```
Course-Section: CMSC 100  1                    University of Maryland                              Page  366
Title          Intro To Computers/Pro          Baltimore County                                   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    desJardins,Mari                 Fall   2009                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    37
Questionnaires: 29                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  2  1  4 12  10  3.93 1184/1509  3.93  4.31  4.31 4.18  3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  1  5 10  12  4.07 1042/1509  4.07  4.28  4.26 4.25  4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   1  1  3  1 11  12  4.07  894/1287  4.07  4.05  4.30 4.24  4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  5  1  4  6  12  3.68 1233/1459  3.68  4.06  4.22 4.11  3.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  4  4  6  7   7  3.32 1261/1406  3.32  3.62  4.09 4.02  3.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 3 3 10  5   7  3.36 1256/1384  3.36  3.92  4.11 3.98  3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  1  3  4  5  15  4.07  937/1489  4.07  4.10  4.17 4.20  4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  1  2  25  4.86  682/1506  4.86  4.49  4.67 4.66  4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 13 0 0 1 1  9   5  4.13  774/1463  4.13  4.11  4.09 4.02  4.13


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  1  2  2  5  19  4.34  991/1438  4.34  4.41  4.46 4.44  4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  1  0  3  2  23  4.59 1099/1421  4.59  4.65  4.73 4.66  4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  2  0  4  9  14  4.14  978/1411  4.14  4.21  4.31 4.27  4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  3  4  1  7  14  3.86 1150/1405  3.86  4.22  4.32 4.27  3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1  1  2  5  6  14  4.07  630/1236  4.07  4.00  4.00 3.87  4.07


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  3  0  4 11   5  3.65  987/1260  3.65  3.91  4.14 3.95  3.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0  0  0  9  6   7  3.91  992/1255  3.91  3.98  4.33 4.15  3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0  1  1  3  9   7  3.95  972/1258  3.95  4.25  4.38 4.18  3.95
4. Were special techniques successful                  8   2  2  3  5  4   5  3.37  747/ 873  3.37  4.16  4.03 3.89  3.37


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  22  3  0  1  1  0   2  3.75 ****/ 184  ****  4.29  4.16 4.06  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 22 0 1 0 1  3   2  3.71 ****/ 198  ****  4.25  4.22 4.14  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 23 3 0 1 0  0   2  4.00 ****/ 184  ****  4.68  4.48 4.48  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           23  2  0  1  0  1   2  4.00 ****/ 177  ****  4.86  4.36 4.29  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 23  2  0  0  1  1   2  4.25 ****/ 165  ****  4.17  4.18 4.15  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23 1  0  0  2  1   2  4.00 ****/  89  ****  ****  4.49 4.31  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0 0 0 1  3   2  4.17 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.54 4.16  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 22 0  0  2  1  3   1  3.43 ****/  90  ****  ****  4.50 4.21  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    23  0  0  0  2  2   2  4.00 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.38 4.21  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                23  0  0  0  2  2   2  4.00 ****/  93  ****  ****  4.06 3.92  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 22  0  0  0  2  4   1  3.86 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.39 3.75  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 23  0  0  0  0  4   2  4.33 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.41 4.29  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       22  0  0  0  1  2   4  4.43 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.51 4.53  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   23  0  0  0  2  2   2  4.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.18 4.26  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 23  1  0  1  0  2   2  4.00 ****/  44  ****  ****  4.32 4.12  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 23 0  0  0  2  3   1  3.83 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.26 4.28  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    23  1  0  0  2  2   1  3.80 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.14 4.13  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      23  1  0  0  0  3   2  4.40 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.31 4.52  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       23  2  0  0  0  2   2  4.50 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.05 4.47  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     23  1  0  2  1  1   1  3.20 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.27 4.21  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	8	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	28
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	8	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

```
Course-Section: CMSC 104  1                    University of Maryland                              Page  367
Title       Prob Sol & Computer Pr             Baltimore County                                   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor: Park,John                          Fall   2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    40
Questionnaires: 25                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                    Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean Mean  Mean Mean   Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  1  3  21  4.80  244/1509   4.65 4.31  4.31 4.18   4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  7  17  4.64  378/1509   4.55 4.28  4.26 4.25   4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  4  21  4.84  175/1287   3.90 4.05  4.30 4.24   4.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   3  0  0  0  5  17  4.77  173/1459   3.92 4.06  4.22 4.11   4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  19  0  1  0  2   3  4.17  ****/1406  4.09 3.62  4.09 4.02   ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  8  0  0  0  7  10  4.59  292/1384   3.82 3.92  4.11 3.98   4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   1  0  1  1  3  19  4.67  276/1489   3.94 4.10  4.17 4.20   4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0 14  11  4.44 1127/1506   3.89 4.49  4.67 4.66   4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  1  0  0  0  8  12  4.60  248/1463   4.47 4.11  4.09 4.02   4.60


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  6  19  4.76  430/1438   4.60 4.41  4.46 4.44   4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  1  24  4.96  215/1421   4.58 4.65  4.73 4.66   4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  2  6  17  4.60  496/1411   4.50 4.21  4.31 4.27   4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  0  7  18  4.72  393/1405   4.66 4.22  4.32 4.27   4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  3  0  1  2  5  14  4.45  314/1236   4.36 4.00  4.00 3.87   4.45


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 19  0  0  0  1  2   3  4.33 ****/1260   4.32 3.91  4.14 3.95   ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 19  0  0  0  0  3   3  4.50 ****/1255   4.09 3.98  4.33 4.15   ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19  0  0  0  0  2   4  4.67 ****/1258   4.45 4.25  4.38 4.18   ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   19  1  0  1  0  4   0  3.60 ****/ 873   4.71 4.16  4.03 3.89   ****


                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   22  0  0  0  0  1   2  4.67 ****/ 184   4.50 4.29  4.16 4.06   ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 22 0  0  0  0  0   3  5.00 ****/ 198   4.80 4.25  4.22 4.14   ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 22 0  0  0  0  0   3  5.00 ****/ 184   4.83 4.68  4.48 4.48   ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            22  1  0  0  0  1   1  4.50 ****/ 177   5.00 4.86  4.36 4.29   ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  22  1  0  0  0  0   2  5.00 ****/ 165   **** 4.17  4.18 4.15   ****

                            Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades         Reasons             Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     4         0.00-0.99   0     A   16       Required for Majors   9     Graduate     0     Major        5
  28-55     2         1.00-1.99   0     B    5                                                      
  56-83     1         2.00-2.99   0     C    1       General               1     Under-grad  25     Non-major   20
  84-150    0         3.00-3.49   0     D    0                                                       
  Grad.     0         3.50-4.00   1     F    0       Electives             5     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                 6
                                        ?    1
```

```
Enrollment:      44
Questionnaires:  22                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                  NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5 Mean    Rank   Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    2   0   1   1   3   5  10  4.10 1044/1509  4.65 4.31  4.31 4.18  4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     2   0   0   0   4   6  10  4.30  807/1509  4.55 4.28  4.26 4.25  4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0   0   0   1   5  15  4.67  359/1287  3.90 4.05  4.30 4.24  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     2   2   0   0   1   6  11  4.56  400/1459  3.92 4.06  4.22 4.11  4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  18   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/1406  4.09 3.62  4.09 4.02  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  7   0   0   1   4   8  4.54  327/1384  3.82 3.92  4.11 3.98  4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0   0   0   3   3  14  4.55  399/1489  3.94 4.10  4.17 4.20  4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2   0   0   0   0  15   5  4.25 1258/1506  3.89 4.49  4.67 4.66  4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0   0   0   4  13   0  3.76 1092/1463  4.47 4.11  4.09 4.02  3.76

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3   0   0   0   2   5  12  4.53  775/1438  4.60 4.41  4.46 4.44  4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3   0   0   1   1   2  15  4.63 1049/1421  4.58 4.65  4.73 4.66  4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0   0   0   3   8   9  4.30  841/1411  4.50 4.21  4.31 4.27  4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0   0   1   2   4  13  4.45  708/1405  4.66 4.22  4.32 4.27  4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  1   0   0   4   7   6  4.12  607/1236  4.36 4.00  4.00 3.87  4.12


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11  0   1   2   0   5   3  3.64  996/1260  4.32 3.91  4.14 3.95  3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11  0   0   3   4   3   1  3.18 1189/1255  4.09 3.98  4.33 4.15  3.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0   0   1   3   3   4  3.91 1013/1258  4.45 4.25  4.38 4.18  3.91
4. Were special techniques successful                   11 10   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 873  4.71 4.16  4.03 3.89  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   21  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 184  4.50 4.29  4.16 4.06  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 21 0  1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 198  4.80 4.25  4.22 4.14  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            21  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 177  5.00 4.86  4.36 4.29  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      10        0.00-0.99     4      A   10        Required for Majors  12      Graduate     0       Major      6
28-55       0        1.00-1.99     0      B    8                                     Under-grad  22       Non-major 16
56-83       0        2.00-2.99     0      C    0        General               0
84-150      0        3.00-3.49     1      D    0                                     #### - Means there are not enough
Grad.       0        3.50-4.00     1      F    0        Electives             4              responses to be significant
                                         P    0
                                         I    0        Other                 0
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 104  3                 University of Maryland                                    Page  369
Title        Prob Sol & Computer Pr         Baltimore County                                         MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Miner,Donald                   Fall   2009                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     36
Questionnaires: 22                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                     NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   0   5  17  4.77   279/1509  4.65 4.31  4.31 4.18  4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   3  18  4.77   234/1509  4.55 4.28  4.26 4.25  4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   2  20  4.91   127/1287  3.90 4.05  4.30 4.24  4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   4   0   0   1   2  15  4.78   173/1459  3.92 4.06  4.22 4.11  4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 13   0   0   0   0   8  5.00     1/1406  4.09 3.62  4.09 4.02  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 7  0   0   0   1  13  4.93    57/1384  3.82 3.92  4.11 3.98  4.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   0   0   3  18  4.86   121/1489  3.94 4.10  4.17 4.20  4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled                  3   0   0   0   0   9  10  4.53  1054/1506  3.89 4.49  4.67 4.66  4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1  0   0   3   4   9  4.38   500/1463  4.47 4.11  4.09 4.02  4.38


