

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	6	11	10	8	3.43	1520/1639	4.09	4.13	4.27	4.08	3.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	9	12	7	5	3.00	1579/1639	3.97	4.12	4.22	4.17	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	1	7	14	10	3.69	1204/1397	4.42	4.25	4.28	4.18	3.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	4	6	10	7	7	3.21	1497/1583	4.13	4.15	4.19	4.01	3.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	5	3	12	5	10	3.34	1325/1532	3.49	3.56	4.01	3.88	3.34	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	12	5	4	5	4	2.47	1480/1504	3.48	4.07	4.05	3.78	2.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	4	7	10	12	3.59	1363/1612	4.41	4.17	4.16	4.10	3.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	30	5	4.14	1428/1635	4.33	4.72	4.65	4.56	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	5	6	6	13	3	0	2.46	1557/1579	3.74	3.90	4.08	3.95	2.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	3	5	3	8	4	3.22	1464/1518	4.23	4.33	4.43	4.38	3.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	1	6	10	5	3.86	1449/1520	4.45	4.67	4.70	4.61	3.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	4	3	7	7	3	3.08	1449/1517	4.02	4.07	4.27	4.20	3.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	2	6	2	6	5	3	2.86	1467/1550	4.10	4.08	4.22	4.17	2.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	9	5	2	4	2	2	2.60	1237/1295	3.75	3.91	3.94	3.84	2.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	8	2	1	1	1	1.85	1392/1398	3.18	3.77	4.07	3.85	1.85	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	3	2	3	2	3	3.00	1321/1391	3.51	3.94	4.30	4.07	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	3	1	3	4	2	3.08	1310/1388	3.66	3.94	4.28	4.01	3.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	25	8	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 958	4.18	3.98	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 224	3.55	3.99	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	4.36	4.41	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	4.45	4.78	4.44	4.44	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	4.00	3.92	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.58	4.50	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 50	****	1.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	1	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	1	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	1.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	1	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	3.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 6	General 4	Under-grad 37	Non-major 30
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 1	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	24	
?	1			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	6	21	4.60	508/1639	4.09	4.13	4.27	4.08	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	11	19	4.63	382/1639	3.97	4.12	4.22	4.17	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	24	4.83	216/1397	4.42	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	0	5	20	4.69	299/1583	4.13	4.15	4.19	4.01	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	17	1	0	3	3	5	3.92	897/1532	3.49	3.56	4.01	3.88	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	367/1504	3.48	4.07	4.05	3.78	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	118/1612	4.41	4.17	4.16	4.10	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	25	4	4.10	1454/1635	4.33	4.72	4.65	4.56	4.10	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	13	15	4.54	352/1579	3.74	3.90	4.08	3.95	4.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	22	4.76	454/1518	4.23	4.33	4.43	4.38	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	24	4.83	750/1520	4.45	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	8	20	4.66	417/1517	4.02	4.07	4.27	4.20	4.66	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	7	22	4.76	351/1550	4.10	4.08	4.22	4.17	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	0	2	5	14	4.41	346/1295	3.75	3.91	3.94	3.84	4.41	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	502/1398	3.18	3.77	4.07	3.85	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	462/1391	3.51	3.94	4.30	4.07	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	624/1388	3.66	3.94	4.28	4.01	4.54	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	386/ 958	4.18	3.98	3.93	3.71	4.18	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 224	3.55	3.99	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 240	4.36	4.41	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 219	4.45	4.78	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 215	4.33	4.53	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	4.00	3.92	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.52	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	1.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	1.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	3.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A 19	Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 5
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 8	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 2 Under-grad 30 Non-major 25
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				I 0	Other 26
				? 1	

Course-Section: CMSC 104 0301  
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR  
 Instructor: KUSS, FRED C  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 400  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	2	2	13	4	3.65	1422/1639	4.09	4.13	4.27	4.08	3.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	3	4	13	2	3.52	1473/1639	3.97	4.12	4.22	4.17	3.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	6	13	4.35	713/1397	4.42	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	2	0	4	8	8	3.91	1158/1583	4.13	4.15	4.19	4.01	3.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	8	6	3	3	3.05	1415/1532	3.49	3.56	4.01	3.88	3.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	6	4	8	1	2	2.48	1479/1504	3.48	4.07	4.05	3.78	2.48	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	3	7	11	4.17	903/1612	4.41	4.17	4.16	4.10	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	19	4	4.17	1409/1635	4.33	4.72	4.65	4.56	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	9	7	0	3.22	1430/1579	3.74	3.90	4.08	3.95	3.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	3	3	8	9	4.00	1237/1518	4.23	4.33	4.43	4.38	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	5	3	12	4.14	1390/1520	4.45	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.14	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	8	8	4	3.52	1339/1517	4.02	4.07	4.27	4.20	3.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	5	9	6	3.82	1209/1550	4.10	4.08	4.22	4.17	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	3	2	6	8	3	3.27	1093/1295	3.75	3.91	3.94	3.84	3.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	4	1	3	3	0	2.45	1360/1398	3.18	3.77	4.07	3.85	2.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	5	1	5	0	1	2.25	1383/1391	3.51	3.94	4.30	4.07	2.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	3	1	4	3	0	2.64	1367/1388	3.66	3.94	4.28	4.01	2.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	11	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 958	4.18	3.98	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	1	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	193/ 224	3.55	3.99	4.10	3.90	3.55	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	110/ 240	4.36	4.41	4.11	4.01	4.36	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	131/ 219	4.45	4.78	4.44	4.44	4.45	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	2	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	128/ 215	4.33	4.53	4.35	4.43	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	3	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	129/ 198	4.00	3.92	4.18	4.25	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	2	3	0	3.17	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	2	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	2.00	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 82	****	4.00	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	3	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	3	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	4	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	****/ 50	****	1.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	1	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 32	****	1.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/ 21	****	3.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 104 0301  
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR  
 Instructor: KUSS, FRED C  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 400  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	8
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 104 0401  
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR  
 Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 401  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	3	23	4.68	417/1639	4.09	4.13	4.27	4.08	4.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	21	4.71	295/1639	3.97	4.12	4.22	4.17	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	216/1397	4.42	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	21	4.70	292/1583	4.13	4.15	4.19	4.01	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	17	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	1136/1532	3.49	3.56	4.01	3.88	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	1	1	0	2	13	4.47	404/1504	3.48	4.07	4.05	3.78	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	45/1612	4.41	4.17	4.16	4.10	4.96	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	529/1635	4.33	4.72	4.65	4.56	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	190/1579	3.74	3.90	4.08	3.95	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	85/1518	4.23	4.33	4.43	4.38	4.96	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	273/1520	4.45	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	214/1517	4.02	4.07	4.27	4.20	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	70/1550	4.10	4.08	4.22	4.17	4.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	155/1295	3.75	3.91	3.94	3.84	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	2	0	0	2	6	4.00	770/1398	3.18	3.77	4.07	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	940/1391	3.51	3.94	4.30	4.07	4.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	740/1388	3.66	3.94	4.28	4.01	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	6	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 958	4.18	3.98	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 224	3.55	3.99	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	4.36	4.41	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 219	4.45	4.78	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 215	4.33	4.53	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	4.00	3.92	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	2.00	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.00	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	1.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	1.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	3.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 104 0401  
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR  
 Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 401  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	17	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	28	Non-major	23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0101  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 402  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	860/1639	4.43	4.13	4.27	4.35	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	650/1639	4.38	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	632/1397	4.58	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	852/1583	4.40	4.15	4.19	4.28	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1532	4.07	3.56	4.01	4.09	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	150/1504	4.50	4.07	4.05	4.09	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	259/1612	4.45	4.17	4.16	4.21	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	766/1635	4.91	4.72	4.65	4.63	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	725/1579	4.17	3.90	4.08	4.14	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	529/1518	4.80	4.33	4.43	4.48	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	674/1520	4.83	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	510/1517	4.48	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	638/1550	4.52	4.08	4.22	4.33	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	1035/1295	4.41	3.91	3.94	4.07	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	695/1398	3.91	3.77	4.07	4.14	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	752/1391	3.98	3.94	4.30	4.35	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1185/1388	3.60	3.94	4.28	4.37	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	456/ 958	3.94	3.98	3.93	4.00	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 224	4.60	3.99	4.10	4.33	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 240	4.42	4.41	4.11	4.47	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 219	4.95	4.78	4.44	4.61	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 215	4.57	4.53	4.35	4.43	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	3.89	3.92	4.18	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	1.00	1.00	4.45	3.24	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	1.00	1.00	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	3.00	3.00	4.52	3.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0101  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 403  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	860/1639	4.43	4.13	4.27	4.35	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	650/1639	4.38	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	632/1397	4.58	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	852/1583	4.40	4.15	4.19	4.28	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1532	4.07	3.56	4.01	4.09	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	150/1504	4.50	4.07	4.05	4.09	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	259/1612	4.45	4.17	4.16	4.21	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	766/1635	4.91	4.72	4.65	4.63	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	889/1579	4.17	3.90	4.08	4.14	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1518	4.80	4.33	4.43	4.48	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1520	4.83	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1517	4.48	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1550	4.52	4.08	4.22	4.33	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1295	4.41	3.91	3.94	4.07	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	695/1398	3.91	3.77	4.07	4.14	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	752/1391	3.98	3.94	4.30	4.35	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1185/1388	3.60	3.94	4.28	4.37	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	456/ 958	3.94	3.98	3.93	4.00	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 224	4.60	3.99	4.10	4.33	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 240	4.42	4.41	4.11	4.47	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 219	4.95	4.78	4.44	4.61	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 215	4.57	4.53	4.35	4.43	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	3.89	3.92	4.18	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	1.00	1.00	4.45	3.24	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	1.00	1.00	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	3.00	3.00	4.52	3.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0102  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 404  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	318/1639	4.43	4.13	4.27	4.35	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	252/1639	4.38	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	517/1397	4.58	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	323/1583	4.40	4.15	4.19	4.28	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	4.07	3.56	4.01	4.09	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	4.50	4.07	4.05	4.09	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	490/1612	4.45	4.17	4.16	4.21	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	884/1635	4.91	4.72	4.65	4.63	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1579	4.17	3.90	4.08	4.14	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1518	4.80	4.33	4.43	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	4.83	4.67	4.70	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	597/1517	4.48	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	351/1550	4.52	4.08	4.22	4.33	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	398/1295	4.41	3.91	3.94	4.07	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1030/1398	3.91	3.77	4.07	4.14	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	3.98	3.94	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	496/1388	3.60	3.94	4.28	4.37	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	841/ 958	3.94	3.98	3.93	4.00	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	129/ 224	4.60	3.99	4.10	4.33	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	221/ 240	4.42	4.41	4.11	4.47	3.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 219	4.95	4.78	4.44	4.61	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	207/ 215	4.57	4.53	4.35	4.43	3.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	129/ 198	3.89	3.92	4.18	4.08	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0103  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 405  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	4	4.50	615/1639	4.43	4.13	4.27	4.35	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	774/1639	4.38	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	722/1397	4.58	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	881/1583	4.40	4.15	4.19	4.28	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1136/1532	4.07	3.56	4.01	4.09	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1051/1504	4.50	4.07	4.05	4.09	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1327/1612	4.45	4.17	4.16	4.21	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	766/1635	4.91	4.72	4.65	4.63	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	569/1579	4.17	3.90	4.08	4.14	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	807/1518	4.80	4.33	4.43	4.48	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1033/1520	4.83	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	800/1517	4.48	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	638/1550	4.52	4.08	4.22	4.33	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	265/1295	4.41	3.91	3.94	4.07	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	916/1398	3.91	3.77	4.07	4.14	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	3	0	1	3.00	1321/1391	3.98	3.94	4.30	4.35	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	2	1	1	1	2.83	1347/1388	3.60	3.94	4.28	4.37	2.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 958	3.94	3.98	3.93	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 224	4.60	3.99	4.10	4.33	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 240	4.42	4.41	4.11	4.47	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 219	4.95	4.78	4.44	4.61	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 215	4.57	4.53	4.35	4.43	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	3.89	3.92	4.18	4.08	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	3.00	3.00	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	****	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	4
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0104  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 406  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	814/1639	4.43	4.13	4.27	4.35	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	774/1639	4.38	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	367/1397	4.58	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	323/1583	4.40	4.15	4.19	4.28	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1532	4.07	3.56	4.01	4.09	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	182/1504	4.50	4.07	4.05	4.09	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	718/1612	4.45	4.17	4.16	4.21	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1001/1635	4.91	4.72	4.65	4.63	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	569/1579	4.17	3.90	4.08	4.14	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	315/1518	4.80	4.33	4.43	4.48	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	725/1520	4.83	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	597/1517	4.48	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	457/1550	4.52	4.08	4.22	4.33	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	505/1295	4.41	3.91	3.94	4.07	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1030/1398	3.91	3.77	4.07	4.14	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1296/1391	3.98	3.94	4.30	4.35	3.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1130/1388	3.60	3.94	4.28	4.37	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	4.60	3.99	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	4.42	4.41	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	4.95	4.78	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	4.57	4.53	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	3.89	3.92	4.18	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	3
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0105  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 407  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	4.40	754/1639	4.43	4.13	4.27	4.35	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	915/1639	4.38	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	417/1397	4.58	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	597/1583	4.40	4.15	4.19	4.28	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1046/1532	4.07	3.56	4.01	4.09	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	824/1504	4.50	4.07	4.05	4.09	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	882/1612	4.45	4.17	4.16	4.21	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1635	4.91	4.72	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	657/1579	4.17	3.90	4.08	4.14	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	947/1518	4.80	4.33	4.43	4.48	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1273/1520	4.83	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	726/1517	4.48	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	522/1550	4.52	4.08	4.22	4.33	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	221/1295	4.41	3.91	3.94	4.07	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	625/1398	3.91	3.77	4.07	4.14	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	816/1391	3.98	3.94	4.30	4.35	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	944/1388	3.60	3.94	4.28	4.37	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	4.60	3.99	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	4.42	4.41	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	4.95	4.78	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	4.57	4.53	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	3.89	3.92	4.18	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate	0	Major	2	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	3
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 responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	5				
				? 0						

