

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expecte | d Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|---------|----------|---------------------|---|--------------|--------|----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 6 6 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 5 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 1 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 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 | L |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 4 | _ | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 491M 0101 University of Maryland Title SEMANTIC WEB Baltimore County Instructor: FININ, TIMOTHY Spring 2007

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 442

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

| Enrollment: | 19 | | | | |
|-----------------|----|---------|--------|------------|---------------|
| Questionnaires: | 13 | Student | Course | Evaluation | Questionnaire |

| | Questions | | | | NR | NA | Fre | equer 2 | ncies 3 | s 4 | 5 | Inst Mean | tructor Rank | Course | Dept Mean | | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|-------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---------|---------------------|----------|----------|-------|-------------|------------|--------|--------|--------------|----------------------|---------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Genera | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | om this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 4.46 | 656/1522 | | 4.05 | 4.30 | 4.42 | 4.46 |
| | | or make clear | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 4.46 | 607/1522 | | 3.97 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.46 |
| | | | | expected goals | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | ****/1285 | **** | 4.10 | 4.30 | 4.42 | *** |
| | | ations reflect | | 1 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 4 | | 1009/1476 | | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.31 | 4.00 |
| | | | | what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 4.67 | 231/1412 | | 3.40 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 4.67 |
| 6. Did wri | itten assi | ignments contr | ibute t | 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 |
| | | system clearl | | ained | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3.42 | 1351/1500 | 3.42 | 4.01 | 4.18 | 4.25 | 3.42 |
| | - | was class canc | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.92 | 389/1517 | 4.92 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.71 | 4.92 |
| 9. How wor | ıld you gı | rade the overa | ll tead | ching effectiveness | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 4.50 | 385/1497 | 4.50 | 3.89 | 4.11 | 4.21 | 4.50 |
| | | Lectur | е | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | ctor's lecture | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 4.46 | 851/1440 | | 4.22 | 4.45 | 4.52 | 4.46 |
| | | | | in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 5.00 | 1/1448 | | 4.63 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 5.00 |
| | | _ | | explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 4.46 | | | 4.04 | 4.29 | 4.32 | 4.46 |
| | | contribute t | | - | 0 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 4.46 | | | 4.01 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.46 |
| 5. Did auc | . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi | | | | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4.00 | 606/1221 | 4.00 | 3.86 | 3.93 | 4.04 | 4.00 |
| | | Discus | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.50 | 390/1280 | | 3.89 | 4.10 | 4.28 | 4.50 |
| | | | | ed to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4.44 | | | 4.02 | 4.34 | 4.50 | 4.44 |
| | | _ | | nd 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 sp | pecial ted | chniques succe | ssful | | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 854 | **** | 3.80 | 4.02 | 4.31 | **** |
| | | Semina | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | - | _ | | announced theme | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | ****/ 79 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 4.67 | **** |
| | | | | dividual attention | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1.00 | | **** | **** | 4.52 | 4.60 | **** |
| | _ | _ | | what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | ****/ 65 | **** | **** | 4.49 | 4.65 | **** |
| | | ns contribute or grading mad | | | 11 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 1 | 1 1 | | ****/ 78 ****/ 80 | | **** | 4.45 4.11 | 4.58 4.14 | **** |
| | | | | P | | D. L. L. | 2 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Frequ | lency | DISU | ribu | ıcıoı | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Ea | Expected Grades | | | | Rea | asons | 3 | | | Ту | pe | | | Majors | ; | | | |
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 11 | | Rec | quire | ed fo | or Ma | jor | s | 1 | Graduat | е | 5 | Majo | r • | 6 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | в 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | | | | | | Ger | neral | L | | | | 9 | Under-g | rad | 8 | Non- | major | 7 |
| 84-150 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grad. 5 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 | | | | | | Ele | ectiv | <i>r</i> es | | | | 2 | #### - respons | | | | _ | ŗh |
| | | | | - 0 | | Ot.h | ner | | | | | 1 | respons | es to D | e sign | ıııcan | LL | |
| | I O | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | |

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: CMSC 491R 0101

ROBOTICS

33

OATES, TIMOTHY

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 26

Spring 2007

Page 443

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | | eauei | ncies | 3 | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--|--------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 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 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 0 1 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 1 0 | 0 0 0 0 1 | 3 0 5 1 5 | 23 26 20 24 20 | 4.33 | 224/1440 1/1448 217/1436 240/1432 134/1221 ****/1277 ****/1277 | | 4.22 4.63 4.04 4.01 3.86 | 4.45 4.71 4.29 4.29 3.93 | 4.52 4.75 4.32 4.34 4.04 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | | ****/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 | **** |
| Frequ | iency | Dist | trib | ution | n | | | | | | | | | |

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | A | Expecte | d Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|----|---------|----------|-----------------------|----|--------------|--------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 22 | Required for Majors (| | Graduate | 3 | Major | 11 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 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 | n |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | mificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 8 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 491S 0101
Title SENSOR NETWORKS