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   2   8  12  4.45   865/1438  4.60 4.41  4.46 4.44  4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   2  20  4.91   537/1421  4.58 4.65  4.73 4.66  4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   2   5  15  4.59   508/1411  4.50 4.21  4.31 4.27  4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   1   2  19  4.82   273/1405  4.66 4.22  4.32 4.27  4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2  1   0   0   6  13  4.50   274/1236  4.36 4.00  4.00 3.87  4.50


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0  0   0   0   0  12  5.00     1/1260  4.32 3.91  4.14 3.95  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0  0   0   0   0  11  5.00     1/1255  4.09 3.98  4.33 4.15  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0   0   0   0  11  5.00     1/1258  4.45 4.25  4.38 4.18  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  11   4   0   0   0   2   5  4.71   130/ 873  4.71 4.16  4.03 3.89  4.71


                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  12   0   0   1   0   2   7  4.50    47/ 184  4.50 4.29  4.16 4.06  4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 0   0   0   2   8  4.80    27/ 198  4.80 4.25  4.22 4.14  4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 3  0   0   0   1   5  4.83    36/ 184  4.83 4.68  4.48 4.48  4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           12   2   0   0   0   0   8  5.00     1/ 177  5.00 4.86  4.36 4.29  5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12   6   0   0   0   1   3  4.75  ****/ 165  **** 4.17  4.18 4.15  ****


                Seminar
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    20   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  92  **** ****  4.38 4.21  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                20   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  93  **** ****  4.06 3.92  ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  48  **** ****  4.39 3.75  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  48  **** ****  4.41 4.29  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       21   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  47  **** ****  4.51 4.53  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   21   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  47  **** ****  4.18 4.26  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 20   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  44  **** ****  4.32 4.12  ****


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  49  **** ****  4.26 4.28  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    21   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  41  **** ****  4.14 4.13  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      21   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  46  **** ****  4.31 4.52  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       21   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  37  **** ****  4.05 4.47  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     20   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00  ****/  30  **** ****  4.27 4.21  ****
```

```
1Course-Section: CMSC 104  3                 University of Maryland                                    Page  369
Title        Prob Sol & Computer Pr          Baltimore County                                         MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Miner,Donald                    Fall   2009                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     36
Questionnaires: 22                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

| | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	6	16	4.61	482/1509	4.65	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	12	4.48	589/1509	4.55	4.28	4.26	4.25	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	15	0	3.57	1147/1287	3.90	4.05	4.30	4.24	3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	8	14	0	3.64	1254/1459	3.92	4.06	4.22	4.11	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	0	1	6	0	3.86	971/1406	4.09	3.62	4.09	4.02	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	2	5	8	0	3.40	1235/1384	3.82	3.92	4.11	3.98	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	19	0	3.83	1162/1489	3.94	4.10	4.17	4.20	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	14	9	0	3.39	1489/1506	3.89	4.49	4.67	4.66	3.39
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	7	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	131/1463	4.47	4.11	4.09	4.02	4.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	660/1438	4.60	4.41	4.46	4.44	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	3	0	1	5	12	4.10	1332/1421	4.58	4.65	4.73	4.66	4.10

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Title   Prob Sol & Computer Pr   Baltimore County   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor: MacGlashan,Jame   Fall   2009   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 25   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                              Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  1  4 20  4.76   291/1509  4.65  4.31  4.31 4.18  4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  8 16  4.60   424/1509  4.55  4.28  4.26 4.25  4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  1  9 15  0  3.56  1147/1287  3.90  4.05  4.30 4.24  3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2  0  3  3 17  0  3.61  1271/1459  3.92  4.06  4.22 4.11  3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  19  1  0  2  2  0  3.00  ****/1406  4.09  3.62  4.09 4.02  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 14  0  0  4  6  0  3.60  1145/1384  3.82  3.92  4.11 3.98  3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  1  1  7 15  0  3.50  1303/1489  3.94  4.10  4.17 4.20  3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2   0  0  0  0 23  0  4.00  1383/1506  3.89  4.49  4.67 4.66  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5  8  0  0  0  2 10  4.83   106/1463  4.47  4.11  4.09 4.02  4.83

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  0  6 18  4.75   447/1438  4.60  4.41  4.46 4.44  4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  2  1  1  4 16  4.29  1278/1421  4.58  4.65  4.73 4.66  4.29
```

                                     Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                Type                 Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0      A  13          Required for Majors  18    Graduate     0       Major        7
28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0      B   7
56-83      0       2.00-2.99    0      C   2          General               1    Under-grad  25       Non-major   18
84-150     0       3.00-3.49    0      D   0
Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    0      F   0          Electives             2    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0                                     responses to be significant
                                       I   0          Other                 4
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 201  1                     University of Maryland                                      Page  378
Title          Computer Science I               Baltimore County                                          MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Evans,Susan A                    Fall   2009                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    153
Questionnaires:  45                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   4   3   7  12  19  3.87 1243/1509  4.01  4.31  4.31 4.34  3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   4   0   7  16  18  3.98 1109/1509  4.05  4.28  4.26 4.32  3.98
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   1   2   5  14  23  4.24  787/1287  4.39  4.05  4.30 4.35  4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   6   5   2   7  13  12  3.64 1249/1459  3.99  4.06  4.22 4.30  3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  19   7   2   4   6   7  3.15 1309/1406  3.12  3.62  4.09 4.09  3.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 11   1   3   5  13  12  3.94  886/1384  4.18  3.92  4.11 4.09  3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   1   3   7  13  21  4.11  906/1489  4.30  4.10  4.17 4.19  4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   1   1   0   3  40  4.78  820/1506  4.89  4.49  4.67 4.61  4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0   3   1  10  21   5  3.60 1207/1463  3.84  4.11  4.09 4.08  3.60


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   3   1   7  16  18  4.00 1203/1438  4.32  4.41  4.46 4.48  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   2   1   5   9  28  4.33 1257/1421  4.55  4.65  4.73 4.76  4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   3   3   9  16  13  3.75 1204/1411  4.06  4.21  4.31 4.37  3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   1   4   2  12  13  12  3.63 1234/1405  4.06  4.22  4.32 4.39  3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  2   2   3  15  11  12  3.65  909/1236  3.78  4.00  4.00 4.11  3.65


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0   1   1   6  16  12  4.03  739/1260  3.99  3.91  4.14 4.19  4.03
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0   3   2  15   8   8  3.44 1143/1255  3.67  3.98  4.33 4.37  3.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0   3   5  10   9   9  3.44 1159/1258  3.77  4.25  4.38 4.44  3.44
4. Were special techniques successful                  9  23   1   1   4   5   2  3.46  718/ 873  3.62  4.16  4.03 4.04  3.46


                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 37   2   1   0   2   1   2  3.50 ****/ 184  ****  4.29  4.16 4.54  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 38 0  1   0   1   2   3  3.86 ****/ 198  ****  4.25  4.22 4.51  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 38 1  0   1   1   0   4  4.17 ****/ 184  ****  4.68  4.48 4.62  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          38   0   0   1   0   2   4  4.29 ****/ 177  ****  4.86  4.36 4.65  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 38   2   0   1   1   0   3  4.00 ****/ 165  ****  4.17  4.18 4.56  ****


                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 42  1   1   1   0   0   0  1.50 ****/  89  ****  ****  4.49 5.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 43 0  0   2   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.54 ****  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 43  0   1   1   0   0   0  1.50 ****/  90  ****  ****  4.50 ****  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    43  0   1   1   0   0   0  1.50 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.38 4.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                43  0   1   1   0   0   0  1.50 ****/  93  ****  ****  4.06 2.88  ****


                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 43  0   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.39 4.79  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 43  0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.41 4.50  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       43  0   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.51 4.83  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   43  0   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.18 4.56  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 43  0   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/  44  ****  ****  4.32 4.67  ****


                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 42 0   1   0   0   1   1  3.33 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.26 4.33  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    41  0   1   1   0   1   1  3.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.14 ****  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      42  0   1   1   0   0   1  2.67 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.31 4.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       42  0   1   1   0   0   1  2.67 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.05 ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     42  0   1   1   0   0   1  2.67 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.27 ****  ****
```