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0106  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 408  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	257/1639	4.43	4.13	4.27	4.35	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	684/1639	4.38	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	230/1397	4.58	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1583	4.40	4.15	4.19	4.28	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	4.50	4.07	4.05	4.09	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	166/1612	4.45	4.17	4.16	4.21	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1635	4.91	4.72	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	283/1579	4.17	3.90	4.08	4.14	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1518	4.80	4.33	4.43	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	4.83	4.67	4.70	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	474/1517	4.48	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	288/1550	4.52	4.08	4.22	4.33	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	265/1295	4.41	3.91	3.94	4.07	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1271/1398	3.91	3.77	4.07	4.14	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	983/1391	3.98	3.94	4.30	4.35	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1320/1388	3.60	3.94	4.28	4.37	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 958	3.94	3.98	3.93	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	51/ 224	4.60	3.99	4.10	4.33	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 240	4.42	4.41	4.11	4.47	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	4.95	4.78	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	4.57	4.53	4.35	4.43	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	5	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0201  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 409  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	366/1639	4.43	4.13	4.27	4.35	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	295/1639	4.38	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1397	4.58	4.25	4.28	4.39	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1583	4.40	4.15	4.19	4.28	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	236/1532	4.07	3.56	4.01	4.09	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	4.50	4.07	4.05	4.09	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1612	4.45	4.17	4.16	4.21	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1635	4.91	4.72	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	312/1579	4.17	3.90	4.08	4.14	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1518	4.80	4.33	4.43	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	674/1520	4.83	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1517	4.48	4.07	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	556/1550	4.52	4.08	4.22	4.33	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	234/1295	4.41	3.91	3.94	4.07	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1398	3.91	3.77	4.07	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	863/1391	3.98	3.94	4.30	4.35	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	944/1388	3.60	3.94	4.28	4.37	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	155/ 958	3.94	3.98	3.93	4.00	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	4.60	3.99	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	4.42	4.41	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	4.95	4.78	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	4.57	4.53	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	3.89	3.92	4.18	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0202  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 410  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	4.00	1138/1639	4.43	4.13	4.27	4.35	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	774/1639	4.38	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	722/1397	4.58	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	323/1583	4.40	4.15	4.19	4.28	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	824/1504	4.50	4.07	4.05	4.09	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1044/1612	4.45	4.17	4.16	4.21	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1635	4.91	4.72	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	889/1579	4.17	3.90	4.08	4.14	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1518	4.80	4.33	4.43	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	4.83	4.67	4.70	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1083/1517	4.48	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	832/1550	4.52	4.08	4.22	4.33	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1295	4.41	3.91	3.94	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1030/1398	3.91	3.77	4.07	4.14	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1321/1391	3.98	3.94	4.30	4.35	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	1383/1388	3.60	3.94	4.28	4.37	2.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	129/ 224	4.60	3.99	4.10	4.33	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	221/ 240	4.42	4.41	4.11	4.47	3.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 219	4.95	4.78	4.44	4.61	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 215	4.57	4.53	4.35	4.43	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	129/ 198	3.89	3.92	4.18	4.08	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	69/ 85	4.00	4.00	4.58	4.00	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	78/ 82	3.00	3.00	4.52	3.00	3.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	80/ 80	2.00	2.00	4.47	2.00	2.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	49/ 82	4.00	4.00	4.16	4.00	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	50/ 50	1.00	1.00	4.45	3.24	1.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	32/ 32	1.00	1.00	4.37	1.00	1.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	19/ 21	3.00	3.00	4.52	3.00	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	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	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0203  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 411  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	990/1639	4.43	4.13	4.27	4.35	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	948/1639	4.38	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	367/1397	4.58	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1010/1583	4.40	4.15	4.19	4.28	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1330/1532	4.07	3.56	4.01	4.09	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	824/1504	4.50	4.07	4.05	4.09	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	150/1612	4.45	4.17	4.16	4.21	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	4.91	4.72	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1170/1579	4.17	3.90	4.08	4.14	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	602/1518	4.80	4.33	4.43	4.48	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	725/1520	4.83	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	405/1517	4.48	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	638/1550	4.52	4.08	4.22	4.33	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	109/1295	4.41	3.91	3.94	4.07	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	675/1398	3.91	3.77	4.07	4.14	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	863/1391	3.98	3.94	4.30	4.35	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	872/1388	3.60	3.94	4.28	4.37	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	456/ 958	3.94	3.98	3.93	4.00	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	4.60	3.99	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	4.42	4.41	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	4.95	4.78	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	4.57	4.53	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	3.89	3.92	4.18	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0204  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 412  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	0	4	4.40	754/1639	4.43	4.13	4.27	4.35	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	684/1639	4.38	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1397	4.58	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1010/1583	4.40	4.15	4.19	4.28	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	824/1504	4.50	4.07	4.05	4.09	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1044/1612	4.45	4.17	4.16	4.21	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1635	4.91	4.72	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1318/1579	4.17	3.90	4.08	4.14	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	360/1518	4.80	4.33	4.43	4.48	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	802/1520	4.83	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	726/1517	4.48	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	944/1550	4.52	4.08	4.22	4.33	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1067/1295	4.41	3.91	3.94	4.07	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1030/1398	3.91	3.77	4.07	4.14	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	983/1391	3.98	3.94	4.30	4.35	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1130/1388	3.60	3.94	4.28	4.37	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	42/ 224	4.60	3.99	4.10	4.33	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	56/ 240	4.42	4.41	4.11	4.47	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 219	4.95	4.78	4.44	4.61	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	128/ 215	4.57	4.53	4.35	4.43	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	3.89	3.92	4.18	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0205  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 413  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	366/1639	4.43	4.13	4.27	4.35	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	831/1639	4.38	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	323/1397	4.58	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	900/1583	4.40	4.15	4.19	4.28	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	774/1532	4.07	3.56	4.01	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	245/1504	4.50	4.07	4.05	4.09	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	779/1612	4.45	4.17	4.16	4.21	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1635	4.91	4.72	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	889/1579	4.17	3.90	4.08	4.14	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	286/1518	4.80	4.33	4.43	4.48	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	674/1520	4.83	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	700/1517	4.48	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	556/1550	4.52	4.08	4.22	4.33	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	100/1295	4.41	3.91	3.94	4.07	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	599/1398	3.91	3.77	4.07	4.14	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	983/1391	3.98	3.94	4.30	4.35	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	815/1388	3.60	3.94	4.28	4.37	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	456/ 958	3.94	3.98	3.93	4.00	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	42/ 224	4.60	3.99	4.10	4.33	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	56/ 240	4.42	4.41	4.11	4.47	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	91/ 219	4.95	4.78	4.44	4.61	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	77/ 215	4.57	4.53	4.35	4.43	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	164/ 198	3.89	3.92	4.18	4.08	3.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	4.00	4.00	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	3.00	3.00	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	2.00	2.00	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	4.00	4.00	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	1.00	1.00	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	1.00	1.00	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	3.00	3.00	4.52	3.00	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0205  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 413  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0206  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 414  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	1	1	5	4.25	890/1639	4.43	4.13	4.27	4.35	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	886/1639	4.38	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	722/1397	4.58	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	929/1583	4.40	4.15	4.19	4.28	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1532	4.07	3.56	4.01	4.09	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	182/1504	4.50	4.07	4.05	4.09	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	197/1612	4.45	4.17	4.16	4.21	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	691/1635	4.91	4.72	4.65	4.63	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	1	4.00	889/1579	4.17	3.90	4.08	4.14	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	416/1518	4.80	4.33	4.43	4.48	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	597/1520	4.83	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	800/1517	4.48	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	920/1550	4.52	4.08	4.22	4.33	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	95/1295	4.41	3.91	3.94	4.07	4.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	1207/1398	3.91	3.77	4.07	4.14	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	816/1391	3.98	3.94	4.30	4.35	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1185/1388	3.60	3.94	4.28	4.37	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 958	3.94	3.98	3.93	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	4.60	3.99	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	4.42	4.41	4.11	4.47	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	4.57	4.53	4.35	4.43	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201H 0101  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 415  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	1266/1639	3.89	4.13	4.27	4.35	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	466/1639	4.56	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.25	4.28	4.39	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	697/1583	4.33	4.15	4.19	4.28	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1358/1504	3.20	4.07	4.05	4.09	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	439/1612	4.56	4.17	4.16	4.21	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.72	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	382/1579	4.50	3.90	4.08	4.14	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	416/1518	4.72	4.33	4.43	4.48	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	597/1520	4.94	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	173/1517	4.78	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	920/1550	4.28	4.08	4.22	4.33	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	505/1295	4.20	3.91	3.94	4.07	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	929/1398	3.80	3.77	4.07	4.14	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	983/1391	4.00	3.94	4.30	4.35	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	944/1388	4.00	3.94	4.28	4.37	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 958	****	3.98	3.93	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	218/ 224	2.67	3.99	4.10	4.33	2.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	56/ 240	4.67	4.41	4.11	4.47	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.78	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.53	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	3.92	4.18	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201H 0101  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 416  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	1266/1639	3.89	4.13	4.27	4.35	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	466/1639	4.56	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.25	4.28	4.39	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	697/1583	4.33	4.15	4.19	4.28	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1358/1504	3.20	4.07	4.05	4.09	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	439/1612	4.56	4.17	4.16	4.21	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.72	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	382/1579	4.50	3.90	4.08	4.14	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	602/1518	4.72	4.33	4.43	4.48	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	4.94	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	405/1517	4.78	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	832/1550	4.28	4.08	4.22	4.33	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1295	4.20	3.91	3.94	4.07	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	929/1398	3.80	3.77	4.07	4.14	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	983/1391	4.00	3.94	4.30	4.35	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	944/1388	4.00	3.94	4.28	4.37	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 958	****	3.98	3.93	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	218/ 224	2.67	3.99	4.10	4.33	2.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	56/ 240	4.67	4.41	4.11	4.47	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.78	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.53	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	3.92	4.18	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0101  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: FREY, DENNIS  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 417  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	1	6	4	3.79	1339/1639	4.34	4.13	4.27	4.35	3.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	748/1639	4.69	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	705/1397	4.56	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	392/1583	4.57	4.15	4.19	4.28	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1378/1532	3.33	3.56	4.01	4.09	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1504	4.69	4.07	4.05	4.09	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	340/1612	4.67	4.17	4.16	4.21	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	1	4.07	1466/1635	4.69	4.72	4.65	4.63	4.07	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	538/1579	4.53	3.90	4.08	4.14	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	529/1518	4.66	4.33	4.43	4.48	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	837/1520	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	779/1517	4.66	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	3	8	4.07	1043/1550	4.34	4.08	4.22	4.33	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	581/1295	4.38	3.91	3.94	4.07	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	2	3	3	3.45	1134/1398	4.19	3.77	4.07	4.14	3.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	2	4	3	3.55	1208/1391	4.19	3.94	4.30	4.35	3.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	5	3	3	3.82	1073/1388	4.40	3.94	4.28	4.37	3.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	9	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 958	4.50	3.98	3.93	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	218/ 224	3.63	3.99	4.10	4.33	2.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	148/ 240	4.30	4.41	4.11	4.47	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	104/ 219	4.60	4.78	4.44	4.61	4.60	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	137/ 215	4.50	4.53	4.35	4.43	4.20	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	3.92	4.18	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0102  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: FREY, DENNIS  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 418  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	257/1639	4.34	4.13	4.27	4.35	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	273/1639	4.69	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	417/1397	4.56	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	299/1583	4.57	4.15	4.19	4.28	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	911/1532	3.33	3.56	4.01	4.09	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	10	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	150/1504	4.69	4.07	4.05	4.09	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	0	13	4.73	238/1612	4.67	4.17	4.16	4.21	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1114/1635	4.69	4.72	4.65	4.63	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	302/1579	4.53	3.90	4.08	4.14	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	491/1518	4.66	4.33	4.43	4.48	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	382/1520	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	428/1517	4.66	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	376/1550	4.34	4.08	4.22	4.33	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	361/1295	4.38	3.91	3.94	4.07	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	863/1398	4.19	3.77	4.07	4.14	3.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	831/1391	4.19	3.94	4.30	4.35	4.23	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1065/1388	4.40	3.94	4.28	4.37	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	10	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 958	4.50	3.98	3.93	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	88/ 224	3.63	3.99	4.10	4.33	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	29/ 240	4.30	4.41	4.11	4.47	4.83	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 219	4.60	4.78	4.44	4.61	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	83/ 215	4.50	4.53	4.35	4.43	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	3.92	4.18	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 0		