Title SENSOR NETWORKS Instructor: YOUNIS, MOHAMED

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 444 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | Fre | equer | ncies | ; | | Inst | tructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----------|----|-----|-------|-------|---|----|------|------------------------|--------|------|--------------|--------------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | _ | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | Mean | 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 | | ****/ 854 | **** | 3.80 | 4.02 | 4.31 | **** |
| T albania banna | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Laboratory | 1.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | г оо | ++++/ 015 | **** | 1 (1 | 1 20 | 1 17 | **** |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 19 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 215 | **** | 4.64 | 4.36 4.35 | 4.47 | **** |
| | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ 228 | **** | 4.53 | | 4.32 4.55 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 19 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | - | | ****/ 217 | **** | 4.53 | 4.51 | | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 19 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ 216 ****/ 205 | **** | 4.75 | 4.42 | 4.20 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 19 | U | U | U | Т | U | U | 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 | 3.00 | ****/ 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 | **** |

Course-Section: CMSC 491S 0101
Title SENSOR NETWORKS
Instructor: YOUNIS, MOHAMED
Enrollment: 26

Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 444 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Credits E | Earned | Cum. GPA | <u>.</u> | Expected | Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | Majors | |
|-----------|--------|-----------|----------|----------|--------|---------------------|----|--------------|-------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 9 | Required for Majors | 4 | Graduate | 6 | Major | 3 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 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 | a |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be si | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 4 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 491U 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County UNIX SECURITY ADMIN PO

Instructor: WEISS, GEOFFREY (Instr. A) Spring 2007

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | | | | | Fre | - | ncies | ; | | Inst | cructor | Course | e Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|------------|-----------|-----------------|----------|--------------------|-------|------|-----------|-------|-------|------|---------|-----------|-----------|--------|--------|-------|--------|------|
| | | Question | S | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | Genera | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did vo | u gain ne | ew insights,ski | _ | m this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 3.31 | 1456/1522 | 3.31 | 4.05 | 4.30 | 4.42 | 3.31 |
| _ | _ | ctor make clear | | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3.15 | 1465/1522 | 3.15 | 3.97 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 3.15 |
| | | uestions reflec | | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3.46 | 1176/1285 | 3.46 | 4.10 | 4.30 | 4.42 | 3.46 |
| 4. Did ot | her evalu | uations reflect | the ex | pected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 3.25 | 1380/1476 | 3.25 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.31 | 3.25 |
| 5. Did as | signed re | eadings contrib | ute 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 wr | itten ass | signments contr | ibute t | o 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 th | e grading | g system clearl | y expla | ined | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 3.50 | 1298/1500 | 3.50 | 4.01 | 4.18 | 4.25 | 3.50 |
| 8. How max | ny times | was class canc | elled | | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 487/1517 | 4.90 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.71 | 4.90 |
| 9. How wo | uld you g | grade the overa | ll teac | hing effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 2.77 | 1456/1497 | 3.38 | 3.89 | 4.11 | 4.21 | 3.38 |
| | | Lectur | e | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were t | he instr | actor's lecture | prepared | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3.83 | 1276/1440 | 4.29 | 4.22 | 4.45 | 4.52 | 4.29 | |
| | | ctor seem inter | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | | 1157/1448 | 4.50 | 4.63 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.50 | |
| | | | | xplained clearly | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | | 1374/1436 | 3.79 | 4.04 | 4.29 | 4.32 | 3.79 |
| | | es contribute t | | | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | | 1364/1432 | | 4.01 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 3.88 |
| | | | | our understanding | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 3.40 | 956/1221 | 3.45 | 3.86 | 3.93 | | 3.45 |
| | | Discus | aion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Did al | acc dica | | | what you learned | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | Λ | Λ | 1 00 | ****/1280 | **** | 3.89 | 4.10 | 4.28 | **** |
| | | | | d to participate | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | ****/1277 | **** | 4.02 | 4.34 | 4.50 | **** |
| | | _ | _ | d open discussion | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | ****/1269 | **** | 4.15 | 4.31 | 4.49 | **** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Frequ | lency | Dist | cribu | ution | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | | | Rea | asons | ; | | | Ту | pe | | | Majors | 3 |
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 2 | | Rec | guire | ed fo | or Ma | jors | | 1 | Graduat | e | 0 | Majo | or | 12 |
| 28-55 | 0 | В 8 | | | | | | J | | | | | | 5 | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | C 1 | | Ger | nera: | 1 | | | | 6 | Under-q | rad 1 | .3 | Non- | -major | 1 | | |
| 84-150 | 9 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | | | | | | | | J | | | | 3 - | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | | Ele | ecti | ves | | | | 0 | #### - | Means t | here a | re not | enous | jh | |
| | | | | P 0 | | | | | | | | | respons | | | | _ | |
| | | | | I 0 | | Oth | ner | | | | | 5 | _ | | _ | | | |
| | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Page 445

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: CMSC 491U 0101 University of Maryland Title UNIX SECURITY ADMIN PO Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007 Instructor: Job IRBR3029