Enrollment: 153
Questionnaires: 45   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   7   0.00-0.99   0   A   25   Required for Majors 39   Graduate   0   Major   26
 28-55   8   1.00-1.99   0   B   12
 56-83   2   2.00-2.99   1   C   4   General   0   Under-grad   45   Non-major 19
 84-150   1   3.00-3.49   1   D   0
 Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   7   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P   0   responses to be significant
                                            I   0   Other   2
                                            ?   0

```
Course-Section: CMSC 201  9                    University of Maryland                                        Page  379
Title          Computer Science I              Baltimore County                                             MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Evans,Susan A                   Fall   2009                                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    118
Questionnaires: 26                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean      Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  2  4  8 12  4.15   987/1509   4.01  4.31  4.31  4.34  4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  1  3 10 11  4.12  1002/1509   4.05  4.28  4.26  4.32  4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  1  7 17  4.54   491/1287   4.39  4.05  4.30  4.35  4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   4  0  1  4  3 13  4.33   686/1459   3.99  4.06  4.22  4.30  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  4  3  3  8  3  4  3.10  1320/1406   3.12  3.62  4.09  4.09  3.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 10 0 1 2 1 10  4.43   421/1384   4.18  3.92  4.11  4.09  4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  1  2  6 16  4.48   485/1489   4.30  4.10  4.17  4.19  4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  0 25  5.00     1/1506   4.89  4.49  4.67  4.61  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 0 0 3 15 5  4.09   809/1463   3.84  4.11  4.09  4.08  4.09


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  9 16  4.64   617/1438   4.32  4.41  4.46  4.48  4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  2  2 21  4.76   863/1421   4.55  4.65  4.73  4.76  4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  3 10 12  4.36   779/1411   4.06  4.21  4.31  4.37  4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   1  0  0  4  4 16  4.50   634/1405   4.06  4.22  4.32  4.39  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  3  1  2  5  3 10  3.90   774/1236   3.78  4.00  4.00  4.11  3.90


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  2  5  5  8  3.95   807/1260   3.99  3.91  4.14  4.19  3.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  1  1  4  8  7  3.90   992/1255   3.67  3.98  4.33  4.37  3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 1 0 5 4 10  4.10   901/1258   3.77  4.25  4.38  4.44  4.10
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   8  2  0  2  4  5  3.77   605/ 873   3.62  4.16  4.03  4.04  3.77


               Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  24  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 184   ****  4.29  4.16  4.54  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 24 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 198   ****  4.25  4.22  4.51  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 24 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 184   ****  4.68  4.48  4.62  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           24  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 177   ****  4.86  4.36  4.65  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 24  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 165   ****  4.17  4.18  4.56  ****


               Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 25 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  89   ****  ****  4.49  5.00  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    25  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  92   ****  ****  4.38  4.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                25  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  93   ****  ****  4.06  2.88  ****


               Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 25  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  48   ****  ****  4.39  4.79  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 25  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  48   ****  ****  4.41  4.50  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       25  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  47   ****  ****  4.51  4.83  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 25  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  44   ****  ****  4.32  4.67  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      6         0.00-0.99    2      A   15        Required for Majors  19      Graduate      0      Major        7
28-55      1         1.00-1.99    0      B    9
56-83      1         2.00-2.99    2      C    0        General               0      Under-grad   26      Non-major   19
84-150     1         3.00-3.49    2      D    0
Grad.      0         3.50-4.00    4      F    0        Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other                 3
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 202  1                      University of Maryland                                    Page  380
Title          Computer Science II                Baltimore County                                        MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Bergeron,Ryan J                    Fall  2009                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    29
Questionnaires: 15                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                          Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                         NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  1   0   0   0   1   2  11  4.71   351/1509  4.29  4.31  4.31  4.34  4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1   0   0   0   2   3   9  4.50   543/1509  4.41  4.28  4.26  4.32  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1   0   1   1   1   3   8  4.14   857/1287  3.51  4.05  4.30  4.35  4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1   1   0   0   0   4   9  4.69   247/1459  3.81  4.06  4.22  4.30  4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   7   1   0   0   1   5  4.29   551/1406  3.16  3.62  4.09  4.09  4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1   4   1   0   0   2   7  4.40   440/1384  3.60  3.92  4.11  4.09  4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0   0   1   2   3   8  4.29   728/1489  3.93  4.10  4.17  4.19  4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0   0   0   0   3  11  4.79   807/1506  3.89  4.49  4.67  4.61  4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4   0   0   0   3   3   5  4.18   702/1463  4.23  4.11  4.09  4.08  4.18

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2   0   0   0   3   5   5  4.15  1141/1438  4.42  4.41  4.46  4.48  4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2   0   0   0   3   3   7  4.31  1275/1421  4.46  4.65  4.73  4.76  4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0   0   1   4   4   4  3.85  1170/1411  4.28  4.21  4.31  4.37  3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2   0   0   0   3   3   7  4.31   859/1405  4.37  4.22  4.32  4.39  4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2   2   0   0   2   3   6  4.36   392/1236  4.28  4.00  4.00  4.11  4.36

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0   1   0   4   2   4  3.73   952/1260  4.07  3.91  4.14  4.19  3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0   2   0   4   2   3  3.36  1161/1255  3.56  3.98  4.33  4.37  3.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4   0   0   1   3   2   5  4.00   932/1258  4.09  4.25  4.38  4.44  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 4   8   2   0   0   1   0  2.00  ****/ 873  3.86  4.16  4.03  4.04  ****

                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 12  0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67  ****/ 184  4.19  4.29  4.16  4.54  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12  0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00  ****/ 198  3.98  4.25  4.22  4.51  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 12  0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00  ****/ 184  4.61  4.68  4.48  4.62  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          12  0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00  ****/ 177  4.79  4.86  4.36  4.65  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12  1   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/ 165  4.17  4.17  4.18  4.56  ****
```

                             Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                  Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1        0.00-0.99    0        A    6        Required for Majors  13      Graduate     0       Major       8
 28-55      3        1.00-1.99    0        B    4
 56-83      3        2.00-2.99    1        C    3        General               0      Under-grad  15       Non-major   7
 84-150     0        3.00-3.49    3        D    0
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    3        F    0        Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                      responses to be significant
                                          I    0        Other                 0
                                          ?    0
```

Title   Computer Science II   Baltimore County   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor: Mitchell,Susan   Fall   2009   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 18   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                                 Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   1   2   0   6   9  4.11 1032/1509  4.29  4.31  4.31  4.34  4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   1   9   8  4.39  720/1509  4.41  4.28  4.26  4.32  4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   1   4   7   6   0  3.00 1247/1287  3.51  4.05  4.30  4.35  3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1   0   1  10   6   0  3.29 1380/1459  3.81  4.06  4.22  4.30  3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  10   2   1   3   2   0  2.63 1386/1406  3.16  3.62  4.09  4.09  2.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 13   0   1   3   1   0  3.00 1322/1384  3.60  3.92  4.11  4.09  3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   1   1   5  11   0  3.44 1327/1489  3.93  4.10  4.17  4.19  3.44
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   1  13   4   0  3.17 1499/1506  3.89  4.49  4.67  4.61  3.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 3   0   0   1   2  10  4.69  190/1463  4.23  4.11  4.09  4.08  4.69

                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   2   7   9  4.39  950/1438  4.42  4.41  4.46  4.48  4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   1   0   6   5   6  3.83 1373/1421  4.46  4.65  4.73  4.76  3.83
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    0      0.00-0.99   0        A   8          Required for Majors  15     Graduate    0       Major      14
 28-55    0      1.00-1.99   0        B   7
 56-83    0      2.00-2.99   0        C   1          General               1     Under-grad  18       Non-major   4
 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
                                      P   0                                      responses to be significant
                                      I   0          Other                 1
                                      ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 202  4                University of Maryland                              Page  385
Title      Computer Science II             Baltimore County                                   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Frey,Dennis L                Fall   2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   39
Questionnaires: 21                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0  0  1  1  2 16  4.65  422/1509  4.29  4.31  4.31  4.34  4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  1  1  4 14  4.55  483/1509  4.41  4.28  4.26  4.32  4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  1  1  1  7 10  4.20  826/1287  3.51  4.05  4.30  4.35  4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2   2  0  2  0  4 11  4.41  602/1459  3.81  4.06  4.22  4.30  4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  14  0  1  1  0  4  4.17  683/1406  3.16  3.62  4.09  4.09  4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3  6  0  1  0  3  8  4.50  349/1384  3.60  3.92  4.11  4.09  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  0  3 17  4.85  121/1489  3.93  4.10  4.17  4.19  4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0  0  0  0  2 17  4.89  602/1506  3.89  4.49  4.67  4.61  4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6  0  1  0  0 11  3  4.00  853/1463  4.23  4.11  4.09  4.08  4.00


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  4 16  4.80  363/1438  4.42  4.41  4.46  4.48  4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  4 16  4.80  794/1421  4.46  4.65  4.73  4.76  4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  1  6 13  4.60  496/1411  4.28  4.21  4.31  4.37  4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  2  2 16  4.70  419/1405  4.37  4.22  4.32  4.39  4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  2  0  0  3  6  8  4.29  458/1236  4.28  4.00  4.00  4.11  4.29


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0  1  0  2  3  8  4.21  653/1260  4.07  3.91  4.14  4.19  4.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0  1  1  3  4  5  3.79 1043/1255  3.56  3.98  4.33  4.37  3.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7  0  1  1  2  3  7  4.00  932/1258  4.09  4.25  4.38  4.44  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  7   7  0  1  2  1  3  3.86  560/ 873  3.86  4.16  4.03  4.04  3.86


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  14  0  0  0  1  2  4  4.43   64/ 184  4.19  4.29  4.16  4.54  4.43
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0  0  1  1  3  2  3.86  156/ 198  3.98  4.25  4.22  4.51  3.86
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 14 0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71   62/ 184  4.61  4.68  4.48  4.62  4.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           14  0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/ 177  4.79  4.86  4.36  4.65  5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 14  2  0  0  0  1  4  4.80 ****/ 165  4.17  4.17  4.18  4.56  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 18 1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  89  ****  ****  4.49  5.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 18 1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.54  ****  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 18 1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  90  ****  ****  4.50  ****  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    18  1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.38  4.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                18  1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  93  ****  ****  4.06  2.88  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.39  4.79  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 19  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.41  4.50  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       19  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.51  4.83  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   19  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.18  4.56  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 19  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  44  ****  ****  4.32  4.67  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 20 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.26  4.33  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    20  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.14  ****  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      20  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.31  4.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       20  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.05  ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     20  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.27  ****  ****
```