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0201  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 419  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	9	4.64	469/1639	4.34	4.13	4.27	4.35	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	415/1639	4.69	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	589/1397	4.56	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	597/1583	4.57	4.15	4.19	4.28	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	2	3	3.60	1184/1532	3.33	3.56	4.01	4.09	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	4.69	4.07	4.05	4.09	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	388/1612	4.67	4.17	4.16	4.21	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1635	4.69	4.72	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	439/1579	4.53	3.90	4.08	4.14	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	877/1518	4.66	4.33	4.43	4.48	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	776/1520	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	439/1517	4.66	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	703/1550	4.34	4.08	4.22	4.33	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	0	1	8	4.27	443/1295	4.38	3.91	3.94	4.07	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	0	7	4.40	511/1398	4.19	3.77	4.07	4.14	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	863/1391	4.19	3.94	4.30	4.35	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	496/1388	4.40	3.94	4.28	4.37	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 958	4.50	3.98	3.93	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	163/ 224	3.63	3.99	4.10	4.33	3.83	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	176/ 240	4.30	4.41	4.11	4.47	3.83	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	167/ 219	4.60	4.78	4.44	4.61	4.20	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	83/ 215	4.50	4.53	4.35	4.43	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 198	****	3.92	4.18	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	2.00	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	4.00	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	1.00	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	1.00	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	3.00	4.52	3.00	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0201  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 419  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0201  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 420  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	9	4.64	469/1639	4.34	4.13	4.27	4.35	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	415/1639	4.69	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	589/1397	4.56	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	597/1583	4.57	4.15	4.19	4.28	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	2	3	3.60	1184/1532	3.33	3.56	4.01	4.09	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	4.69	4.07	4.05	4.09	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	388/1612	4.67	4.17	4.16	4.21	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1635	4.69	4.72	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1579	4.53	3.90	4.08	4.14	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1518	4.66	4.33	4.43	4.48	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1520	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1517	4.66	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1550	4.34	4.08	4.22	4.33	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1295	4.38	3.91	3.94	4.07	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	0	7	4.40	511/1398	4.19	3.77	4.07	4.14	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	863/1391	4.19	3.94	4.30	4.35	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	496/1388	4.40	3.94	4.28	4.37	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 958	4.50	3.98	3.93	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	163/ 224	3.63	3.99	4.10	4.33	3.83	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	176/ 240	4.30	4.41	4.11	4.47	3.83	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	167/ 219	4.60	4.78	4.44	4.61	4.20	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	83/ 215	4.50	4.53	4.35	4.43	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 198	****	3.92	4.18	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	2.00	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	4.00	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	1.00	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	1.00	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	3.00	4.52	3.00	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0201  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 420  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0202  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 421  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	990/1639	4.34	4.13	4.27	4.35	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	177/1639	4.69	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	517/1397	4.56	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	371/1583	4.57	4.15	4.19	4.28	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	3	1	3.17	1390/1532	3.33	3.56	4.01	4.09	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	4.69	4.07	4.05	4.09	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	317/1612	4.67	4.17	4.16	4.21	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	811/1635	4.69	4.72	4.65	4.63	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	128/1579	4.53	3.90	4.08	4.14	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	602/1518	4.66	4.33	4.43	4.48	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	405/1517	4.66	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	457/1550	4.34	4.08	4.22	4.33	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	185/1295	4.38	3.91	3.94	4.07	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	260/1398	4.19	3.77	4.07	4.14	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	393/1391	4.19	3.94	4.30	4.35	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1388	4.40	3.94	4.28	4.37	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	201/ 958	4.50	3.98	3.93	4.00	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	3.63	3.99	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	4.30	4.41	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	4.60	4.78	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	4.50	4.53	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	3.92	4.18	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0205  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 422  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1138/1639	4.34	4.13	4.27	4.35	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1639	4.69	4.12	4.22	4.27	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1397	4.56	4.25	4.28	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	239/1583	4.57	4.15	4.19	4.28	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	1501/1532	3.33	3.56	4.01	4.09	2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1116/1504	4.69	4.07	4.05	4.09	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	218/1612	4.67	4.17	4.16	4.21	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	884/1635	4.69	4.72	4.65	4.63	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	657/1579	4.53	3.90	4.08	4.14	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	454/1518	4.66	4.33	4.43	4.48	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	4.66	4.07	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1237/1550	4.34	4.08	4.22	4.33	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	265/1295	4.38	3.91	3.94	4.07	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1398	4.19	3.77	4.07	4.14	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1391	4.19	3.94	4.30	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1388	4.40	3.94	4.28	4.37	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	195/ 224	3.63	3.99	4.10	4.33	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 240	4.30	4.41	4.11	4.47	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 219	4.60	4.78	4.44	4.61	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	4.50	4.53	4.35	4.43	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	2	5	10	4.21	929/1639	4.14	4.13	4.27	4.35	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	5	12	4.35	748/1639	4.24	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	13	4.40	661/1397	4.32	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	1	4	2	7	3.87	1185/1583	4.19	4.15	4.19	4.28	3.87	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	3	0	1	4	4	3.50	1241/1532	3.71	3.56	4.01	4.09	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	3	1	6	6	3.94	908/1504	4.02	4.07	4.05	4.09	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	15	4.55	439/1612	4.37	4.17	4.16	4.21	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	840/1635	4.76	4.72	4.65	4.63	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	5	5	5	3.88	1079/1579	3.91	3.90	4.08	4.14	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	643/1518	4.34	4.33	4.43	4.48	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	1074/1520	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	5	9	4.11	1025/1517	3.96	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	805/1550	4.35	4.08	4.22	4.33	4.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	806/1295	4.20	3.91	3.94	4.07	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	875/1398	4.13	3.77	4.07	4.14	3.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	2	1	4	4	3.67	1177/1391	3.83	3.94	4.30	4.35	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	3	2	5	3.75	1095/1388	3.92	3.94	4.28	4.37	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	563/ 958	3.83	3.98	3.93	4.00	3.83	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	3.99	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.41	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.78	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.53	4.35	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	****	1.00	4.45	3.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 203 0201  
 Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES  
 Instructor: ANTHONY, ADAM P  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 424  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	15	4.46	684/1639	4.14	4.13	4.27	4.35	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	10	10	4.25	859/1639	4.24	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	4	14	4.21	841/1397	4.32	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	3	6	7	4.06	974/1583	4.19	4.15	4.19	4.28	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	3	10	7	3.95	842/1532	3.71	3.56	4.01	4.09	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	2	8	8	3.95	884/1504	4.02	4.07	4.05	4.09	3.95	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	7	14	4.38	669/1612	4.37	4.17	4.16	4.21	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	884/1635	4.76	4.72	4.65	4.63	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	3	9	6	4.17	760/1579	3.91	3.90	4.08	4.14	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	9	12	4.39	957/1518	4.34	4.33	4.43	4.48	4.39	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	925/1520	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	3	6	11	4.14	999/1517	3.96	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	6	14	4.50	638/1550	4.35	4.08	4.22	4.33	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	221/1295	4.20	3.91	3.94	4.07	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	560/1398	4.13	3.77	4.07	4.14	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	983/1391	3.83	3.94	4.30	4.35	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	923/1388	3.92	3.94	4.28	4.37	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	7	1	2	1	0	1	2.60	****/ 958	3.83	3.98	3.93	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 224	****	3.99	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	4.41	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 219	****	4.78	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	4.53	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	3.92	4.18	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.52	3.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	2.00	4.47	2.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	1.00	4.45	3.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	1.00	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 21	****	3.00	4.52	3.00	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 203 0201  
 Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES  
 Instructor: ANTHONY, ADAM P  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 424  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 203 0301  
 Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES  
 Instructor: LOMONACO JR, SA  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 425  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	3	6	8	6	3.74	1371/1639	4.14	4.13	4.27	4.35	3.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	8	10	4.13	981/1639	4.24	4.12	4.22	4.27	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	6	13	4.35	713/1397	4.32	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	347/1583	4.19	4.15	4.19	4.28	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	4	5	3	9	3.68	1120/1532	3.71	3.56	4.01	4.09	3.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	678/1504	4.02	4.07	4.05	4.09	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	6	11	4.17	903/1612	4.37	4.17	4.16	4.21	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	913/1635	4.76	4.72	4.65	4.63	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	9	7	5	3.68	1220/1579	3.91	3.90	4.08	4.14	3.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	5	10	8	4.00	1237/1518	4.34	4.33	4.43	4.48	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	2	19	4.63	1087/1520	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	7	10	4	3.63	1304/1517	3.96	4.07	4.27	4.34	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	8	12	4.17	972/1550	4.35	4.08	4.22	4.33	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	19	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/1295	4.20	3.91	3.94	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1398	4.13	3.77	4.07	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1391	3.83	3.94	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1388	3.92	3.94	4.28	4.37	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	3.83	3.98	3.93	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 8
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 5	General 2	Under-grad 24 Non-major 16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 19	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CMSC 304 0101  
 Title ETHICAL ISSUES IN IT  
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 426  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	3	5	0	3.00	1599/1639	3.22	4.13	4.27	4.28	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	5	0	3.18	1566/1639	3.31	4.12	4.22	4.20	3.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	4	1	3.27	1330/1397	3.64	4.25	4.28	4.26	3.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	4	2	3.55	1390/1583	3.61	4.15	4.19	4.24	3.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	4	2	0	2.70	1483/1532	2.91	3.56	4.01	4.05	2.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	5	2	0	2.73	1465/1504	3.24	4.07	4.05	4.12	2.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	4	1	0	2.36	1584/1612	2.90	4.17	4.16	4.12	2.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	1107/1635	4.72	4.72	4.65	4.66	4.55	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	2	4	3	0	0	2.11	1570/1579	2.78	3.90	4.08	4.07	2.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	6	1	1	2.91	1494/1518	3.20	4.33	4.43	4.39	2.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	1379/1520	4.34	4.67	4.70	4.68	4.18	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	5	2	0	2.73	1492/1517	3.05	4.07	4.27	4.23	2.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	5	1	0	2.55	1489/1550	2.96	4.08	4.22	4.20	2.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	3	4	0	0	2.22	1267/1295	2.78	3.91	3.94	3.95	2.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	1	1	4	3.44	1139/1398	3.10	3.77	4.07	4.13	3.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	3	3	1	2	3.22	1286/1391	3.11	3.94	4.30	4.35	3.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	1	1	2	2	2.89	1343/1388	2.94	3.94	4.28	4.34	2.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	554/ 958	3.86	3.98	3.93	3.97	3.86	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 304 0102  
 Title ETHICAL ISSUES IN IT  
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 427  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	5	1	2	3.44	1516/1639	3.22	4.13	4.27	4.28	3.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	4	1	3.44	1505/1639	3.31	4.12	4.22	4.20	3.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	973/1397	3.64	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1324/1583	3.61	4.15	4.19	4.24	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	1	2	2	3.13	1402/1532	2.91	3.56	4.01	4.05	3.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1051/1504	3.24	4.07	4.05	4.12	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	0	3	3.44	1424/1612	2.90	4.17	4.16	4.12	3.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	691/1635	4.72	4.72	4.65	4.66	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	3	5	0	3.44	1345/1579	2.78	3.90	4.08	4.07	3.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1419/1518	3.20	4.33	4.43	4.39	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	1188/1520	4.34	4.67	4.70	4.68	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	2	3	1	3.38	1393/1517	3.05	4.07	4.27	4.23	3.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	4	1	3.38	1375/1550	2.96	4.08	4.22	4.20	3.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1067/1295	2.78	3.91	3.94	3.95	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1330/1398	3.10	3.77	4.07	4.13	2.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1321/1391	3.11	3.94	4.30	4.35	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1320/1388	2.94	3.94	4.28	4.34	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 958	3.86	3.98	3.93	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 313 0101  
 Title COMP ORGAN & ASSEMB LA  
 Instructor: BURT, GARY  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 428  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	6	5	9	5	3.42	1523/1639	3.30	4.13	4.27	4.28	3.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	4	6	9	4	3.27	1550/1639	3.13	4.12	4.22	4.20	3.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	8	4	8	3	3.08	1355/1397	3.16	4.25	4.28	4.26	3.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	7	6	8	3.58	1378/1583	3.38	4.15	4.19	4.24	3.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	3	4	4	1	4	2.94	1449/1532	2.77	3.56	4.01	4.05	2.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	2	5	5	7	3.89	951/1504	3.52	4.07	4.05	4.12	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	5	8	4	7	3.44	1424/1612	3.10	4.17	4.16	4.12	3.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	15	10	4.40	1235/1635	4.23	4.72	4.65	4.66	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	4	3	6	6	2	2.95	1495/1579	2.87	3.90	4.08	4.07	2.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	3	9	4	5	3.30	1453/1518	3.18	4.33	4.43	4.39	3.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	4	5	14	4.43	1247/1520	4.19	4.67	4.70	4.68	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	5	5	6	4	3.13	1443/1517	2.92	4.07	4.27	4.23	3.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	3	7	4	8	3.65	1278/1550	3.33	4.08	4.22	4.20	3.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	2	3	4	5	2	3.13	1143/1295	3.13	3.91	3.94	3.95	3.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	965/1398	2.98	3.77	4.07	4.13	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1255/1391	2.69	3.94	4.30	4.35	3.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1047/1388	3.04	3.94	4.28	4.34	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	7	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 958	****	3.98	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.41	4.11	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 27
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	0
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	22
			? 2		