Page 446

(Instr. B) Spring 2007

| Enrollment: | 24 | | | | - | |
|-----------------|----|--|---------|--------|------------|---------------|
| Questionnaires: | 13 | | Student | Course | Evaluation | Questionnaire |

| | | | | | | | | Fre | equei | ncies | 3 | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|-----------|--|-----------------|---------|--------------|----------|-------|-----|------|-------|-------|-------|---|------|-----------|--------|------|------|--------|------|
| | | Question | S | | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | Genera | .1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did yo | ou gain n | ew insights,ski | lls fr | om this cou | rse | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 3.31 | 1456/1522 | 3.31 | 4.05 | 4.30 | 4.42 | 3.31 |
| 2. Did th | ne instru | ctor make clear | the ex | xpected goal | ls | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3.15 | 1465/1522 | 3.15 | 3.97 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 3.15 |
| 3. Did th | ne exam q | uestions reflec | t the | expected go | als | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3.46 | 1176/1285 | 3.46 | 4.10 | 4.30 | 4.42 | 3.46 |
| 4. Did ot | her eval | uations reflect | the ex | xpected goal | ls | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 3.25 | 1380/1476 | 3.25 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.31 | 3.25 |
| 5. Did as | ssigned r | eadings contrib | ute to | what you le | earned | 0 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2.80 | 1362/1412 | 2.80 | 3.40 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 2.80 |
| 6. Did wr | ritten as | signments contr | ibute | 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 th | ne gradin | g system clearl | y expla | ained | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 3.50 | 1298/1500 | 3.50 | 4.01 | 4.18 | 4.25 | 3.50 |
| 8. How ma | any times | was class canc | elled | | | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 487/1517 | 4.90 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.71 | 4.90 |
| 9. How wo | How would you grade the overall teaching effective | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4.00 | 898/1497 | 3.38 | 3.89 | 4.11 | 4.21 | 3.38 |
| | | Lectur | e | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were t | the instr | uctor's lecture | s 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 th | ne instru | ctor seem inter | ested | in the subj | ect | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 1157/1448 | 4.50 | 4.63 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.50 |
| 3. Was le | ecture ma | terial presente | d and | explained c | learly | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 601/1436 | 3.79 | 4.04 | 4.29 | 4.32 | 3.79 |
| 4. Did th | ne lectur | es contribute t | o what | you learned | d | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 350/1432 | 3.88 | 4.01 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 3.88 |
| 5. Did au | udiovisua | l techniques en | hance : | your unders | tanding | 8 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.50 | 899/1221 | 3.45 | 3.86 | 3.93 | 4.04 | 3.45 |
| | | Discus | sion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did cl | lass disc | ussions contrib | ute to | what you le | earned | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/1280 | **** | 3.89 | 4.10 | 4.28 | **** |
| 2. Were a | all stude | nts actively en | courage | ed to parti | cipate | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1277 | **** | 4.02 | 4.34 | 4.50 | *** |
| 3. Did th | ne instru | ctor encourage | fair a | nd open dis | cussion | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1269 | **** | 4.15 | 4.31 | 4.49 | **** |
| | | | | | Freq | uency | Dis | trib | ution | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits E | Earned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | d Grades | | | | Rea | asons | 3 | | | Ту | pe | | | Majors | ; |
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 2 | | Re | quir | ed f | or Ma | ajors | 3 | 1 | Graduat | e | 0 | Majo | or | 12 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|------------|-------|-----------|---|----------|--------|---------------------|---|--------------|--------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 2 | Required for Majors | 1 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 12 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 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 | n |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 5 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 491V 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County ELECTRONIC VOTING SYS

Title Instructor: SHERMAN, ALAN Spring 2007

Enrollment: 5

Questionnaires: 5 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | | | | | Fre | eanei | ncies | | | Inst | tructor | Course | Dept. | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|-----------|------------|-----------------|---------|--------------------|------|------|------|-------|-------|------|---|------|-----------|---------|--------|--------|--------|------|
| | | Question | s | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | Mean | | Mean | Mean |
| | | Genera | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did vo | ou gain n | ew insights,ski | _ | m 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 th | ne instru | ctor make clear | the ex | pected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 702/1522 | 4.40 | 3.97 | 4.26 | 4.34 | 4.40 |
| 3. Did th | ne exam q | uestions reflec | t the e | xpected goals | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1285 | **** | 4.10 | 4.30 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. Did ot | her eval | uations reflect | the ex | pected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.25 | 792/1476 | 4.25 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.31 | 4.25 |
| 5. Did as | ssigned r | eadings contrib | ute 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 wr | ritten as | signments contr | ibute t | o 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 th | ne gradin | g system clearl | y expla | ined | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.25 | 1396/1500 | 3.25 | 4.01 | 4.18 | 4.25 | 3.25 |
| 8. How ma | any times | was class canc | elled | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1517 | 5.00 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.71 | 5.00 |
| 9. How wo | ould you | grade the overa | ll teac | hing effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 898/1497 | 4.00 | 3.89 | 4.11 | 4.21 | 4.00 |
| | | Lectur | e | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were t | the instr | uctor's lecture | s 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 th | ne instru | ctor seem inter | ested i | n 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 le | ecture ma | terial presente | d and e | xplained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 720/1436 | 4.40 | 4.04 | 4.29 | 4.32 | 4.40 |
| 4. Did th | ne lectur | es contribute t | o 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 av | udiovisua | l techniques en | hance y | our understanding | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | 279/1221 | 4.50 | 3.86 | 3.93 | 4.04 | 4.50 |
| | | Discus | sion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did cl | lass disc | ussions contrib | ute 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 |
| | | | | d to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1277 | 5.00 | 4.02 | 4.34 | 4.50 | 5.00 |
| | | | | d 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 s | special to | echniques succe | ssful | - | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 854 | **** | 3.80 | 4.02 | 4.31 | **** |
| | | | | Frequ | ency | Dist | trib | utio | ı | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits E | Carned | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | | | Re: | asons | | | | Ту | ne | | | Majors | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 3 | | Red | quir | ed fo | or Ma | jors | 3 | 1 | Graduat | е | 0 | Majo | r | 4 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | В 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C 0 | | Ger | nera | 1 | | | | 1 | Under-g | rad | 5 | Non- | major | 1 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | F 0 | | Ele | ecti | ves | | | | 1 | #### - 1 | | | | _ | ;h |
| | | | | P 1 | | | | | | | | | respons | es to b | e sign | ificar | ıt | |
| | | | | I 0 | | Otl | ner | | | | | 2 | | | | | | |
| | | | | ? 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Page 447