Title   Computer Science II   Baltimore County   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor: Frey,Dennis L   Fall   2009   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 21   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 19   Graduate   0   Major   13
28-55   4   1.00-1.99   0   B   12
56-83   2   2.00-2.99   2   C   1   General   0   Under-grad 21   Non-major   8
84-150   0   3.00-3.49   4   D   0
Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   4   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0   responses to be significant
                                        I   0   Other   0
                                        ?   0

```
Course-Section: CMSC 202  7                          University of Maryland                                    Page  386
Title      Computer Science II                       Baltimore County                                         MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Frey,Dennis L                          Fall   2009                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    38
Questionnaires:  22                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                    NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  1   0   0   0   3  10   8  4.24   901/1509  4.29  4.31  4.31  4.34  4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1   0   0   0   3  10   8  4.24   880/1509  4.41  4.28  4.26  4.32  4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1   0   0   0   2  12   7  4.24   795/1287  3.51  4.05  4.30  4.35  4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1   3   0   0   0  11   7  4.39   638/1459  3.81  4.06  4.22  4.30  4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 16   1   1   0   2   0  2.75  ****/1406  3.16  3.62  4.09  4.09  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 10  0   0   2   3   5  4.30   570/1384  3.60  3.92  4.11  4.09  4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           2   0   0   0   3   2  15  4.60   341/1489  3.93  4.10  4.17  4.19  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                 2   0   0   0   1   1  18  4.85   682/1506  3.89  4.49  4.67  4.61  4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  0  0   0   4   9   5  4.06   826/1463  4.23  4.11  4.09  4.08  4.06

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2   0   0   0   0   9  11  4.55   737/1438  4.42  4.41  4.46  4.48  4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2   0   0   0   0   2  18  4.90   537/1421  4.46  4.65  4.73  4.76  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0   0   2   8  10  4.40   738/1411  4.28  4.21  4.31  4.37  4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2   0   1   0   4   6   9  4.10  1001/1405  4.37  4.22  4.32  4.39  4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  3  0   0   4   6   7  4.18   554/1236  4.28  4.00  4.00  4.11  4.18

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11  0  0   0   2   4   5  4.27   605/1260  4.07  3.91  4.14  4.19  4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0  0   0   7   2   2  3.55  1117/1255  3.56  3.98  4.33  4.37  3.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0  0   0   2   4   5  4.27   807/1258  4.09  4.25  4.38  4.44  4.27
4. Were special techniques successful                 11  7   1   0   2   0   1  3.00  ****/ 873  3.86  4.16  4.03  4.04  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  3   0   0   2   3   8   6  3.95   123/ 184  4.19  4.29  4.16  4.54  3.95
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 0  0   1   2  10   6  4.11   117/ 198  3.98  4.25  4.22  4.51  4.11
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3 5  0   0   1   5   8  4.50   105/ 184  4.61  4.68  4.48  4.62  4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           3   0   0   1   1   3  14  4.58    80/ 177  4.79  4.86  4.36  4.65  4.58
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  3   7   0   0   3   4   5  4.17    91/ 165  4.17  4.17  4.18  4.56  4.17
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons              Type               Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      2      0.00-0.99   0         A    6      Required for Majors  21    Graduate    0       Major       13
28-55      4      1.00-1.99   0         B   10
56-83      3      2.00-2.99   2         C    2      General               0    Under-grad  22      Non-major    9
84-150     1      3.00-3.49   0         D    0
Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   4         F    0      Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                 0
                                        ?    1
```

```
                                                Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                 NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0   0   1   0   7  10  4.44   673/1509  4.21  4.31  4.31 4.34  4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2   0   0   0   1   5  11  4.59   447/1509  4.39  4.28  4.26 4.32  4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0   0   0   1   8   9  4.44   590/1287  4.30  4.05  4.30 4.35  4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   4   0   1   2   4   8  4.27   759/1459  4.19  4.06  4.22 4.30  4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  9   0   0   2   3   5  4.30   527/1406  3.96  3.62  4.09 4.09  4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3  0   0   3   6   7  4.25   619/1384  4.03  3.92  4.11 4.09  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   1   6  12  4.58   376/1489  4.35  4.10  4.17 4.19  4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0   8  10  4.56  1030/1506  4.77  4.49  4.67 4.61  4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0   0   5   7   6  4.06   826/1463  3.86  4.11  4.09 4.08  4.06


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   0   1   5  12  4.61   660/1438  4.32  4.41  4.46 4.48  4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   0   4  14  4.78   846/1421  4.81  4.65  4.73 4.76  4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   0   1   2   5   9  4.29   849/1411  4.10  4.21  4.31 4.37  4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0   0   3   1  14  4.61   526/1405  4.41  4.22  4.32 4.39  4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 9   1   0   3   2   3  3.67   904/1236  3.70  4.00  4.00 4.11  3.67


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0   1   1   1   3   2  3.50  1045/1260  3.08  3.91  4.14 4.19  3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0   1   0   1   3   3  3.88  1005/1255  3.94  3.98  4.33 4.37  3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0  0   0   1   2   4  4.43   700/1258  4.11  4.25  4.38 4.44  4.43
4. Were special techniques successful                  12   2   0   0   0   2   3  4.60   178/ 873  4.60  4.16  4.03 4.04  4.60
```

                                    Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     1      0.00-0.99    1        A    5      Required for Majors  15     Graduate      0        Major        5
28-55     4      1.00-1.99    0        B   10                                 Under-grad   19        Non-major   14
56-83     4      2.00-2.99    3        C    4      General               0
84-150    0      3.00-3.49    1        D    0
Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    3        F    0      Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                 0
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 203  2                    University of Maryland                                    Page  388
Title         Discrete Structures               Baltimore County                                     MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Sherman,Alan T                    Fall  2009                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   32
Questionnaires: 16                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean   Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  1  1  6  8  4.31  822/1509  4.21  4.31  4.31 4.34   4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  1  3  3  9  4.25  859/1509  4.39  4.28  4.26 4.32   4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  2  1  1  3  9  4.00  924/1287  4.30  4.05  4.30 4.35   4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1  0  2  3  6  4  3.80 1167/1459  4.19  4.06  4.22 4.30   3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  2  4  4  5  3.80 1009/1406  3.96  3.62  4.09 4.09   3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1  1  1  5  2  5  3.64 1120/1384  4.03  3.92  4.11 4.09   3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  1  1  3  5  6  3.88 1127/1489  4.35  4.10  4.17 4.19   3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  1  1 14  4.81  762/1506  4.77  4.49  4.67 4.61   4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  1  7  3  4  3.67 1168/1463  3.86  4.11  4.09 4.08   3.67


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  0  2  2  3  7  4.07 1182/1438  4.32  4.41  4.46 4.48   4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  0  0  0  3 11  4.79  828/1421  4.81  4.65  4.73 4.76   4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  0  3  9  2  3.93 1126/1411  4.10  4.21  4.31 4.37   3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  0  1  2  3  8  4.29  874/1405  4.41  4.22  4.32 4.39   4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  6  1  0  2  3  2  3.63  925/1236  3.70  4.00  4.00 4.11   3.63


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10  0  2  0  3  0  1  2.67 1226/1260  3.08  3.91  4.14 4.19   2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11  0  0  0  1  3  1  4.00  904/1255  3.94  3.98  4.33 4.37   4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0  0  1  1  1  2  3.80 1054/1258  4.11  4.25  4.38 4.44   3.80
4. Were special techniques successful                   10  4  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/ 873  4.60  4.16  4.03 4.04   ****


                            Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                  Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     2         0.00-0.99   1        A    1        Required for Majors  15    Graduate      0      Major        13
  28-55     4         1.00-1.99   0        B    7                                   Under-grad   16      Non-major     3
  56-83     1         2.00-2.99   0        C    5        General               0
  84-150    0         3.00-3.49   1        D    0
  Grad.     0         3.50-4.00   1        F    0        Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                           I    0        Other                 0
                                           ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 203  3                      University of Maryland                              Page  389
Title        Discrete Structures                 Baltimore County                                   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Lomonaco JR,Sam                     Fall  2009                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     43
Questionnaires: 26                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                      Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                      NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  2  2  3  9  10  3.88 1228/1509  4.21  4.31  4.31 4.34  3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  0  1 11  13  4.35  763/1509  4.39  4.28  4.26 4.32  4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  1  1  0  7  17  4.46  566/1287  4.30  4.05  4.30 4.35  4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   5  0  0  1  8  11  4.50  454/1459  4.19  4.06  4.22 4.30  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  2  2  1  4  8   7  3.77 1030/1406  3.96  3.62  4.09 4.09  3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 3  1  0  2  9   9  4.19  677/1384  4.03  3.92  4.11 4.09  4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0  0  0  3  4  17  4.58  364/1489  4.35  4.10  4.17 4.19  4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   1  0  0  0  1  22  4.96  292/1506  4.77  4.49  4.67 4.61  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1  0  1  5 12   4  3.86 1013/1463  3.86  4.11  4.09 4.08  3.86


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  1  3  8  12  4.29 1039/1438  4.32  4.41  4.46 4.48  4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  0  3  21  4.88  614/1421  4.81  4.65  4.73 4.76  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  2  3 10   9  4.08 1010/1411  4.10  4.21  4.31 4.37  4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  0  0  5  6  13  4.33  828/1405  4.41  4.22  4.32 4.39  4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 14  2  0  0  4   4  3.80  824/1236  3.70  4.00  4.00 4.11  3.80


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 22 0  1  0  1  0   2  3.50 ****/1260  3.08  3.91  4.14 4.19  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22 0  0  2  0  0   2  3.50 ****/1255  3.94  3.98  4.33 4.37  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 0  0  0  1   3  4.75 ****/1258  4.11  4.25  4.38 4.44  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  22   2  0  0  0  1   1  4.50 ****/ 873  4.60  4.16  4.03 4.04  ****


                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  24   0  0  0  0  1   1  4.50 ****/ 184  ****  4.29  4.16 4.54  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 24 0 0  0  0  1   1  4.50 ****/ 198  ****  4.25  4.22 4.51  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 24 0  0  0  0  1   1  4.50 ****/ 184  ****  4.68  4.48 4.62  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           24   0  0  0  1  0   1  4.00 ****/ 177  ****  4.86  4.36 4.65  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 24   0  0  0  1  0   1  4.00 ****/ 165  ****  4.17  4.18 4.56  ****


                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 24  0  0  0  1  0   1  4.00 ****/  89  ****  ****  4.49 5.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 25 0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.54 **** ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 25  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  90  ****  ****  4.50 **** ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    25   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.38 4.00 ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                25   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  93  ****  ****  4.06 2.88 ****


                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 25   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.39 4.79 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 25   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.41 4.50 ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       25   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.51 4.83 ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   25   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.18 4.56 ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 25   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  44  ****  ****  4.32 4.67 ****