Course-Section: CMSC 331 0101  
 Title PRIN OF PROG LANGUAGES  
 Instructor: VICK, SHON  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 430  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	5	3	2	4	3.20	1578/1639	3.54	4.13	4.27	4.28	3.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	2	3	3	2.93	1597/1639	3.27	4.12	4.22	4.20	2.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	4	3	4	3.33	1318/1397	3.64	4.25	4.28	4.26	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	0	3	4	3	3.31	1472/1583	3.75	4.15	4.19	4.24	3.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/1532	3.75	3.56	4.01	4.05	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1051/1504	4.03	4.07	4.05	4.12	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	3	3	4	3.27	1471/1612	3.36	4.17	4.16	4.12	3.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	2	1	6	5	1	3.13	1616/1635	3.51	4.72	4.65	4.66	3.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	1	5	4	2	3.21	1434/1579	3.21	3.90	4.08	4.07	3.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	5	2	4	2	2.93	1490/1518	3.36	4.33	4.43	4.39	2.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	1318/1520	4.25	4.67	4.70	4.68	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	5	2	3	2	2.73	1491/1517	3.14	4.07	4.27	4.23	2.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	4	1	4	3.00	1440/1550	3.42	4.08	4.22	4.20	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	2	0	4	3	2	3.27	1093/1295	3.55	3.91	3.94	3.95	3.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	965/1398	3.99	3.77	4.07	4.13	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	983/1391	4.33	3.94	4.30	4.35	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1095/1388	4.04	3.94	4.28	4.34	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 958	****	3.98	3.93	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 331 0201  
 Title PRIN OF PROG LANGUAGES  
 Instructor: VICK, SHON  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 431  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	9	5	3.89	1266/1639	3.54	4.13	4.27	4.28	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	3	7	4	3.61	1438/1639	3.27	4.12	4.22	4.20	3.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	6	6	3.94	1040/1397	3.64	4.25	4.28	4.26	3.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	862/1583	3.75	4.15	4.19	4.24	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1046/1532	3.75	3.56	4.01	4.05	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	568/1504	4.03	4.07	4.05	4.12	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	9	4	3	3.44	1424/1612	3.36	4.17	4.16	4.12	3.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	5	7	5	3.89	1572/1635	3.51	4.72	4.65	4.66	3.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	1	7	6	0	3.20	1438/1579	3.21	3.90	4.08	4.07	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	6	4	6	3.78	1361/1518	3.36	4.33	4.43	4.39	3.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	1383/1520	4.25	4.67	4.70	4.68	4.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	3	6	5	3.56	1328/1517	3.14	4.07	4.27	4.23	3.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	7	6	3.83	1198/1550	3.42	4.08	4.22	4.20	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	2	2	6	6	3.82	791/1295	3.55	3.91	3.94	3.95	3.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	651/1398	3.99	3.77	4.07	4.13	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	489/1391	4.33	3.94	4.30	4.35	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	783/1388	4.04	3.94	4.28	4.34	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 958	****	3.98	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.41	4.11	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.52	4.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0101  
 Title DATA STRUCTURES  
 Instructor: ORDONEZ, PATRIC  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 432  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	7	8	5	3.76	1352/1639	4.27	4.13	4.27	4.28	3.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	10	5	3.86	1294/1639	4.20	4.12	4.22	4.20	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	0	8	9	4.00	973/1397	4.24	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	3	1	2	4	7	3.65	1338/1583	4.10	4.15	4.19	4.24	3.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	6	1	6	3	1	2.53	1499/1532	3.13	3.56	4.01	4.05	2.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	2	3	1	3	3.56	1183/1504	3.77	4.07	4.05	4.12	3.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	6	10	4.05	1016/1612	4.38	4.17	4.16	4.12	4.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	331/1635	4.96	4.72	4.65	4.66	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	9	6	3	3.67	1232/1579	4.18	3.90	4.08	4.07	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	7	9	3	3.52	1416/1518	4.27	4.33	4.43	4.39	3.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	7	13	4.52	1173/1520	4.71	4.67	4.70	4.68	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	6	9	3	3.48	1358/1517	4.15	4.07	4.27	4.23	3.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	4	5	8	3.71	1254/1550	4.30	4.08	4.22	4.20	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	2	1	7	3	3	3.25	1101/1295	4.03	3.91	3.94	3.95	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	2	2	0	1	3.00	****/1398	4.38	3.77	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/1391	4.50	3.94	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/1388	4.38	3.94	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	****/ 958	****	3.98	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	3.99	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.41	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 219	****	4.78	4.44	4.44	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	2.00	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.00	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	1.00	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	1.00	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	3.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0101  
 Title DATA STRUCTURES  
 Instructor: ORDONEZ, PATRIC  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 432  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0201  
 Title DATA STRUCTURES  
 Instructor: EDELMAN, MITCHE  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 433  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	11	18	4.41	754/1639	4.27	4.13	4.27	4.28	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	5	15	10	4.06	1044/1639	4.20	4.12	4.22	4.20	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	13	11	4.13	916/1397	4.24	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	4	12	13	4.23	812/1583	4.10	4.15	4.19	4.24	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	3	1	6	9	7	3.62	1176/1532	3.13	3.56	4.01	4.05	3.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	1	2	12	7	3.76	1042/1504	3.77	4.07	4.05	4.12	3.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	12	16	4.47	546/1612	4.38	4.17	4.16	4.12	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	463/1635	4.96	4.72	4.65	4.66	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	5	9	13	4.30	612/1579	4.18	3.90	4.08	4.07	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	12	18	4.50	807/1518	4.27	4.33	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	26	4.81	776/1520	4.71	4.67	4.70	4.68	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	14	14	4.28	854/1517	4.15	4.07	4.27	4.23	4.28	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	10	18	4.44	729/1550	4.30	4.08	4.22	4.20	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	2	2	9	15	4.21	497/1295	4.03	3.91	3.94	3.95	4.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	532/1398	4.38	3.77	4.07	4.13	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	616/1391	4.50	3.94	4.30	4.35	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	758/1388	4.38	3.94	4.28	4.34	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	24	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 958	****	3.98	3.93	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 19		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 32 Non-major 20
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 6	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 31	
			? 1		