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: CMSC 491W 0101 University of Maryland Title WEARABLE COMPUTING Baltimore County Instructor:

SEGALL, ZARY Spring 2007

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 448

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

| | | | Fr | equei | ncies | 3 | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|----|-------|-------|---|----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expecte | d Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|------------|-------|-----------|---|---------|----------|---------------------|---|--------------|--------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 11 | Required for Majors | 1 | Graduate | 2 | Major | 12 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 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 | h |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | nificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 5 | - | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 601 0101 University of Maryland Title RESEARCH SKILLS FOR CS

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 449

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 13

SIVALINGAM, KRI

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 12 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Ceneral 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | | | Questions | 5 | | NR | NA | Fre | _ | ncies 3 | 4 | 5 | Inst Mean | ructor Rank | | Dept Mean | | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|--|------------|-----------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-------|-------|------|-------|------------|-------|---|--------------|----------------|---------|--------------|--------|---------------|--------------|
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. Did volume to what you learned 9. Did volume was class cancelled 9. Did volume would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 9. Did the instructor seen interested in the subject 9. Did days discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Discussion 1. Did | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 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 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 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 0 0 0 1 11 4.92 418/1517 4.65 4.73 4.92 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 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 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 0 3 3 3 4 4.10 1342/1448 4.10 4.63 4.73 4.92 9. Did the instructor seem interested and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 0 3 3 5 2 3.90 1158/1435 3.90 4.04 4.29 4.33 3.40 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 0 3 3 5 0 3.50 899/1221 3.50 3.80 3.89 4.10 4.29 4.33 3.40 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 2 2 1 1 3.80 874/1280 3.80 3.89 4.10 4.29 4.33 3.40 5. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 1 0 0 1 5 5 4.83 290/1277 4.83 4.02 4.34 4.52 4.63 7. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 1 0 0 1 2 0 0 2.67 824/854 2.67 3.80 4.02 4.31 4.51 4.71 4.80 4.71 4.71 4.80 4.71 4.80 4.71 4.80 4.71 4.71 4.80 4.71 4.71 4.71 4.71 4.71 4.71 4.71 4.71 | 1 Did | | | | thia asymas | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 1 22 | 014/1500 | 1 22 | 4 OF | 4 20 | 1 1E | 1 22 |
| 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 0 4 8 8 4.67 207/1381 4.67 3.85 4.08 4.25 4.67 7.08 at the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 5 4.42 6.15/1500 4.24 2.01 4.18 4.22 4.42 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 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 0 2 8 0 3.80 1133/1497 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 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 4.37 3.90 4. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 4 0 0 0 3 3 5 0 3.80 874/1280 3.80 3.89 4.10 4.24 3.80 2. Discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 1 0 0 1 5 4.83 290/1277 4.83 4.02 4.34 4.52 4.83 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0 | | | | | | - | - | _ | • | - | _ | | | - , - | | | | | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 3 2 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 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 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 0 1 1 1 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 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 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 0 3 3 4 4.10 1342/1448 4.10 4.63 4.71 4.80 4.10 3.80 81 6. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 3 3 5 2 3.90 1158/1436 3.90 4.04 4.29 4.37 3.90 4.01 4.01 4.02 4.03 3.40 4.01 4.02 4.03 3.40 4.01 4.02 4.03 3.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 4 0 0 3 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 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 0 1 5 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 2 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 8 0 1 0 0 0 1 2 5 6.83 290/1277 4.83 4.02 4.34 4.52 4.83 4. Were special techniques successful 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.83 290/1277 4.83 4.02 4.34 4.52 4.83 5. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 1 0 0 1 1 4 4.17 828/1269 4.17 4.15 4.31 4.51 4.17 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 0 0 0 2 2 1 3.80 874/1280 3.80 3.89 4.00 4.02 4.08 2.67 5. Major 12 6.83 0 2.00-2.99 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | | | | | - | - | - | | _ | 5 | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 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 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 0 1 11 14 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 0 2 8 0 3.80 1113/1497 3.80 3.89 4.11 4.21 3.80 Lecture Lecture 1. Were the instructor slectures well prepared 2 0 0 0 0 2 7 1 1 3.90 1252/1440 3.90 4.22 4.45 4.48 3.90 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1 | 4. Dia oti | ner evaru | actons refrect | the ext | ected goals | U | U | U | U | | 5 | 0 | 4.42 | 013/14/0 | 4.42 | 3.90 | 4.22 | 4.31 | 4.42 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 8 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 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 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 0 2 8 0 3.80 1113/1497 3.80 3.89 4.11 4.21 3.80 Lecture Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 0 0 2 7 1 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 0 