                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 25  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.26 4.33 ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    25   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.14 **** ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      25   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.31 4.00 ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       25   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.05 **** ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     25   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.27 **** ****
```

Title   Discrete Structures   Baltimore County   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor: Lomonaco JR,Sam   Fall   2009   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 43
Questionnaires: 26   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: CMSC 304  1                  University of Maryland                           Page  390
Title        Social/Ethical Iss In           Baltimore County                           MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Wilson,Richard                  Fall  2009                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:  40
Questionnaires: 27                Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                     Frequencies        Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions          NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   2   0  3  6  4  7  5  3.20 1455/1509  3.20 4.31  4.31 4.32  3.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2   0  2  7  3  5  8  3.40 1404/1509  3.40 4.28  4.26 4.25  3.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2   0  1  2  1 10 11  4.12  869/1287  4.12 4.05  4.30 4.33  4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2   0  0  0  7  7 11  4.16  860/1459  4.16 4.06  4.22 4.26  4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  2  2  6  6  4  4  3.09 1320/1406  3.09 3.62  4.09 4.12  3.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 3 6 9 5  3.58 1154/1384  3.58 3.92  4.11 4.15  3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            3   0  3  1  6  4 10  3.71 1219/1489  3.71 4.10  4.17 4.14  3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled                  3   1  0  0  1  1 21  4.87  662/1506  4.87 4.49  4.67 4.67  4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 1 5 4 8 2  3.25 1338/1463  3.25 4.11  4.09 4.08  3.25


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4   0  1  4  4  6  8  3.70 1336/1438  3.70 4.41  4.46 4.43  3.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   4   0  1  0  1  2 19  4.65 1026/1421  4.65 4.65  4.73 4.73  4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0  0  8  4  4  7  3.43 1299/1411  3.43 4.21  4.31 4.29  3.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4   0  5  6  1  6  5  3.00 1348/1405  3.00 4.22  4.32 4.32  3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 11 4 0 2 3 2  2.91 1164/1236  2.91 4.00  4.00 4.07  2.91


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21 0 3 2 0 1 0  1.83 ****/1260  **** 3.91  4.14 4.22  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 20 0 2 2 2 0 1  2.43 1245/1255  2.43 3.98  4.33 4.37  2.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 20 0 1 0 0 3 3  4.00  932/1258  4.00 4.25  4.38 4.42  4.00


                                     Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type             Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0      A   16      Required for Majors  18    Graduate     0    Major       17
 28-55      6      1.00-1.99    0      B    3                                                   
 56-83      5      2.00-2.99    2      C    1      General               0    Under-grad  27    Non-major   10
 84-150     2      3.00-3.49    3      D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    6      F    0      Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                 0
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 313  1                    University of Maryland                        Page  391
Title          Comp Organ & Assemb La          Baltimore County                             MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Frey,Dennis L                   Fall   2009                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    42
Questionnaires: 28                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   2   0  0  0  2  3 21  4.73  327/1509  4.59 4.31  4.31 4.32  4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2   0  0  0  1  4 21  4.77  245/1509  4.55 4.28  4.26 4.25  4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   3   0  0  0  1  9 15  4.56  463/1287  4.17 4.05  4.30 4.33  4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    3   3  0  0  1  3 18  4.77  173/1459  4.32 4.06  4.22 4.26  4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  6  1  1  4  3 10  4.05  776/1406  3.73 3.62  4.09 4.12  4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 11 0 0  1  0 12  4.85   92/1384  4.37 3.92  4.11 4.15  4.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            3   0  0  0  0  4 21  4.84  127/1489  4.46 4.10  4.17 4.14  4.84
8. How many times was class cancelled                  3   0  0  0  0  0 25  5.00    1/1506  5.00 4.49  4.67 4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 1 0  1  4 14  4.50  325/1463  4.33 4.11  4.09 4.08  4.50


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0  0  0  0  4 21  4.84  305/1438  4.75 4.41  4.46 4.43  4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0  0  0  0  0 25  5.00    1/1421  4.96 4.65  4.73 4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  0  1  3 21  4.80  243/1411  4.67 4.21  4.31 4.29  4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0  0  0  1  7 17  4.64  486/1405  4.49 4.22  4.32 4.32  4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 3 1 0  0  8 12  4.43  338/1236  4.29 4.00  4.00 4.07  4.43


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 25 0 1 0  1  0  1  3.00 ****/1260  3.89 3.91  4.14 4.22  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 25 0 1 0  1  0  1  3.00 ****/1255  4.38 3.98  4.33 4.37  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 25 0 1 0  1  0  1  3.00 ****/1258  4.25 4.25  4.38 4.42  ****

                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades         Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0        0.00-0.99   0       A   12       Required for Majors  25   Graduate     0      Major      24
 28-55      2        1.00-1.99   0       B   13
 56-83      6        2.00-2.99   2       C    2       General               0   Under-grad  28      Non-major   4
 84-150     3        3.00-3.49   2       D    0
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00  13       F    0       Electives             0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                 0
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 313  2                        University of Maryland                              Page  392
Title          Comp Organ & Assemb La              Baltimore County                                   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Frey,Dennis L                       Fall   2009                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    41
Questionnaires: 27                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                           Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA   1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0  0  4  7 16  4.44  673/1509  4.59  4.31  4.31 4.32  4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0  2  1 10 14  4.33  774/1509  4.55  4.28  4.26 4.25  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   1  2  7  9  8  3.78 1084/1287  4.17  4.05  4.30 4.33  3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   3   2  2  2  9  9  3.88 1111/1459  4.32  4.06  4.22 4.26  3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  3   3  1  9  5  6  3.42 1231/1406  3.73  3.62  4.09 4.12  3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 18  1  0  2  2  4  3.89  954/1384  4.37  3.92  4.11 4.15  3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0  2  5  9 11  4.07  937/1489  4.46  4.10  4.17 4.14  4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0  0  0  0 27  5.00    1/1506  5.00  4.49  4.67 4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0  0  1  1 11  6  4.16  738/1463  4.33  4.11  4.09 4.08  4.16


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0   0  1  0  6 19  4.65  603/1438  4.75  4.41  4.46 4.43  4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0   0  0  0  2 24  4.92  429/1421  4.96  4.65  4.73 4.73  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0   0  0  2  8 16  4.54  580/1411  4.67  4.21  4.31 4.29  4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0   1  0  4  5 16  4.35  818/1405  4.49  4.22  4.32 4.32  4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5  0  1  4  7  9  4.14  580/1236  4.29  4.00  4.00 4.07  4.14


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0  1  1  1  1  5  3.89  876/1260  3.89  3.91  4.14 4.22  3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 19 0  0  0  2  1  5  4.38  690/1255  4.38  3.98  4.33 4.37  4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 0 1  0  1  0  6  4.25  818/1258  4.25  4.25  4.38 4.42  4.25
4. Were special techniques successful                 20   6   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 873  ****  4.16  4.03 4.08  ****

                                           Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                   Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0     0.00-0.99    0      A  12      Required for Majors  21    Graduate      1      Major        22
28-55      2     1.00-1.99    0      B  10                                Under-grad    26     Non-major     5
56-83      5     2.00-2.99    1      C   2      General               1
84-150     4     3.00-3.49    2      D   0
Grad.      1     3.50-4.00    8      F   0      Electives             2    #### - Means there are not enough
                                     P   0                                responses to be significant
                                     I   0      Other                 0
                                     ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 331  1                    University of Maryland                                   Page  393
Title          Prin Of Prog Languages             Baltimore County                                    MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Dimitroff,Donal                    Fall   2009                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    22
Questionnaires: 11                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  1  8  2  4.09 1051/1509  3.72  4.31  4.31 4.32  4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  5  5  4.36  742/1509  3.72  4.28  4.26 4.25  4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  7  4  4.36  678/1287  4.09  4.05  4.30 4.33  4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2  1  0  1  3  4  4.00  979/1459  3.73  4.06  4.22 4.26  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  1  0  4  3  3  3.64 1122/1406  3.43  3.62  4.09 4.12  3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  2  5  4  4.18  685/1384  3.84  3.92  4.11 4.15  4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  3  2  6  4.27  738/1489  3.78  4.10  4.17 4.14  4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  8  3  4.27 1243/1506  4.28  4.49  4.67 4.67  4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1  0  0  4  4  0  3.50 1241/1463  3.38  4.11  4.09 4.08  3.50


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  5  3  3  3.82 1294/1438  3.62  4.41  4.46 4.43  3.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  3  0  8  4.45 1189/1421  4.48  4.65  4.73 4.73  4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  4  4  3  3.91 1145/1411  3.60  4.21  4.31 4.29  3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  1  2  3  1  4  3.45 1279/1405  3.46  4.22  4.32 4.32  3.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0  2  0  2  3  2  3.33 1056/1236  3.30  4.00  4.00 4.07  3.33


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9   0  1  0  1  0  0  2.00 ****/1260  3.29  3.91  4.14 4.22  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9   0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/1255  4.00  3.98  4.33 4.37  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9  0  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/1258  4.14  4.25  4.38 4.42  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   9   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 873  ****  4.16  4.03 4.08  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 331  2              University of Maryland                           Page  394
Title        Prin Of Prog Languages         Baltimore County                           MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Vick,Shon                      Fall   2009                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   20
Questionnaires: 14              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  1  8  4  1  3.36 1432/1509  3.72  4.31  4.31 4.32  3.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  4  6  3  1  3.07 1458/1509  3.72  4.28  4.26 4.25  3.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  3  1  1  2  2  5  3.82 1069/1287  4.09  4.05  4.30 4.33  3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  3  0  2  5  1  3  3.45 1328/1459  3.73  4.06  4.22 4.26  3.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 2 3 1 4 3  3.23 1289/1406  3.43  3.62  4.09 4.12  3.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4 0 2 3 3 2 3.50 1192/1384 3.84 3.92 4.11 4.15 3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  2  2  1  8  1  3.29 1370/1489  3.78  4.10  4.17 4.14  3.29
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  1  8  5  4.29 1236/1506  4.28  4.49  4.67 4.67  4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 3 5 2 2 3.25 1338/1463 3.38 4.11 4.09 4.08 3.25


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  0  2  6  4  2  3.43 1379/1438  3.62  4.41  4.46 4.43  3.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  2  3  9  4.50 1162/1421  4.48  4.65  4.73 4.73  4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 2 8 2 2  3.29 1328/1411  3.60  4.21  4.31 4.29  3.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  1  0  1  7  3  2  3.46 1276/1405  3.46  4.22  4.32 4.32  3.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 2 0 1 7 2 1 3.27 1074/1236 3.30 4.00 4.00 4.07 3.27


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 1 4 1 1 3.29 1113/1260 3.29 3.91 4.14 4.22 3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 3 1 3 4.00 904/1255 4.00 3.98 4.33 4.37 4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 3 0 4 4.14 878/1258 4.14 4.25 4.38 4.42 4.14
4. Were special techniques successful                 7  6  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 873  ****  4.16  4.03 4.08  ****

                                  Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                  Type                  Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0      0.00-0.99    0        A    8      Required for Majors  13    Graduate    0      Major       13
  28-55     0      1.00-1.99    0        B    3                                 Under-grad 14      Non-major    1
  56-83     3      2.00-2.99    0        C    2      General               0    Under-grad 14      Non-major    1
  84-150    4      3.00-3.49    1        D    0
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    8        F    0      Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other                 0
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 341  1                   University of Maryland                              Page  395
Title      Data Structures                      Baltimore County                                 MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Edelman,Mitch                        Fall   2009                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    41
Questionnaires: 29                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
         ----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   1   7  21  4.69  386/1509  4.57  4.31  4.31  4.32  4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   2   8  19  4.59  447/1509  4.48  4.28  4.26  4.25  4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   1   7  21  4.69  337/1287  4.32  4.05  4.30  4.33  4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   4   0   0   4   6  15  4.44  553/1459  4.42  4.06  4.22  4.26  4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  11   2   0   1   6   8  4.06  776/1406  3.59  3.62  4.09  4.12  4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 17  0   0   1   3   7  4.55  320/1384  4.29  3.92  4.11  4.15  4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   0   4   3  21  4.61  341/1489  4.43  4.10  4.17  4.14  4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   1   0   0   1   1  25  4.89  622/1506  4.96  4.49  4.67  4.67  4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0  0   0   1  13  10  4.38  500/1463  4.12  4.11  4.09  4.08  4.38


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0   0   2   9  16  4.52  787/1438  4.41  4.41  4.46  4.43  4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   0   0   4  23  4.85  665/1421  4.69  4.65  4.73  4.73  4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   0   0   1  11  15  4.52  604/1411  4.20  4.21  4.31  4.29  4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   1   0   1   2   4  19  4.58  568/1405  4.36  4.22  4.32  4.32  4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 6  0   0   2   6  13  4.52  261/1236  4.36  4.00  4.00  4.07  4.52


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 22 0  0   0   2   2   3  4.14 ****/1260  3.88  3.91  4.14  4.22  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22 0  0   0   1   2   4  4.43 ****/1255  4.58  3.98  4.33  4.37  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0  0  0   1   1   5  4.57 ****/1258  4.58  4.25  4.38  4.42  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  22   5   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 873  ****  4.16  4.03  4.08  ****


                 Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 28 0 0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 198  ****  4.25  4.22  4.17  ****


                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 28 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  89  ****  ****  4.49  4.86  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 28 0 0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.54  4.67  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    28   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.38  4.73  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                28   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  93  ****  ****  4.06  3.94  ****


                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 28   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.39  4.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 28   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.41  4.34  ****


                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 28  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.26  5.00  ****


                           Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                   Type                Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0      0.00-0.99    0      A   10       Required for Majors  24    Graduate    0      Major      14
  28-55     0      1.00-1.99    0      B    7                                                      
  56-83     4      2.00-2.99    0      C    6       General               0    Under-grad  29     Non-major  15
  84-150    6      3.00-3.49    7      D    0                                                      
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   11      F    0       Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I    0       Other                 1
                                       ?    2
```