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0301  
 Title DATA STRUCTURES  
 Instructor: FREY, DENNIS  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 434  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	6	15	4.64	469/1639	4.27	4.13	4.27	4.28	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	327/1639	4.20	4.12	4.22	4.20	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	427/1397	4.24	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	10	10	4.43	572/1583	4.10	4.15	4.19	4.24	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	5	3	2	3	3.23	1367/1532	3.13	3.56	4.01	4.05	3.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	824/1504	3.77	4.07	4.05	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	352/1612	4.38	4.17	4.16	4.12	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1635	4.96	4.72	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	9	12	4.57	312/1579	4.18	3.90	4.08	4.07	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	360/1518	4.27	4.33	4.43	4.39	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	802/1520	4.71	4.67	4.70	4.68	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	382/1517	4.15	4.07	4.27	4.23	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	351/1550	4.30	4.08	4.22	4.20	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	197/1295	4.03	3.91	3.94	3.95	4.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/1398	4.38	3.77	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1391	4.50	3.94	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1388	4.38	3.94	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 958	****	3.98	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	3.99	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.41	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.78	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.53	4.35	4.21	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	3.92	4.18	4.04	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	2.00	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.00	4.16	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6	
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C 2	General 0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D 0	Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 8
				P 0	
				I 0	Electives 0
				? 1	Other 17

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

Course-Section: CMSC 341H 0101  
 Title DATA STRUCTURES  
 Instructor: RHEINGANS, PENN  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 435  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	9	4.75	318/1639	4.75	4.13	4.27	4.28	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	4	3	3.67	1410/1639	3.67	4.12	4.22	4.20	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	4	2	3.33	1318/1397	3.33	4.25	4.28	4.26	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	536/1583	4.45	4.15	4.19	4.24	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	5	1	3.50	1241/1532	3.50	3.56	4.01	4.05	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	1	5	3.82	1003/1504	3.82	4.07	4.05	4.12	3.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	5	6	4.25	814/1612	4.25	4.17	4.16	4.12	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.72	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	9	0	3.64	1251/1579	3.64	3.90	4.08	4.07	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1237/1518	4.00	4.33	4.43	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	1188/1520	4.50	4.67	4.70	4.68	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	2	5	2	3.42	1380/1517	3.42	4.07	4.27	4.23	3.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	1152/1550	3.92	4.08	4.22	4.20	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	481/1295	4.22	3.91	3.94	3.95	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	770/1398	4.00	3.77	4.07	4.13	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	616/1391	4.50	3.94	4.30	4.35	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	1047/1388	3.88	3.94	4.28	4.34	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	456/ 958	4.00	3.98	3.93	3.97	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 345 0101  
 Title SOFTWARE DESIGN/DEVELO  
 Instructor: MITCHELL, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 436  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	10	11	4.30	841/1639	4.15	4.13	4.27	4.28	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	517/1639	4.16	4.12	4.22	4.20	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	4	7	8	4.21	831/1397	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	13	4.39	611/1583	4.20	4.15	4.19	4.24	4.39	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	12	5	4	3.55	1218/1532	3.16	3.56	4.01	4.05	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	8	10	4.22	647/1504	4.01	4.07	4.05	4.12	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	1	6	14	4.30	756/1612	4.06	4.17	4.16	4.12	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.72	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	10	8	4.30	601/1579	3.98	3.90	4.08	4.07	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	271/1518	4.62	4.33	4.43	4.39	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	750/1520	4.64	4.67	4.70	4.68	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	10	11	4.39	736/1517	4.20	4.07	4.27	4.23	4.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	8	14	4.48	677/1550	4.15	4.08	4.22	4.20	4.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	289/1295	4.55	3.91	3.94	3.95	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	770/1398	4.11	3.77	4.07	4.13	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	393/1391	4.65	3.94	4.30	4.35	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	255/1388	4.60	3.94	4.28	4.34	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	456/ 958	3.75	3.98	3.93	3.97	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 21	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 21
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 23 Non-major 2
84-150	12	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 22	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CMSC 345 0201  
 Title SOFTWARE DESIGN/DEVELO  
 Instructor: MITCHELL, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 437  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	1	5	4.00	1138/1639	4.15	4.13	4.27	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1319/1639	4.16	4.12	4.22	4.20	3.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	795/1397	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1010/1583	4.20	4.15	4.19	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	2	0	2	2	2.78	1474/1532	3.16	3.56	4.01	4.05	2.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	4	3	3.80	1010/1504	4.01	4.07	4.05	4.12	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	2	5	3.82	1245/1612	4.06	4.17	4.16	4.12	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.72	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1232/1579	3.98	3.90	4.08	4.07	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	989/1518	4.62	4.33	4.43	4.39	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	1230/1520	4.64	4.67	4.70	4.68	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	1083/1517	4.20	4.07	4.27	4.23	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	1209/1550	4.15	4.08	4.22	4.20	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	209/1295	4.55	3.91	3.94	3.95	4.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	651/1398	4.11	3.77	4.07	4.13	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	579/1391	4.65	3.94	4.30	4.35	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	783/1388	4.60	3.94	4.28	4.34	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	2	3	0	3	3.50	725/ 958	3.75	3.98	3.93	3.97	3.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	4.41	4.11	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	2.00	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.00	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	1.00	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	1.00	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	3.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 345 0201  
 Title SOFTWARE DESIGN/DEVELO  
 Instructor: MITCHELL, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 437  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 411 0101  
 Title: COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE  
 Instructor: SQUIRE, JON S  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 438  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	6	8	8	4.09	1075/1639	4.47	4.13	4.27	4.42	4.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	8	10	4.14	981/1639	4.41	4.12	4.22	4.29	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	5	12	4.23	822/1397	4.52	4.25	4.28	4.38	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	423/1583	4.37	4.15	4.19	4.31	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	2	5	2	4	3.43	1288/1532	3.64	3.56	4.01	4.07	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	603/1504	4.50	4.07	4.05	4.20	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	4	13	4.43	603/1612	4.55	4.17	4.16	4.18	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	1001/1635	4.86	4.72	4.65	4.72	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	7	7	4.11	830/1579	4.26	3.90	4.08	4.21	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	947/1518	4.80	4.33	4.43	4.51	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	674/1520	4.81	4.67	4.70	4.75	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	833/1517	4.41	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	4	4	10	4.10	1029/1550	4.46	4.08	4.22	4.24	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	1	3	8	4	3.94	698/1295	4.32	3.91	3.94	4.01	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/1398	3.00	3.77	4.07	4.23	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/1391	3.00	3.94	4.30	4.48	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/1388	4.50	3.94	4.28	4.50	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 958	****	3.98	3.93	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 22 Non-major 4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 18	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CMSC 411 0201  
 Title: COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE  
 Instructor: SQUIRE, JON S  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 439  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	9	4.90	171/1639	4.47	4.13	4.27	4.42	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	199/1639	4.41	4.12	4.22	4.29	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	162/1397	4.52	4.25	4.28	4.38	4.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	423/1583	4.37	4.15	4.19	4.31	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	700/1532	3.64	3.56	4.01	4.07	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	329/1504	4.50	4.07	4.05	4.20	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	490/1612	4.55	4.17	4.16	4.18	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	662/1635	4.86	4.72	4.65	4.72	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	241/1579	4.26	3.90	4.08	4.21	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1518	4.80	4.33	4.43	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1520	4.81	4.67	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	275/1517	4.41	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1550	4.46	4.08	4.22	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	90/1295	4.32	3.91	3.94	4.01	4.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1398	3.00	3.77	4.07	4.23	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1391	3.00	3.94	4.30	4.48	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1388	4.50	3.94	4.28	4.50	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 958	****	3.98	3.93	4.24	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	3.99	4.10	4.49	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.41	4.11	4.26	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	4.78	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.53	4.35	4.28	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	3.92	4.18	4.21	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.52	4.49	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	2.00	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.00	4.16	4.02	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.84	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.73	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	1.00	4.45	4.85	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.85	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	1.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	3.00	4.52	4.50	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 411 0201  
 Title: COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE  
 Instructor: SQUIRE, JON S  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 439  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 411 0301  
 Title COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE  
 Instructor: YOUNIS, MOHAMED  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 440  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	726/1639	4.47	4.13	4.27	4.42	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	831/1639	4.41	4.12	4.22	4.29	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	632/1397	4.52	4.25	4.28	4.38	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1010/1583	4.37	4.15	4.19	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1300/1532	3.64	3.56	4.01	4.07	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	245/1504	4.50	4.07	4.05	4.20	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	259/1612	4.55	4.17	4.16	4.18	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1635	4.86	4.72	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	889/1579	4.26	3.90	4.08	4.21	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1518	4.80	4.33	4.43	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1136/1520	4.81	4.67	4.70	4.75	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	990/1517	4.41	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	875/1550	4.46	4.08	4.22	4.24	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	545/1295	4.32	3.91	3.94	4.01	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1271/1398	3.00	3.77	4.07	4.23	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1321/1391	3.00	3.94	4.30	4.48	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	647/1388	4.50	3.94	4.28	4.50	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 421 0101  
 Title PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS  
 Instructor: KALPAKIS, KONST  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 441  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	3	5	12	4.00	1138/1639	3.90	4.13	4.27	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	8	5	8	3.75	1357/1639	3.50	4.12	4.22	4.29	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	11	3	5	3.29	1328/1397	3.25	4.25	4.28	4.38	3.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	5	7	8	4.05	981/1583	3.67	4.15	4.19	4.31	4.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	6	3	4	9	3.50	1241/1532	3.66	3.56	4.01	4.07	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	3	3	7	6	3.70	1092/1504	3.63	4.07	4.05	4.20	3.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	7	11	4.08	989/1612	3.57	4.17	4.16	4.18	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	18	5	4.22	1382/1635	4.08	4.72	4.65	4.72	4.22	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	15	3	4.00	889/1579	3.68	3.90	4.08	4.21	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	17	4.58	708/1518	4.09	4.33	4.43	4.51	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	23	4.92	491/1520	4.51	4.67	4.70	4.75	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	3	9	9	4.00	1083/1517	3.73	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	8	10	4.04	1057/1550	3.67	4.08	4.22	4.24	4.04	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	3	3	5	6	4	3.24	1109/1295	3.35	3.91	3.94	4.01	3.24	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	3	6	2	3.46	1128/1398	3.23	3.77	4.07	4.23	3.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	1170/1391	4.01	3.94	4.30	4.48	3.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	5	3	4	3.69	1116/1388	3.90	3.94	4.28	4.50	3.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	11	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 958	****	3.98	3.93	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 6	General	0
84-150	15	3.00-3.49 9	D 0		Under-grad 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	24
			? 2		