3 3 4 4.10 1342/1448 4.10 4.63 4.71 4.80 4.10 3.85 4.08 4.25 4.67 4.00 4.01 4.29 4.37 3.90 4.01 4.29 4.37 3.90 4.01 4.29 4.37 3.90 4.01 4.29 4.37 3.90 4.01 4.29 4.37 3.90 4.01 4.29 4.37 3.90 4.01 4.29 4.37 3.90 4.01 4.29 4.33 3.40 4.01 4.29 4.33 3.40 4.01 4.29 4.33 3.40 4.01 4.29 4.33 3.50 4.01 4.29 4.30 4.30 4.01 4.29 4.30 4.30 4.01 4.29 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 | 5 Did ass | sianed re | adings contrib | ite to w | hat you learned | ٥ | Ο | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 83 | 1358/1412 | 2 83 | 3 40 | 4 06 | 4 25 | 2 83 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 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 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 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 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 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 4.18 4. Were special techniques successful **Frequency Distribution** **Frequency Distribution** **Frequency Distribution** **Credits Earned **Cum. GPA** **Expected Grades **Reasons **Type **Majors **Type **Maj | | | | | | - | • | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2. 0 0 0 0 0 1 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 0 2 8 0 3.80 1113/1497 3.80 3.89 4.11 4.21 3.80 Lecture Lec | | | | | | • | - | - | • | • | _ | _ | | | | | | | |
| New 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 | | | | | 1100 | 0 | - | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lecture | | | | | ing effectiveness | 2 | - | - | - | - | 8 | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 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 0 3 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 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 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 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 2.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0 | J. 110 | ara you s | , rado ono overa. | 00001 | ang cricociveness | _ | Ü | ŭ | ŭ | _ | Ü | Ū | 3.00 | , | 3.00 | 3.07 | | | 3.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 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 0 3 5 2 3.90 1158/1436 3.90 4.04 4.29 4.37 3.90 4.01 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 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 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2 | | | Lecture | <u> </u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 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 0 3 5 2 3.90 1158/1436 3.90 4.04 4.29 4.37 3.90 4.01 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 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 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2 | 1. Were th | he instru | ctor's lecture | s well n | repared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 3.90 | 1252/1440 | 3.90 | 4.22 | 4.45 | 4.48 | 3.90 |
| 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 4.01 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 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 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 12 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 1 | | | | | 2 | | | 0 | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | 4.80 | 4.10 | |
| 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 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 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 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned 1.00-0.99 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 responses to be significant | | | | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 5 | | | | | 4.04 | 4.29 | 4.37 | 3.90 | |
| 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 B 1 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 responses to be significant | | | | | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | 4.33 | 3.40 | |
| 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 responses to be significant | 5. Did au | diovisual | . techniques enl | nance vo | ur understanding | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3.50 | 899/1221 | 3.50 | 3.86 | 3.93 | 3.83 | 3.50 |
| 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 5 824/854 2.67 3.80 4.02 4.08 2.67 5 824/854 2.67 3.80 4.02 4.08 2.67 6 824/854 2.67 8.28 2.67 8 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2. | | | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 5 7 7 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 | | | Discus | sion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 responses to be significant | 1. Did cla | ass discu | ssions contrib | ite to w | hat you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3.80 | 874/1280 | 3.80 | 3.89 | 4.10 | 4.24 | 3.80 |
| 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 responses to be significant | 2. Were a | ll studer | nts actively end | couraged | to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 290/1277 | 4.83 | 4.02 | 4.34 | 4.52 | 4.83 |
| Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 | 3. Did the | e instruc | tor 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 |
| Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 | 4. Were s | pecial te | chniques succes | ssful | _ | 6 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2.67 | 824/ 854 | 2.67 | 3.80 | 4.02 | 4.08 | 2.67 |
| Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 00-27 | | | | | Frequ | lency | / Dis | trib | utio | n | | | | | | | | | |
| 28-55 | Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | | | Rea | asons | 5 | | | Ty | pe | | | Majors | ; |
| 28-55 | 00-27 | 4 | 0.00-0.99 | A 10 | | Re | quir | ed f | or Ma | jor | s | 2 | Graduat | e | 5 | Majo | or | 12 | |
| 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 responses to be significant | 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | в 1 | | | - | | | - | | | | | | | | |
| Grad. 5 3.50-4.00 7 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C 0 | | Gei | nera | l | | | 1 | 1 | Under-g | rad | 7 | Non- | -major | 0 |
| P 0 responses to be significant | 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | |
| | Grad. | 5 | 3.50-4.00 | 7 | F 0 | | Ele | ecti | ves | | | | 1 | #### - 1 | Means t | here a | re not | enoug | ſh |
| I 0 Other 0 | | | | | P 0 | | | | | | | | | respons | es to b | e sign | ifican | nt | |
| | | | | | I 0 | | Otl | her | | | | | 0 | _ | | | | | |
| ? 1 | | | | | ? 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 635 0101 University of Maryland Title ADV COMP GRAPHICS