Questionnaires: 14   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                                   Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                     NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0   0   1   1  12  4.79   267/1509  4.57 4.31  4.31 4.32  4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0   0   0   2  12  4.86   158/1509  4.48 4.28  4.26 4.25  4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1   0  0   0   2   1  10  4.62   414/1287  4.32 4.05  4.30 4.33  4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1   1  0   0   1   3   8  4.58   367/1459  4.42 4.06  4.22 4.26  4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  1   3  2   1   2   0   5  3.50  1178/1406  3.59 3.62  4.09 4.12  3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0   6  0   1   1   1   5  4.25   619/1384  4.29 3.92  4.11 4.15  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0   1   0   2  11  4.64   297/1489  4.43 4.10  4.17 4.14  4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0   0   0   0  14  5.00     1/1506  4.96 4.49  4.67 4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  4   0  0   0   0   5   5  4.50   325/1463  4.12 4.11  4.09 4.08  4.50


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0   0   0   4  10  4.71   514/1438  4.41 4.41  4.46 4.43  4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0   0   0   0  13  5.00     1/1421  4.69 4.65  4.73 4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  1   0  0   0   0   4   9  4.69   376/1411  4.20 4.21  4.31 4.29  4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  0   0   0   2  11  4.85   239/1405  4.36 4.22  4.32 4.32  4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  1   0  0   0   0   3  10  4.77   121/1236  4.36 4.00  4.00 4.07  4.77


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10   0  0   0   0   1   3  4.75   244/1260  3.88 3.91  4.14 4.22  4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10   0  0   0   0   0   4  5.00     1/1255  4.58 3.98  4.33 4.37  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10   0  0   0   0   0   4  5.00     1/1258  4.58 4.25  4.38 4.42  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 10   2  0   0   0   0   2  5.00  ****/ 873  **** 4.16  4.03 4.08  ****
```

                                           Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0         0.00-0.99    0        A    7        Required for Majors  12      Graduate     0        Major        8
  28-55      0         1.00-1.99    0        B    5                                                                       
  56-83      4         2.00-2.99    1        C    1        General               0      Under-grad  14        Non-major    6
  84-150     3         3.00-3.49    1        D    0                                                                       
  Grad.      0         3.50-4.00    5        F    0        Electives             1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                             P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                             I    0        Other                 0
                                             ?    1
```

Title   Data Structures   Baltimore County   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor: Bergeron,Ryan J   Fall   2009   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 22   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                                Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0  1  0  1  10   9  4.24   901/1509   4.57 4.31  4.31 4.32  4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  1  0  4   9   7  4.00  1086/1509   4.48 4.28  4.26 4.25  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  1  1  8   5   6  3.67  1118/1287   4.32 4.05  4.30 4.33  3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2   4  0  1  1   7   7  4.25   770/1459   4.42 4.06  4.22 4.26  4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  6  1  3  6   2   3  3.20  1299/1406   3.59 3.62  4.09 4.12  3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 8  0  1  1   7   4  4.08   767/1384   4.29 3.92  4.11 4.15  4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  1  1  4   5  10  4.05   958/1489   4.43 4.10  4.17 4.14  4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0   0  21  5.00     1/1506   4.96 4.49  4.67 4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0  1  1  6   7   2  3.47  1257/1463   4.12 4.11  4.09 4.08  3.47


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4   0  1  0  4   6   7  4.00  1203/1438   4.41 4.41  4.46 4.43  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   4   0  0  1  3   5   9  4.22  1303/1421   4.69 4.65  4.73 4.73  4.22
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0  1  1  9   4   3  3.39  1312/1411   4.20 4.21  4.31 4.29  3.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4   0  1  1  5   7   4  3.67  1220/1405   4.36 4.22  4.32 4.32  3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 5  1  1  0   5   3  3.80   824/1236   4.36 4.00  4.00 4.07  3.80


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16 0  2  0  1   2   1  3.00  1162/1260   3.88 3.91  4.14 4.22  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16 0  1  0  0   1   4  4.17   839/1255   4.58 3.98  4.33 4.37  4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 1  0  0   1   4  4.17   867/1258   4.58 4.25  4.38 4.42  4.17