Course-Section: CMSC 421 0201  
 Title PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS  
 Instructor: CHETTI, SAMIR  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 442  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	6	8	3.80	1326/1639	3.90	4.13	4.27	4.42	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	6	6	3	3.25	1553/1639	3.50	4.12	4.22	4.29	3.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	6	4	4	3.20	1337/1397	3.25	4.25	4.28	4.38	3.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	2	2	2	6	2	3.29	1477/1583	3.67	4.15	4.19	4.31	3.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	9	2	6	3.82	973/1532	3.66	3.56	4.01	4.07	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	2	3	7	3	3.56	1177/1504	3.63	4.07	4.05	4.20	3.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	3	4	6	3	3.05	1515/1612	3.57	4.17	4.16	4.18	3.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	18	1	3.95	1533/1635	4.08	4.72	4.65	4.72	3.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	3	0	2	7	2	3.36	1383/1579	3.68	3.90	4.08	4.21	3.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	5	8	4	3.60	1404/1518	4.09	4.33	4.43	4.51	3.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	3	1	7	9	4.10	1397/1520	4.51	4.67	4.70	4.75	4.10	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	4	4	7	4	3.45	1365/1517	3.73	4.07	4.27	4.34	3.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	3	6	5	3.30	1393/1550	3.67	4.08	4.22	4.24	3.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	2	0	8	2	5	3.47	995/1295	3.35	3.91	3.94	4.01	3.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	3	0	3	1	3.00	1271/1398	3.23	3.77	4.07	4.23	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	752/1391	4.01	3.94	4.30	4.48	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	912/1388	3.90	3.94	4.28	4.50	4.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	7	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 958	****	3.98	3.93	4.24	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	3.99	4.10	4.49	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 240	****	4.41	4.11	4.26	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	4.78	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.53	4.35	4.28	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	3.92	4.18	4.21	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.52	4.49	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.84	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.73	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	1.00	4.45	4.85	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.85	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	19	
?	2			

Course-Section: CMSC 426 0101  
 Title PRINC COMPUTER SECURIT  
 Instructor: JOSHI, ANUPAM  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 443  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	1	5	10	4.41	740/1639	4.41	4.13	4.27	4.42	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	4	3	8	4.06	1044/1639	4.06	4.12	4.22	4.29	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	869/1397	4.18	4.25	4.28	4.38	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	7	9	4.35	669/1583	4.35	4.15	4.19	4.31	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	4	3	5	3.71	1092/1532	3.71	3.56	4.01	4.07	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	2	2	4	5	3.71	1083/1504	3.71	4.07	4.05	4.20	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	4	3	9	4.12	965/1612	4.12	4.17	4.16	4.18	4.12	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.72	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	2	0	2	6	3.91	1056/1579	3.91	3.90	4.08	4.21	3.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	933/1518	4.41	4.33	4.43	4.51	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	979/1520	4.71	4.67	4.70	4.75	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	964/1517	4.18	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	0	5	9	4.06	1053/1550	4.06	4.08	4.22	4.24	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	709/1295	3.92	3.91	3.94	4.01	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	329/1398	4.67	3.77	4.07	4.23	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	489/1391	4.67	3.94	4.30	4.48	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	296/1388	4.83	3.94	4.28	4.50	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	380/ 958	4.20	3.98	3.93	4.24	4.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 3
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	9
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		15
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		

Course-Section: CMSC 435 0101  
 Title: COMPUTER GRAPHICS  
 Instructor: HOOD, DANIEL J  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 444  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	4	12	4.65	456/1639	4.65	4.13	4.27	4.42	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	7	4.06	1052/1639	4.06	4.12	4.22	4.29	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	2	9	4.06	954/1397	4.06	4.25	4.28	4.38	4.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	741/1583	4.31	4.15	4.19	4.31	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1023/1532	3.78	3.56	4.01	4.07	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	491/1504	4.40	4.07	4.05	4.20	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	7	4	6	3.94	1122/1612	3.94	4.17	4.16	4.18	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.72	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	737/1579	4.19	3.90	4.08	4.21	4.19	
-----															
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	849/1518	4.47	4.33	4.43	4.51	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	1060/1520	4.65	4.67	4.70	4.75	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	907/1517	4.24	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.24	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	1019/1550	4.12	4.08	4.22	4.24	4.12	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	5	2	7	4.00	623/1295	4.00	3.91	3.94	4.01	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5	General	9 Under-grad 17 Non-major 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 4		
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	D 1	Electives	0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	7

Course-Section: CMSC 441 0101  
 Title ALGORITHMS  
 Instructor: YESHA, YAACOV  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 445  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	7	5	3	3.20	1578/1639	3.91	4.13	4.27	4.42	3.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	7	5	3.65	1416/1639	4.14	4.12	4.22	4.29	3.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	6	8	4.00	973/1397	4.25	4.25	4.28	4.38	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	3	2	4	4	3.69	1303/1583	4.16	4.15	4.19	4.31	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	2	4	2	7	3.75	1046/1532	4.04	3.56	4.01	4.07	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	824/1504	4.31	4.07	4.05	4.20	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	352/1612	4.57	4.17	4.16	4.18	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	662/1635	4.51	4.72	4.65	4.72	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	3	6	7	0	3.00	1477/1579	3.44	3.90	4.08	4.21	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	4	4	5	7	3.75	1368/1518	4.09	4.33	4.43	4.51	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	3	13	4.45	1239/1520	4.65	4.67	4.70	4.75	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	6	2	6	4	3.20	1433/1517	3.53	4.07	4.27	4.34	3.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	3	3	6	3	3.05	1436/1550	3.74	4.08	4.22	4.24	3.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	16	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1295	3.40	3.91	3.94	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	1364/1398	3.45	3.77	4.07	4.23	2.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	2	1	1	2	0	2.50	1377/1391	3.50	3.94	4.30	4.48	2.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/1388	5.00	3.94	4.28	4.50	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 958	****	3.98	3.93	4.24	****	
Field Work															
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.73	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 15	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 1
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	19
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 4
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	18
			? 0		