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 450

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: OLANO, MARC Enrollment: 11

| Ouestionnaires: 11 | Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire |
|--------------------|---|
|--------------------|---|

| | | | | | | | Fre | equer | ncies | 5 | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|------------|-----------|------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|---------|-------|------|----------|----------|-----------|---------|--------|--------|--------|------|
| | | Question | S | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | Genera | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you | u gain ne | w insights,ski | lls fro | m 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 | e instruc | tor make clear | the ex | pected 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 | e exam qu | estions reflec | t the e | xpected goals | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 531/1285 | 4.50 | 4.10 | 4.30 | 4.31 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did ot | her evalu | ations reflect | the ex | pected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 4.70 | 285/1476 | 4.70 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.31 | 4.70 |
| 5. Did as | signed re | adings contrib | ute 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 wr | itten ass | signments contr | ibute t | o 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 | e grading | system clearly | y expla | ined | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 4.36 | 670/1500 | 4.36 | 4.01 | 4.18 | 4.22 | 4.36 |
| 8. How man | ny times | was class cance | elled | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1517 | 5.00 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.73 | 5.00 |
| 9. How wo | uld you g | grade the overa | ll teac | hing effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 4.78 | 172/1497 | 4.78 | 3.89 | 4.11 | 4.21 | 4.78 |
| | | Lectur | e | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were th | he instru | ctor's lecture | s 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 | e instruc | tor seem inter | ested i | n the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1448 | 5.00 | 4.63 | 4.71 | 4.80 | 5.00 |
| | | xplained 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 | e lecture | es contribute to | vou learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4.36 | 793/1432 | 4.36 | 4.01 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.36 | |
| | | | | our understanding | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4.70 | 156/1221 | | 3.86 | | | 4.70 |
| | | Discus | gion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Did cla | ass discu | | | what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 00 | ****/1280 | **** | 3.89 | 4.10 | 4.24 | **** |
| | | | | d to participate | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | ****/1277 | **** | 4.02 | 4.34 | 4.52 | **** |
| | | | | d open discussion | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | ****/1269 | **** | 4.15 | 4.31 | 4.51 | **** |
| | | | | Frequ | | . Dia | ⊦ wib | .+ : 0. | - | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | rrequ | rency | DIS | CLID | 10101 | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | | | Rea | asons | 3 | | | Ту | pe | | | Majors | } |
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 7 | | Red | quir | ed fo | or Ma | jor | ` | 1 | Graduat | e | 5 | Majo | or | 9 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | в 4 | | | - | | | , | | | | | | 3 | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | С 0 | | Gei | nera | 1 | | | | 7 | Under-g | rad | 6 | Non- | -major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 4 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D 0 | | | | | | | | | J | | | | - | |
| Grad. | 5 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F 0 | | Ele | ecti | ves | | | | 0 | #### - 1 | Means t | here a | re not | enoug | rh |
| | | | | P 0 | | | | | | | | | respons | es to b | e sign | ificar | ıt | |
| | | | | I 0 | | Otl | her | | | | | 5 | _ | | | | | |
| | | | | ? 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 641 0101

Title DESIGN & ANALY ALGORTH

Instructor: SHERMAN, ALAN

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 27

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 451 Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007 Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

| | | | Fre | eque | ncie | s | | Inst | tructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-----|------|------|----|----|---------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | _ | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | _ | 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 | | 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 | | 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 | | 1058/1221 | 3.05 | 3.86 | 3.93 | 3.83 | 3.05 |
| 5. Dia dadiovidadi eceminqued emanee your anderbeanding | _ | , | 3 | - | 3 | 3 | , | 3.03 | 1030/1221 | 3.03 | 3.00 | 3.75 | 3.03 | 3.03 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | | 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 | , - | **** | 4.53 | 4.35 | 4.39 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 217 | **** | 4.53 | 4.51 | 4.61 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ 216 | **** | 4.75 | 4.42 | 4.76 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ 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 | | **** | **** | 4.52 | 4.70 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ 65 | **** | **** | 4.49 | 4.70 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ 78 | **** | **** | 4.45 | 4.66 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ 80 | **** | **** | 4.11 | 4.38 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made crear | 20 | U | U | U | 1 | U | U | 3.00 | / 80 | | | 4.11 | 4.30 | |
| 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 | | ****/ 22 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.83 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ 18 | **** | **** | | 4.92 | **** |
| | | - | - | - | _ | - | - | - / - 3 | , | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 641 0101 University of Maryland Page 451