                 Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 21 0 0  1  0   0   0  2.00  ****/ 198   **** 4.25  4.22 4.17  ****
```

                                        Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                  Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27       1        0.00-0.99    0        A    6          Required for Majors  19     Graduate      0        Major       17
28-55       2        1.00-1.99    0        B   10
56-83       6        2.00-2.99    3        C    3          General               0     Under-grad   22        Non-major    5
84-150      4        3.00-3.49    3        D    0
Grad.       0        3.50-4.00   10        F    0          Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                       responses to be significant
                                          I    0          Other                 0
                                          ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 341H 1                    University of Maryland                              Page  398
Title         Data Structures                     Baltimore County                              MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Oates,James T                       Fall  2009                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      8
Questionnaires:  8                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1509   5.00  4.31  4.31 4.32  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1509   5.00  4.28  4.26 4.25  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1287   5.00  4.05  4.30 4.33  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2   0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1459   5.00  4.06  4.22 4.26  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   7   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1406   ****  3.62  4.09 4.12  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1384   ****  3.92  4.11 4.15  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1489   5.00  4.10  4.17 4.14  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0  0  0  7  1  4.13 1335/1506   4.13  4.49  4.67 4.67  4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1463   5.00  4.11  4.09 4.08  5.00


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1438   5.00  4.41  4.46 4.43  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1421   5.00  4.65  4.73 4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1411   5.00  4.21  4.31 4.29  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1405   5.00  4.22  4.32 4.32  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0   0  0  1  0  7  4.75  126/1236   4.75  4.00  4.00 4.07  4.75


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0   0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1260   5.00  3.91  4.14 4.22  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0   0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1255   5.00  3.98  4.33 4.37  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0   0  0  1  0  3  4.50  620/1258   4.50  4.25  4.38 4.42  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                   4   2   0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/ 873   5.00  4.16  4.03 4.08  5.00

                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
                                                  Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                     NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  2  1  2  8  5  3.72 1314/1509  4.03  4.31  4.31 4.32  3.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  2  2  4  7  3  3.39 1408/1509  3.86  4.28  4.26 4.25  3.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   5  1  3  3  3  3  3.31 1212/1287  4.01  4.05  4.30 4.33  3.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  1  4  4  4  5  3.44 1330/1459  3.93  4.06  4.22 4.26  3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 4  1  5  3  3  2  3.00 1333/1406  3.57  3.62  4.09 4.12  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 1 5 4 7 3.83  993/1384  3.81  3.92  4.11 4.15  3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   3  3  6  2  1  3  2.67 1450/1489  3.38  4.10  4.17 4.14  2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  3 15  4.83  722/1506  4.38  4.49  4.67 4.67  4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 0 1 4 7 2 3.71 1133/1463  3.80  4.11  4.09 4.08  3.71


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  1  1  2  4 10  4.17 1135/1438  4.21  4.41  4.46 4.43  4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  2  4 12  4.56 1123/1421  4.53  4.65  4.73 4.73  4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 6 7 5 3.94 1107/1411  4.14  4.21  4.31 4.29  3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  5  2  4  7  3.72 1200/1405  3.90  4.22  4.32 4.32  3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 2 2 4 8 4.13  598/1236  4.01  4.00  4.00 4.07  4.13


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.40  505/1260  4.40  3.91  4.14 4.22  4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.40  665/1255  4.37  3.98  4.33 4.37  4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.40  721/1258  4.50  4.25  4.38 4.42  4.40
4. Were special techniques successful                 14   0  0  0  2  0  2  4.00 ****/ 873  ****  4.16  4.03 4.08  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  89  ****  ****  4.49 4.86  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.54 4.67  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  90  ****  ****  4.50 4.63  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   17   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.38 4.73  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               17   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  93  ****  ****  4.06 3.94  ****
```

                               Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                 Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0       A   12      Required for Majors  15     Graduate      0      Major         15
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0       B    6
  56-83      2        2.00-2.99    2       C    0      General               0     Under-grad   18      Non-major      3
  84-150    10        3.00-3.49    4       D    0
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    4       F    0      Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                          I    0      Other                 0
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 345  2              University of Maryland                           Page  400
Title      Software Design/Develo            Baltimore County                          MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Vick,Shon                        Fall   2009                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   15
Questionnaires:  12                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions               NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank        Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   1   0   1   2   8  4.33   800/1509   4.03 4.31  4.31 4.32  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   2   0   2   8  4.33   774/1509   3.86 4.28  4.26 4.25  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   5   0   0   0   2   5  4.71   304/1287   4.01 4.05  4.30 4.33  4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   1   1   2   8  4.42   602/1459   3.93 4.06  4.22 4.26  4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  5   0   0   2   2   3  4.14   702/1406   3.57 3.62  4.09 4.12  4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2  1   0   2   3   3  3.78  1036/1384   3.81 3.92  4.11 4.15  3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   1   0   1   3   1   6  4.09   923/1489   3.38 4.10  4.17 4.14  4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   4   5   3  3.92  1441/1506   4.38 4.49  4.67 4.67  3.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0   0   3   4   2  3.89   998/1463   3.80 4.11  4.09 4.08  3.89

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   1   7   4  4.25  1071/1438   4.21 4.41  4.46 4.43  4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   1   4   7  4.50  1162/1421   4.53 4.65  4.73 4.73  4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   2   4   6  4.33   810/1411   4.14 4.21  4.31 4.29  4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   1   2   4   5  4.08  1010/1405   3.90 4.22  4.32 4.32  4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3  0   1   2   3   3  3.89   784/1236   4.01 4.00  4.00 4.07  3.89

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0   0   0   1   1   3  4.40   505/1260   4.40 3.91  4.14 4.22  4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0   0   0   1   2   3  4.33   723/1255   4.37 3.98  4.33 4.37  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0  0   0   1   0   4  4.60   549/1258   4.50 4.25  4.38 4.42  4.60
4. Were special techniques successful                  7   4   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 873   **** 4.16  4.03 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  12    Graduate     0      Major        12
   28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0       B    2
   56-83      1       2.00-2.99    2       C    0      General               0    Under-grad  12      Non-major     0
   84-150     6       3.00-3.49    2       D    0
   Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    2       F    0      Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                           I    0      Other                 0
                                           ?    1
```

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

                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1509  5.00  4.31  4.31  4.32  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50  543/1509  4.50  4.28  4.26  4.25  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50  454/1459  4.50  4.06  4.22  4.26  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1   0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1406  5.00  3.62  4.09  4.12  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1384  5.00  3.92  4.11  4.15  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   1   0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1489  5.00  4.10  4.17  4.14  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1506  5.00  4.49  4.67  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  325/1463  4.50  4.11  4.09  4.08  4.50


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0  0  1  0  1  4.00 1203/1438  4.00  4.41  4.46  4.43  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1421  5.00  4.65  4.73  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50  617/1411  4.50  4.21  4.31  4.29  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1405  5.00  4.22  4.32  4.32  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  274/1236  4.50  4.00  4.00  4.07  4.50


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1260  5.00  3.91  4.14  4.22  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1255  5.00  3.98  4.33  4.37  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1258  5.00  4.25  4.38  4.42  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 873  5.00  4.16  4.03  4.08  5.00
```

                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Title         Computer Architecture            Baltimore County                                     MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Squire,Jon S                     Fall   2009                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   39
Questionnaires: 22                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                 Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean      Rank  Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   1   2   7  12  4.36   767/1509  4.24 4.31  4.31 4.39  4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   1   5  16  4.68   333/1509  4.62 4.28  4.26 4.26  4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   6  15  4.64   392/1287  4.65 4.05  4.30 4.38  4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   6   0   0   0   4  12  4.75   191/1459  4.54 4.06  4.22 4.32  4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   7   4   3   1   2   5  3.07  1324/1406  3.39 3.62  4.09 4.11  3.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4   0   1   0   5  12  4.56   313/1384  4.63 3.92  4.11 4.23  4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   0   2   3  17  4.68   254/1489  4.67 4.10  4.17 4.18  4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   0  22  5.00     1/1506  5.00 4.49  4.67 4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0   0   0   5  11   4  3.95   918/1463  4.03 4.11  4.09 4.18  3.95


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   0   6  16  4.73   497/1438  4.75 4.41  4.46 4.50  4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   0   3  19  4.86   639/1421  4.82 4.65  4.73 4.76  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   0   2   7  13  4.50   617/1411  4.31 4.21  4.31 4.35  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0   2   2   5  13  4.32   848/1405  4.38 4.22  4.32 4.34  4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  5   0   1   2   7   5  4.07   635/1236  4.03 4.00  4.00 4.03  4.07


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/1260  **** 3.91  4.14 4.25  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00  ****/1255  **** 3.98  4.33 4.46  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 21 0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00  ****/1258  **** 4.25  4.38 4.51  ****
```

                              Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                   Type                    Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0         0.00-0.99    0      A   16         Required for Majors  19      Graduate     0         Major       15
 28-55      0         1.00-1.99    0      B    4
 56-83      4         2.00-2.99    0      C    0         General               0      Under-grad  22         Non-major    7
 84-150    12         3.00-3.49    7      D    0
 Grad.      0         3.50-4.00   11      F    0         Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                       responses to be significant
                                         I    0         Other                 0
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 411  2                    University of Maryland                              Page  403
Title         Computer Architecture             Baltimore County                             MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Squire,Jon S                      Fall   2009                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   16
Questionnaires:  9                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  2  4  3  4.11 1032/1509  4.24  4.31  4.31  4.39  4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  2  6  4.56  483/1509  4.62  4.28  4.26  4.26  4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  3  6  4.67  359/1287  4.65  4.05  4.30  4.38  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  2  2  5  4.33  686/1459  4.54  4.06  4.22  4.32  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2  0  0  4  1  2  3.71 1074/1406  3.39  3.62  4.09  4.11  3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0  0  0  2  5  4.71  182/1384  4.63  3.92  4.11  4.23  4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  3  6  4.67  276/1489  4.67  4.10  4.17  4.18  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1506  5.00  4.49  4.67  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0  2  4  3  4.11  786/1463  4.03  4.11  4.09  4.18  4.11


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  1  0  8  4.78  413/1438  4.75  4.41  4.46  4.50  4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  846/1421  4.82  4.65  4.73  4.76  4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  1  0  5  3  4.11  992/1411  4.31  4.21  4.31  4.35  4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  2  1  6  4.44  708/1405  4.38  4.22  4.32  4.34  4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0  0  3  2  3  4.00  664/1236  4.03  4.00  4.00  4.03  4.00


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0  1  0  1  0  0  2.00 ****/1260  ****  3.91  4.14  4.25  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/1255  ****  3.98  4.33  4.46  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/1258  ****  4.25  4.38  4.51  ****

                               Frequency Distribution

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

Enrollment: 37
Questionnaires: 20   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                              Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   2   2   8   5   3  3.25 1447/1509  3.51  4.31  4.31  4.39  3.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   3   3   7   7   0  2.90 1483/1509  3.17  4.28  4.26  4.26  2.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   5   2   4   7   2  2.95 1260/1287  3.10  4.05  4.30  4.38  2.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0   4   3   7   4   1  2.74 1453/1459  2.82  4.06  4.22  4.32  2.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1   1   3  10   3   2  3.11 1319/1406  3.22  3.62  4.09  4.11  3.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3  4   6   3   3   1  2.47 1372/1384  2.62  3.92  4.11  4.23  2.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   8   2   2   4   4  2.70 1444/1489  2.93  4.10  4.17  4.18  2.70
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   3  17  4.85  682/1506  4.81  4.49  4.67  4.67  4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 12 0   1   1   1   0  3.00 ****/1463  3.52  4.11  4.09  4.18  3.40


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        9   0   4   1   2   1   3  2.82 1419/1438  3.41  4.41  4.46  4.50  2.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  10   0   3   1   1   1   4  3.20 1410/1421  4.00  4.65  4.73  4.76  3.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 10  0   3   2   2   0   3  2.80 1386/1411  3.36  4.21  4.31  4.35  3.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    10   0   3   1   5   0   1  2.50 1388/1405  3.10  4.22  4.32  4.34  2.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8  7  1   0   3   0   1  3.00 1131/1236  3.05  4.00  4.00  4.03  2.92


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15 0  1   0   3   1   0  2.80 1206/1260  2.80  3.91  4.14  4.25  2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15 0  2   1   1   0   1  2.40 1246/1255  2.40  3.98  4.33  4.46  2.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 1   0   1   2   1  3.40 1170/1258  3.40  4.25  4.38  4.51  3.40
4. Were special techniques successful                 15   3   1   0   1   0   0  2.00 ****/ 873  ****  4.16  4.03  4.26  ****
```