Course-Section: CMSC 441 0201  
 Title ALGORITHMS  
 Instructor: SHERMAN, ALAN  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 446  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	482/1639	3.91	4.13	4.27	4.42	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	393/1639	4.14	4.12	4.22	4.29	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	517/1397	4.25	4.25	4.28	4.38	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	355/1583	4.16	4.15	4.19	4.31	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	506/1532	4.04	3.56	4.01	4.07	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	275/1504	4.31	4.07	4.05	4.20	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	490/1612	4.57	4.17	4.16	4.18	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	1441/1635	4.51	4.72	4.65	4.72	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1079/1579	3.44	3.90	4.08	4.21	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	919/1518	4.09	4.33	4.43	4.51	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	674/1520	4.65	4.67	4.70	4.75	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1211/1517	3.53	4.07	4.27	4.34	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	742/1550	3.74	4.08	4.22	4.24	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1035/1295	3.40	3.91	3.94	4.01	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	426/1398	3.45	3.77	4.07	4.23	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	616/1391	3.50	3.94	4.30	4.48	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	5.00	3.94	4.28	4.50	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	3.98	3.93	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 442 0101  
 Title INFO & CODING THEORY  
 Instructor: LOMONACO JR, SA  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 447  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	814/1639	4.33	4.13	4.27	4.42	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	476/1639	4.55	4.12	4.22	4.29	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	209/1397	4.83	4.25	4.28	4.38	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	697/1583	4.33	4.15	4.19	4.31	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	1104/1532	3.70	3.56	4.01	4.07	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	275/1504	4.63	4.07	4.05	4.20	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	408/1612	4.58	4.17	4.16	4.18	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	1001/1635	4.67	4.72	4.65	4.72	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	283/1579	4.60	3.90	4.08	4.21	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	757/1518	4.55	4.33	4.43	4.51	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.67	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	239/1517	4.80	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	489/1550	4.64	4.08	4.22	4.24	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	783/1295	3.83	3.91	3.94	4.01	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	770/1398	4.00	3.77	4.07	4.23	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	816/1391	4.25	3.94	4.30	4.48	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1095/1388	3.75	3.94	4.28	4.50	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 445 0101  
 Title SOFTWARE ENGINEERING  
 Instructor: SEGALL, ZARY  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 448  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	2	5	8	3.94	1206/1639	3.94	4.13	4.27	4.42	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	9	4.17	948/1639	4.17	4.12	4.22	4.29	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1254/1397	3.57	4.25	4.28	4.38	3.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	2	5	7	3.94	1098/1583	3.94	4.15	4.19	4.31	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	4	5	4	3.50	1241/1532	3.50	3.56	4.01	4.07	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	4	3	4	4	3.38	1278/1504	3.38	4.07	4.05	4.20	3.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	7	4	2	3.18	1494/1612	3.18	4.17	4.16	4.18	3.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.72	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	806/1579	4.13	3.90	4.08	4.21	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	807/1518	4.50	4.33	4.43	4.51	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	725/1520	4.83	4.67	4.70	4.75	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	747/1517	4.39	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	4	7	4.00	1077/1550	4.00	4.08	4.22	4.24	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	428/1295	4.29	3.91	3.94	4.01	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	260/1398	4.75	3.77	4.07	4.23	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	525/1391	4.63	3.94	4.30	4.48	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1388	5.00	3.94	4.28	4.50	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	185/ 958	4.57	3.98	3.93	4.24	4.57	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	3.99	4.10	4.49	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.58	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	2.00	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.00	4.16	4.02	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 451 0101  
 Title AUTOMATA THRY& FORM LA  
 Instructor: YESHA, YAACOV  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 449  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	4	3	2	3	3.33	1546/1639	3.33	4.13	4.27	4.42	3.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	1	2	5	3.58	1451/1639	3.58	4.12	4.22	4.29	3.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	437/1397	4.58	4.25	4.28	4.38	4.58		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	4.15	4.19	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	3	1	2	2	3.38	1312/1532	3.38	3.56	4.01	4.07	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1083/1504	3.71	4.07	4.05	4.20	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	449/1612	4.55	4.17	4.16	4.18	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.72	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	4	0	3	0	2.86	1519/1579	2.86	3.90	4.08	4.21	2.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	1094/1518	4.25	4.33	4.43	4.51	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	1318/1520	4.33	4.67	4.70	4.75	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	2	1	6	3.75	1260/1517	3.75	4.07	4.27	4.34	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	3	3.92	1152/1550	3.92	4.08	4.22	4.24	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1229/1295	2.67	3.91	3.94	4.01	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1106/1398	3.50	3.77	4.07	4.23	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	4	0	1	3.17	1296/1391	3.17	3.94	4.30	4.48	3.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	1248/1388	3.33	3.94	4.28	4.50	3.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	3.98	3.93	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 455 0101  
 Title NUMERICAL COMPUTATIONS  
 Instructor: STEPHENS, ARTHU  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 450  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	4	3	2	3.50	1497/1639	3.50	4.13	4.27	4.42	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	915/1639	4.20	4.12	4.22	4.29	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	749/1397	4.30	4.25	4.28	4.38	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	929/1583	4.11	4.15	4.19	4.31	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1136/1532	3.67	3.56	4.01	4.07	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	747/1504	4.13	4.07	4.05	4.20	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	976/1612	4.10	4.17	4.16	4.18	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.72	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1200/1579	3.71	3.90	4.08	4.21	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	891/1518	4.44	4.33	4.43	4.51	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1239/1520	4.44	4.67	4.70	4.75	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1007/1517	4.13	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	1	4	1	3.25	1402/1550	3.25	4.08	4.22	4.24	3.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	1158/1295	3.00	3.91	3.94	4.01	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1398	****	3.77	4.07	4.23	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1391	****	3.94	4.30	4.48	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1388	****	3.94	4.28	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 461 0101  
 Title DATABASE MANGMT SYSTEM  
 Instructor: DORBAND, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 451  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	6	2	3.91	1252/1639	3.91	4.13	4.27	4.42	3.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	2	3.64	1427/1639	3.64	4.12	4.22	4.29	3.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	7	1	3.55	1260/1397	3.55	4.25	4.28	4.38	3.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	939/1583	4.10	4.15	4.19	4.31	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	1	3	2	3.33	1330/1532	3.33	3.56	4.01	4.07	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	701/1504	4.17	4.07	4.05	4.20	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	3	2	3.55	1383/1612	3.55	4.17	4.16	4.18	3.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	662/1635	4.91	4.72	4.65	4.72	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	6	3	1	3.27	1412/1579	3.27	3.90	4.08	4.21	3.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	3	6	0	3.27	1456/1518	3.27	4.33	4.43	4.51	3.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	5	3	3	3.82	1455/1520	3.82	4.67	4.70	4.75	3.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	7	2	0	2.82	1481/1517	2.82	4.07	4.27	4.34	2.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	6	3	1	3.27	1398/1550	3.27	4.08	4.22	4.24	3.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	2	3	2	1	3.00	1158/1295	3.00	3.91	3.94	4.01	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	770/1398	4.00	3.77	4.07	4.23	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	752/1391	4.33	3.94	4.30	4.48	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	496/1388	4.67	3.94	4.28	4.50	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 471 0101  
 Title ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENC  
 Instructor: EATON, ERIC R  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 452  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	9	18	4.38	780/1639	4.38	4.13	4.27	4.42	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	14	15	4.38	722/1639	4.38	4.12	4.22	4.29	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	14	13	4.22	831/1397	4.22	4.25	4.28	4.38	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	6	11	11	4.10	939/1583	4.10	4.15	4.19	4.31	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	3	12	7	7	3.45	1270/1532	3.45	3.56	4.01	4.07	3.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	3	7	12	5	3.61	1154/1504	3.61	4.07	4.05	4.20	3.61	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	13	17	4.44	589/1612	4.44	4.17	4.16	4.18	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.72	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	1	4	13	8	4.08	847/1579	4.08	3.90	4.08	4.21	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	6	23	4.63	656/1518	4.63	4.33	4.43	4.51	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	30	4.94	382/1520	4.94	4.67	4.70	4.75	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	5	10	16	4.28	854/1517	4.28	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.28	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	9	17	4.28	875/1550	4.28	4.08	4.22	4.24	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	3	12	16	4.42	337/1295	4.42	3.91	3.94	4.01	4.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	2	8	0	3.55	1093/1398	3.55	3.77	4.07	4.23	3.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	727/1391	4.36	3.94	4.30	4.48	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	764/1388	4.36	3.94	4.28	4.50	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	7	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 958	****	3.98	3.93	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 29
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 9	General 17	Under-grad 32 Non-major 3
84-150	20	3.00-3.49 11	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 12	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CMSC 473 0101  
 Title NATURAL LANG PROCESSIN  
 Instructor: NIRENBURG, SERG  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 453  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1530/1639	3.40	4.13	4.27	4.42	3.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	2	1	2	2.80	1611/1639	2.80	4.12	4.22	4.29	2.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	4	1	3.40	1300/1397	3.40	4.25	4.28	4.38	3.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	1	3	1	3.13	1515/1583	3.13	4.15	4.19	4.31	3.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	3	2	1	3.00	1421/1532	3.00	3.56	4.01	4.07	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	1	3	0	2.71	1467/1504	2.71	4.07	4.05	4.20	2.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	3	1	1	2.50	1576/1612	2.50	4.17	4.16	4.18	2.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.72	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	2	0	4	2	2	3.20	1438/1579	3.20	3.90	4.08	4.21	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	0	5	3	3.70	1385/1518	3.70	4.33	4.43	4.51	3.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	1115/1520	4.60	4.67	4.70	4.75	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	2	4	1	3.10	1448/1517	3.10	4.07	4.27	4.34	3.10	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	2	2	3.30	1393/1550	3.30	4.08	4.22	4.24	3.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	3	1	1	2	3.29	1089/1295	3.29	3.91	3.94	4.01	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1323/1398	2.80	3.77	4.07	4.23	2.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1361/1391	2.80	3.94	4.30	4.48	2.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1282/1388	3.20	3.94	4.28	4.50	3.20	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 481 0101  
 Title: COMPUTER NETWORKS  
 Instructor: GREEN, FRANK E.  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 454  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	6	11	4	3.82	1318/1639	3.82	4.13	4.27	4.42	3.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	9	10	2	3.59	1447/1639	3.59	4.12	4.22	4.29	3.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	7	9	4.00	973/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.38	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	6	1	7	5	3.58	1378/1583	3.58	4.15	4.19	4.31	3.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	5	6	5	3	3.00	1421/1532	3.00	3.56	4.01	4.07	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	5	7	6	0	2.76	1455/1504	2.76	4.07	4.05	4.20	2.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	3	14	4.23	848/1612	4.23	4.17	4.16	4.18	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	12	4.55	1107/1635	4.55	4.72	4.65	4.72	4.55	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	7	14	2	3.78	1148/1579	3.78	3.90	4.08	4.21	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	5	13	5	4.00	1237/1518	4.00	4.33	4.43	4.51	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	12	11	4.48	1213/1520	4.48	4.67	4.70	4.75	4.48	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	7	10	6	3.96	1132/1517	3.96	4.07	4.27	4.34	3.96	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	9	7	5	3.65	1278/1550	3.65	4.08	4.22	4.24	3.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	3	9	4	1	2.95	1183/1295	2.95	3.91	3.94	4.01	2.95	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1398	****	3.77	4.07	4.23	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1391	****	3.94	4.30	4.48	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1388	****	3.94	4.28	4.50	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 958	****	3.98	3.93	4.24	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	4.41	4.11	4.26	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 219	****	4.78	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 215	****	4.53	4.35	4.28	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	3.92	4.18	4.21	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.52	4.49	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	2.00	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 82	****	4.00	4.16	4.02	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.84	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.73	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	1.00	4.45	4.85	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.85	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	1.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	3.00	4.52	4.50	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 481 0101  
 Title: COMPUTER NETWORKS  
 Instructor: GREEN, FRANK E.  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 454  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	10	Under-grad	23	Non-major	10
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 491G 0101  
 Title SPEC TOPICS IN COMP SC  
 Instructor: OLANO, MARC  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 455  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	495/1639	4.62	4.13	4.27	4.42	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	177/1639	4.83	4.12	4.22	4.29	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1397	****	4.25	4.28	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	792/1583	4.25	4.15	4.19	4.31	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	1241/1532	3.50	3.56	4.01	4.07	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	150/1504	4.80	4.07	4.05	4.20	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	1	0	4	5	3.75	1279/1612	3.75	4.17	4.16	4.18	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.72	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	569/1579	4.33	3.90	4.08	4.21	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	435/1518	4.77	4.33	4.43	4.51	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.67	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	125/1517	4.92	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	242/1550	4.85	4.08	4.22	4.24	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	297/1295	4.46	3.91	3.94	4.01	4.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1398	****	3.77	4.07	4.23	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1391	****	3.94	4.30	4.48	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1388	****	3.94	4.28	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 5
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 8
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 4		