Title DESIGN & ANALY ALGORTH

Instructor: SHERMAN, ALAN

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 27

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

| Credits E | Earned | Cum. GPA | A | Expecte | ed Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|-----------|--------|-----------|----|---------|-----------|---------------------|----|--------------|-------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 3 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | Α | 13 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 10 | Major | 25 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 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 | h |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be si | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 23 | _ | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 452 JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: CMSC 643 0101

QUANTUM COMPUTATION

8. How many times was class cancelled

Title

| Questionnaires: 4 Student Cou | ırse | Evalı | uatio | on Qı | uesti | ionna | aire | ! | | | | | | |
|---|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | Fre | equei | ncies | 3 | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 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 |

| 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 |

9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 264/1497 4.67 3.89 4.11 4.21 4.67

0 0 0 1 0 2 1 3.75 1471/1517 3.75 4.74 4.65 4.73 3.75

| 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 |

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

| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expecte | d Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|------------|-------|-----------|---|---------|----------|---------------------|---|--------------|--------|----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | Α | 2 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 2 | Major | 1 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 1 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | С | 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 | ı |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | - | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 661 0101

Title PRIN OF DATABASE SYS

Instructor: KALPAKIS, KONST

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 9

Spring 2007
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 453 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

| | | | Fre | equer | ncies | 3 | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-----|-------|-------|---|---|------|------------|----------------|-------------------|-------|-------|-------------------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 |
| T - 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Laboratory | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 4 50 | **** / O1F | **** | 1 (1 | 1 26 | 4 70 | **** |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | ****/ 215 | **** | 4.64 | 4.36 | 4.72 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | ****/ 228 | | 4.53 | 4.35 | 4.39 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | ****/ 217 | *** | 4.53 | 4.51 | 4.61 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 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 | _ | | | | _ | | _ | | | | | 4 = 0 | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 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 | | ****/ 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 | | ****/ 35 | **** | **** | 4.31 | 4.71 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 34 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.82 | **** |
| | - | - | - | - | - | | - | | , | | | | | |
| Self Paced | _ | • | 0 | • | 0 | - | - | 4 50 | | ale ale ale al | also also also at | 4 65 | 4 00 | also also also at |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | ****/ 37 | **** | **** | 4.63 | 4.82 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 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 | | ****/ 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 | **** |

Course-Section: CMSC 661 0101

Title PRIN OF DATABASE SYS Instructor: KALPAKIS, KONST

Enrollment:

15 Questionnaires: 9 Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 453 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|------------|-------|-----------|---|----------|--------|---------------------|---|--------------|--------|----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 6 | Required for Majors | 1 | Graduate | 5 | Major | 7 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 1 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | С | 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 sig | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 6 | _ | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 676 0101

Title INFORMATION RETRIEVAL

Instructor: NICHOLAS, CHARL

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 16

SPI II

University of Maryland Page 454
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