Course-Section: CMSC 491S 0101  
 Title SERV ORIENTED COMPUTIN  
 Instructor: HALEM, MILTON  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 456  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	2	3	1	3.00	1599/1639	3.00	4.13	4.27	4.42	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	3	1	3.33	1536/1639	3.33	4.12	4.22	4.29	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	2	1	3.11	1517/1583	3.11	4.15	4.19	4.31	3.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	1350/1532	3.29	3.56	4.01	4.07	3.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	367/1504	4.50	4.07	4.05	4.20	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	5	3	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.17	4.16	4.18	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.72	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	4	1	1	3.29	1409/1579	3.29	3.90	4.08	4.21	3.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1392/1518	3.67	4.33	4.43	4.51	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	855/1520	4.78	4.67	4.70	4.75	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	3	1	3.56	1328/1517	3.56	4.07	4.27	4.34	3.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	2	1	3.22	1407/1550	3.22	4.08	4.22	4.24	3.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	2	1	3	0	3.17	1132/1295	3.17	3.91	3.94	4.01	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	4	0	3.57	1083/1398	3.57	3.77	4.07	4.23	3.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1094/1391	3.86	3.94	4.30	4.48	3.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	1108/1388	3.71	3.94	4.28	4.50	3.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 958	****	3.98	3.93	4.24	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	4.41	4.11	4.26	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	4.53	4.35	4.28	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	3.92	4.18	4.21	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.52	4.49	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	2.00	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 82	****	4.00	4.16	4.02	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.84	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.73	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	1.00	4.45	4.85	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	1.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	3.00	4.52	4.50	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 491S 0101  
 Title SERV ORIENTED COMPUTIN  
 Instructor: HALEM, MILTON  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 456  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 611 0101  
 Title ADV COMPUTER ARCHITECT  
 Instructor: YOUNIS, MOHAMED  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 457  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	561/1639	4.55	4.13	4.27	4.42	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	327/1639	4.68	4.12	4.22	4.26	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.25	4.28	4.37	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	751/1583	4.29	4.15	4.19	4.31	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	3	8	7	4.11	700/1532	4.11	3.56	4.01	4.10	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	594/1504	4.28	4.07	4.05	4.29	4.28	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	718/1612	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.27	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	331/1635	4.95	4.72	4.65	4.81	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	352/1579	4.53	3.90	4.08	4.17	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	286/1518	4.86	4.33	4.43	4.49	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	674/1520	4.86	4.67	4.70	4.79	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	347/1517	4.71	4.07	4.27	4.32	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	401/1550	4.71	4.08	4.22	4.23	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	383/1295	4.36	3.91	3.94	3.95	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	6	4	3.92	863/1398	3.92	3.77	4.07	4.22	3.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	594/1391	4.54	3.94	4.30	4.47	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	684/1388	4.46	3.94	4.28	4.49	4.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	349/ 958	4.25	3.98	3.93	4.01	4.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	3.99	4.10	4.43	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.41	4.11	3.96	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	4.78	4.44	4.23	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.53	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	3.92	4.18	4.74	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.52	4.74	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	2.00	4.47	4.50	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.00	4.16	4.37	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.33	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	1.00	4.45	4.39	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	1.00	4.37	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	3.00	4.52	4.42	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 611 0101  
 Title ADV COMPUTER ARCHITECT  
 Instructor: YOUNIS, MOHAMED  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 457  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	12	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CMSC 621 0101  
 Title ADV OPERATING SYSTEMS  
 Instructor: SIDHU, DEEPINDE  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 458  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	2	7	7	3.95	1206/1639	3.95	4.13	4.27	4.42	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	8	4	3.68	1399/1639	3.68	4.12	4.22	4.26	3.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	6	6	3.79	1160/1397	3.79	4.25	4.28	4.37	3.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	7	4	3.68	1310/1583	3.68	4.15	4.19	4.31	3.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	6	10	4.26	571/1532	4.26	3.56	4.01	4.10	4.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	5	5	3	3.16	1375/1504	3.16	4.07	4.05	4.29	3.16	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	6	1	6	4	3.21	1485/1612	3.21	4.17	4.16	4.27	3.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	1034/1635	4.63	4.72	4.65	4.81	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	0	4	6	1	3.31	1402/1579	3.31	3.90	4.08	4.17	3.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	1	7	7	4.12	1196/1518	4.12	4.33	4.43	4.49	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	1	4	10	4.29	1341/1520	4.29	4.67	4.70	4.79	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	8	5	3.94	1142/1517	3.94	4.07	4.27	4.32	3.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	7	5	3.76	1232/1550	3.76	4.08	4.22	4.23	3.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	2	4	5	3	3.47	1000/1295	3.47	3.91	3.94	3.95	3.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	1	8	2	3.69	1009/1398	3.69	3.77	4.07	4.22	3.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	1	6	4	3.85	1100/1391	3.85	3.94	4.30	4.47	3.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	2	1	6	3	3.62	1152/1388	3.62	3.94	4.28	4.49	3.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	2	1	2	2	2	3.11	832/ 958	3.11	3.98	3.93	4.01	3.11	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.41	4.11	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 10	Major 14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 9	Non-major 5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 14		
				? 2			

Course-Section: CMSC 653 0101  
 Title CODING THRY/APPLICATIO  
 Instructor: LOMONACO JR, SA  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 459  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	257/1639	4.80	4.13	4.27	4.42	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.12	4.22	4.26	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	230/1397	4.80	4.25	4.28	4.37	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.15	4.19	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	580/1532	4.25	3.56	4.01	4.10	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.07	4.05	4.29	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.17	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1067/1635	4.60	4.72	4.65	4.81	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	569/1579	4.33	3.90	4.08	4.17	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	360/1518	4.80	4.33	4.43	4.49	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.67	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	726/1517	4.40	4.07	4.27	4.32	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	522/1550	4.60	4.08	4.22	4.23	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1158/1295	3.00	3.91	3.94	3.95	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1398	5.00	3.77	4.07	4.22	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	3.94	4.30	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388	5.00	3.94	4.28	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	3.98	3.93	4.01	****	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.33	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	1.00	4.37	4.31	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 671 0101  
 Title PRIN ARTIFICIAL INTELL  
 Instructor: PENG, YUN  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 460  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	860/1639	4.29	4.13	4.27	4.42	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	831/1639	4.29	4.12	4.22	4.26	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	447/1397	4.57	4.25	4.28	4.37	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	597/1583	4.40	4.15	4.19	4.31	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1092/1532	3.71	3.56	4.01	4.10	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	367/1504	4.50	4.07	4.05	4.29	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	779/1612	4.29	4.17	4.16	4.27	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1087/1635	4.57	4.72	4.65	4.81	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1438/1579	3.20	3.90	4.08	4.17	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1162/1518	4.17	4.33	4.43	4.49	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	725/1520	4.83	4.67	4.70	4.79	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	1347/1517	3.50	4.07	4.27	4.32	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	1274/1550	3.67	4.08	4.22	4.23	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	978/1295	3.50	3.91	3.94	3.95	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1271/1398	3.00	3.77	4.07	4.22	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	983/1391	4.00	3.94	4.30	4.47	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	783/1388	4.33	3.94	4.28	4.49	4.33	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.41	4.11	3.96	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.03	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	1.00	4.45	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 678 0101  
 Title INTRO MACHINE LEARNING  
 Instructor: KARGUPTA, HILLO  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 461  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	5	7	4.46	670/1639	4.46	4.13	4.27	4.42	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.12	4.22	4.26	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	3	3.77	1170/1397	3.77	4.25	4.28	4.37	3.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	960/1583	4.08	4.15	4.19	4.31	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	911/1532	3.91	3.56	4.01	4.10	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	568/1504	4.31	4.07	4.05	4.29	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	718/1612	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.27	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	1001/1635	4.67	4.72	4.65	4.81	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	3	2	3.70	1208/1579	3.70	3.90	4.08	4.17	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	1341/1518	3.83	4.33	4.43	4.49	3.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	1264/1520	4.42	4.67	4.70	4.79	4.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	1	5	2	3.45	1365/1517	3.45	4.07	4.27	4.32	3.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	1303/1550	3.58	4.08	4.22	4.23	3.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	753/1295	3.88	3.91	3.94	3.95	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1083/1398	3.57	3.77	4.07	4.22	3.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	903/1391	4.14	3.94	4.30	4.47	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	897/1388	4.14	3.94	4.28	4.49	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 958	****	3.98	3.93	4.01	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	3.99	4.10	4.43	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 240	****	4.41	4.11	3.96	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	4.78	4.44	4.23	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.53	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	3.92	4.18	4.74	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.52	4.74	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	2.00	4.47	4.50	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 82	****	4.00	4.16	4.37	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.33	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	****	1.00	4.45	4.39	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 32	****	1.00	4.37	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 21	****	3.00	4.52	4.42	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 678 0101  
 Title INTRO MACHINE LEARNING  
 Instructor: KARGUPTA, HILLO  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 461  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 681 0101  
 Title ADVANCED COMP NETWORKS  
 Instructor: SIDHU, DEEPINDE  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 462  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	9	1	3.77	1352/1639	3.77	4.13	4.27	4.42	3.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	5	2	4	3.46	1497/1639	3.46	4.12	4.22	4.26	3.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	6	4	3.85	1125/1397	3.85	4.25	4.28	4.37	3.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1423/1583	3.46	4.15	4.19	4.31	3.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	5	5	3.92	883/1532	3.92	3.56	4.01	4.10	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	713/1504	4.15	4.07	4.05	4.29	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	3	3	3	3.23	1479/1612	3.23	4.17	4.16	4.27	3.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.72	4.65	4.81	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	4	6	0	3.36	1379/1579	3.36	3.90	4.08	4.17	3.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	5	3	4	3.77	1364/1518	3.77	4.33	4.43	4.49	3.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	1166/1520	4.54	4.67	4.70	4.79	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	4	4	3	3.54	1335/1517	3.54	4.07	4.27	4.32	3.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1344/1550	3.46	4.08	4.22	4.23	3.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	0	4	4	2	3.33	1067/1295	3.33	3.91	3.94	3.95	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	770/1398	4.00	3.77	4.07	4.22	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1065/1391	3.90	3.94	4.30	4.47	3.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	918/1388	4.10	3.94	4.28	4.49	4.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 958	****	3.98	3.93	4.01	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.41	4.11	3.96	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.00	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.52	4.74	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	2.00	4.47	4.50	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 82	****	4.00	4.16	4.37	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.33	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	1.00	4.45	4.39	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	1.00	4.37	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	3.00	4.52	4.42	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 681 0101  
 Title ADVANCED COMP NETWORKS  
 Instructor: SIDHU, DEEPIINDE  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 462  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	6	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	7	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						