| | | | | | | Fre | eque: | ncies | 3 | | Inst | ructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|-----------|-----------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|--------|--------|------|---------|--------|---------|--------|------|
| | | Questions | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Ranl | k | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| _ | - | | ls from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 6 | | 1033/1 | | | 4.05 | 4.30 | 4.45 | 4.13 |
| | | | the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 5 | | 1157/1 | | 3.94 | 3.97 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 3.94 |
| | _ | | the expected goals | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | | ****/1 | | **** | 4.10 | 4.30 | 4.31 | **** |
| | | | the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 6 | 4.19 | 871/1 | | 4.19 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.31 | 4.19 |
| | - | - | te to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 4.07 | 722/1 | | 4.07 | 3.40 | 4.06 | 4.25 | 4.07 |
| | | - | bute to what you learned | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 9 | | 280/1 | | 4.56 | 3.85 | 4.08 | 4.25 | 4.56 |
| | | g system clearly | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | | 1298/1 | | 3.50 | 4.01 | 4.18 | 4.22 | 3.50 |
| | - | was class cance | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 4.81 | | | | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.73 | |
| 9. How wo | uld you g | grade the overal | l teaching effectiveness | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 4.25 | 654/1 | 497 | 4.25 | 3.89 | 4.11 | 4.21 | 4.25 |
| | | Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were t | he instr | actor's lectures | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 4.00 | 1186/1 | 440 | 4.00 | 4.22 | 4.45 | 4.48 | 4.00 |
| | | | sted in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 4.81 | 737/1 | | 4.81 | 4.63 | 4.71 | 4.80 | 4.81 |
| | | | and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | | 4.31 | 814/1 | | 4.31 | | 4.29 | | 4.31 |
| | | what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 7 | | 1009/1 | | 4.06 | 4.01 | 4.29 | | 4.06 | |
| | | ance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | | | 422/1 | | | | | | | |
| J. Dia aa | alovibaai | cccinitqueb cini | ance your understanding | Ü | Ü | Ü | Ü | _ | | J | 1.31 | 122/1 | 221 | 1.31 | 3.00 | 3.75 | 3.03 | 1.51 |
| | | Discuss | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | te to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 4.00 | 718/1 | | 4.00 | 3.89 | 4.10 | 4.24 | 4.00 | |
| | | ouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4.56 | 560/1 | | 4.56 | 4.02 | 4.34 | 4.52 | 4.56 | |
| | | air and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 244/1 | | 4.89 | 4.15 | 4.31 | 4.51 | 4.89 | |
| 4. Were s | pecial te | sful | 7 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ | 854 | **** | 3.80 | 4.02 | 4.08 | **** | |
| | | Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Did re | search pr | | te to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ | 65 | **** | **** | 4.49 | 4.71 | **** |
| | | | o what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ | 78 | **** | **** | 4.45 | 4.66 | **** |
| _ | | for grading made | - | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ | 80 | **** | **** | 4.11 | 4.38 | **** |
| | | 3 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Field W | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | _ | | e to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ | 47 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.40 | **** |
| 2. Did yo | u clearly | y understand you | r evaluation criteria | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ | 45 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.49 | **** |
| | | Self P | aced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did se | lf-paced | | te to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ | 37 | **** | **** | 4.63 | 4.82 | **** |
| | _ | - | the expected goal | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ | 23 | **** | **** | 4.41 | 4.68 | **** |
| | | | structor helpful | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ | 33 | **** | **** | 4.69 | 4.79 | **** |
| _ | | ck/tutoring by p | _ | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ | 22 | *** | **** | 4.54 | 4.83 | **** |
| | | | all the students | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ | 18 | **** | **** | 4.49 | 4.92 | **** |
| | | Freq | uencv | 7 Dist | tribi | ıt.io | n | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | 1109 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | | | | Re | asons | 5 | | | | Тур | pe | | | Majors | 5 |
| 00-27 | 2 | 0 A 13 | | Red | quire | ed f | or Ma | jor | S | 3 | Grad | uate | = | 9 | Majo | or | 15 | |
| 28-55 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99 | 0 B 1 | | | _ | | | - | | | | | | | 3 | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 C 0 | | Ger | nera: | l | | | 1 | 1 | Unde: | r-gı | rad | 7 | Non- | -major | 1 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 D 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 9 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 F 0 | | Ele | ectiv | ves | | | | 1 | #### | - 1 | Means t | here a | are not | enoug | jh |
| | | | P 0 | | | | | | | | | resp | onse | es to k | e sign | nificar | nt | |
| | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Other

0

1

I ?

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: CMSC 687 0101 University of Maryland
Title INTRO NETWORK SECURITY Baltimore County

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Instructor: SIDHU, DEEPINDE

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 455

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

| | | | Fre | eque | ncies | 3 | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-----|------|-------|---|----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 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 | | 1313/1448 | | 4.63 | 4.71 | 4.80 | 4.21 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 4 | | 1224/1436 | | 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 | | 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 | **** |

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|----------|--------|---------------------|---|--------------|--------|---------------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 4 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 1 | Major | 14 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 8 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 3 | General | 8 | Under-grad | 16 | Non-major | 3 |
| 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 enoug | h |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 7 | _ | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 691U 0101 University of Maryland Title UNIX SECURITY ADMIN PO Baltimore County Spring 2007

Instructor: SHERMAN, ALAN (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 456

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

| Ouestions | NR | NA | Fre | equei 2 | ncies 3 | s 4 | 5 | Ins Mean | tructor Rank | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|----|----|-----|------------|------------|--------|---|-------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| ~~~~~ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 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 |

| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | 1 | Expected | d 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 | В | 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 sig | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | _ | | | |
| | | | | 2 | Λ | | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 691U 0101 University of Maryland

Page 457 Title UNIX SECURITY ADMIN PO Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007 (Instr. B) Instructor: Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

| Enrollment: | 3 | | | | - | |
|-----------------|---|--|---------|--------|------------|---------------|
| Questionnaires: | 3 | | Student | Course | Evaluation | Questionnaire |

| | | Frequencies | | | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect | | |
|---|---|-------------|---|---|---|------|--------|--------|-----------|------|-------|------|------|------|
| Questions | | | 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 | | | 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 | 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 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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 | В | 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 | _ | | | |
| | | | | 2 | Λ | | | | | | |

Course-Section: CMSC 691U 0101 University of Maryland Page 458 UNIX SECURITY ADMIN PO JUN 26, 2007

Title Baltimore County Instructor: (Instr. C) Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

| Enrollment: | 3 | | | | - | |
|-----------------|---|--|---------|--------|------------|---------------|
| Questionnaires: | 3 | | Student | Course | Evaluation | Questionnaire |

| | | Frequencies | | | | | | Inst | ructor | Course Dept | | t UMBC Level | | Sect |
|---|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|------|-----------|-------------|------|--------------|------|------|
| Questions | | | 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 | 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 | | | 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 | 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 | 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 | | 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 | | 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 |

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | Majors | | | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|---|--------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|---|--|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 2 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 2 | |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 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 | #### - Means there are not enough | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | responses to be signifi | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | _ | | | | |
| | | | | 2 | 0 | | | | | | | |