                            Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA           Expected Grades           Reasons                   Type                   Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1        0.00-0.99   0          A   4          Required for Majors  19       Graduate      0         Major       12
  28-55     0        1.00-1.99   0          B   6                                                                
  56-83     0        2.00-2.99   1          C   5          General               0       Under-grad   20         Non-major    8
  84-150    7        3.00-3.49   4          D   0                                                                
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   2          F   0          Electives             0       #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P   0                                              responses to be significant
                                            I   0          Other                 0
                                            ?   3
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 421  1                    University of Maryland                              Page  405
Title          Princ Of Oper Systems           Baltimore County                                   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Dorband,John E  (Instr. B)           Fall  2009                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    37
Questionnaires: 20                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean   Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  2  2  8  5   3  3.25 1447/1509  3.51  4.31  4.31 4.39  3.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  3  3  7  7   0  2.90 1483/1509  3.17  4.28  4.26 4.26  2.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  5  2  4  7   2  2.95 1260/1287  3.10  4.05  4.30 4.38  2.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0  4  3  7  4   1  2.74 1453/1459  2.82  4.06  4.22 4.32  2.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  1  3 10  3   2  3.11 1319/1406  3.22  3.62  4.09 4.11  3.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 4  6  3  3   1  2.47 1372/1384  2.62  3.92  4.11 4.23  2.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  8  2  2  4   4  2.70 1444/1489  2.93  4.10  4.17 4.18  2.70
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  3  17  4.85  682/1506  4.81  4.49  4.67 4.67  4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 1  7  7   0  3.40 1295/1463  3.52  4.11  4.09 4.18  3.40


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        6   0  2  2  6  1   3  3.07 1403/1438  3.41  4.41  4.46 4.50  2.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   6   0  1  0  0  6   7  4.29 1282/1421  4.00  4.65  4.73 4.76  3.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6  0  1  2  4  6   1  3.29 1328/1411  3.36  4.21  4.31 4.35  3.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     6   0  2  2  4  4   2  3.14 1336/1405  3.10  4.22  4.32 4.34  2.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 2 2  3  3  3   1  2.83 1171/1236  3.05  4.00  4.00 4.03  2.92


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15 0 1  0  3  1   0  2.80 1206/1260  2.80  3.91  4.14 4.25  2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15 0 2  1  1  0   1  2.40 1246/1255  2.40  3.98  4.33 4.46  2.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 1 0  1  2   1  3.40 1170/1258  3.40  4.25  4.38 4.51  3.40
4. Were special techniques successful                  15   3  1  0  1  0   0  2.00 ****/ 873  ****  4.16  4.03 4.26  ****
```

```
                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades            Reasons                    Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1      0.00-0.99   0       A    4       Required for Majors  19    Graduate      0       Major       12
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0       B    6                                                                    
 56-83      0      2.00-2.99   1       C    5       General               0    Under-grad   20       Non-major    8
 84-150     7      3.00-3.49   4       D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   2       F    0       Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0       Other                 0
                                       ?    3
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 421  2                   University of Maryland                                    Page  406
Title        Princ Of Oper Systems            Baltimore County                                      MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Chettri,Samir R                  Fall   2009                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     38
Questionnaires:  25                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  2  1  3  7 12  4.04 1086/1509  3.51 4.31  4.31 4.39  4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  3  1  5  7  9  3.72 1277/1509  3.17 4.28  4.26 4.26  3.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  4  3  4  7  7  3.40 1188/1287  3.10 4.05  4.30 4.38  3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  3  5  4  3  6  4  3.00 1422/1459  2.82 4.06  4.22 4.32  3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 2  2  3  6  7  5  3.43 1219/1406  3.22 3.62  4.09 4.11  3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4 6 2 4 6 3  2.90 1344/1384  2.62 3.92  4.11 4.23  2.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  2  4  8  4  7  3.40 1343/1489  2.93 4.10  4.17 4.18  3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  7 18  4.72  896/1506  4.81 4.49  4.67 4.67  4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 0 3 4 13 2  3.64 1187/1463  3.52 4.11  4.09 4.18  3.64


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2  0  0  0  6  3 14  4.35  991/1438  3.41 4.41  4.46 4.50  4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2  0  0  0  2  7 14  4.52 1146/1421  4.00 4.65  4.73 4.76  4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 1 2 3 7 10  4.00 1051/1411  3.36 4.21  4.31 4.35  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2  0  4  0  5  5  9  3.65 1223/1405  3.10 4.22  4.32 4.34  3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0 3 3 3 10 3  3.32 1064/1236  3.05 4.00  4.00 4.03  3.32


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 23 0 1 0 0 0 1  3.00 ****/1260  2.80 3.91  4.14 4.25  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23 0 0 1 0 0 1  3.50 ****/1255  2.40 3.98  4.33 4.46  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 0 0 1 0 1  4.00 ****/1258  3.40 4.25  4.38 4.51  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                 23  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 873  **** 4.16  4.03 4.26  ****


                Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 24 0 0 1 0 0 0  2.00 ****/ 198  **** 4.25  4.22 4.37  ****


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 24 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/  89  **** ****  4.49 4.71  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 24 0 1 0 0 0 0  1.00 ****/  92  **** ****  4.54 4.83  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 24 0 0 1 0 0 0  2.00 ****/  90  **** ****  4.50 4.69  ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 24 0 1 0 0 0 0  1.00 ****/  48  **** ****  4.39 4.75  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 24 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/  48  **** ****  4.41 4.54  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      24  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  47  **** ****  4.51 4.51  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  24  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  47  **** ****  4.18 4.19  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 24 0 1 0 0 0 0  1.00 ****/  44  **** ****  4.32 4.07  ****


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 24 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/  49  **** ****  4.26 4.67  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   24  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  41  **** ****  4.14 4.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     24  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  46  **** ****  4.31 4.67  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      24  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  37  **** ****  4.05 4.67  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    24  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  30  **** ****  4.27 4.33  ****
```

Title   Princ Of Oper Systems   Baltimore County   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor: Chettri,Samir R   Fall   2009   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 25   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                  Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   0   0.00-0.99   0   A   3   Required for Majors 22   Graduate   0   Major   15
 28-55   0   1.00-1.99   0   B   11
 56-83   0   2.00-2.99   3   C   6   General   0   Under-grad 25   Non-major 10
 84-150   13   3.00-3.49   5   D   0
 Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   7   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0   responses to be significant
                                         I   0   Other   0
                                         ?   2

```
Course-Section: CMSC 431  1                    University of Maryland                          Page  407
Title        Compiler Design Princ                Baltimore County                          MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Chang,Richard                       Fall  2009                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   13
Questionnaires:  6                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean Mean Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83   218/1509  4.83 4.31 4.31 4.39  4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67   356/1509  4.67 4.28 4.26 4.26  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  3  3  4.50   454/1459  4.50 4.06 4.22 4.32  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  3  2  1  3.67  1105/1406  3.67 3.62 4.09 4.11  3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  3  1  2  3.83   993/1384  3.83 3.92 4.11 4.23  3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83   133/1489  4.83 4.10 4.17 4.18  4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  6  0  4.00  1383/1506  4.00 4.49 4.67 4.67  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00     1/1463  5.00 4.11 4.09 4.18  5.00


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83   319/1438  4.83 4.41 4.46 4.50  4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00     1/1421  5.00 4.65 4.73 4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83   211/1411  4.83 4.21 4.31 4.35  4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50   634/1405  4.50 4.22 4.32 4.34  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  2  0  0  1  0  3  4.50   274/1236  4.50 4.00 4.00 4.03  4.50


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/1260  **** 3.91 4.14 4.25  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1255  **** 3.98 4.33 4.46  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1258  **** 4.25 4.38 4.51  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 435  1                     University of Maryland                              Page  408
Title      Computer Graphics                       Baltimore County                                 MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Rheingans,Penny                      Fall   2009                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    39
Questionnaires:  24               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   2   0  0  0  1  4 17  4.73  339/1509  4.73  4.31  4.31  4.39  4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2   0  0  0  2  6 14  4.55  495/1509  4.55  4.28  4.26  4.26  4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2   0  0  0  2  4 16  4.64  392/1287  4.64  4.05  4.30  4.38  4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    3   1  0  0  2  3 15  4.65  291/1459  4.65  4.06  4.22  4.32  4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  0  2  0  8  3  8  3.71 1074/1406  3.71  3.62  4.09  4.11  3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 11  0  0  2  0  7  4.56  313/1384  4.56  3.92  4.11  4.23  4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0  0  0  2  6 14  4.55  411/1489  4.55  4.10  4.17  4.18  4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0  0  0  0  0 22  5.00    1/1506  5.00  4.49  4.67  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  3 11  8  4.23  658/1463  4.23  4.11  4.09  4.18  4.23


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  2  2 18  4.73  497/1438  4.73  4.41  4.46  4.50  4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  2 21  4.91  483/1421  4.91  4.65  4.73  4.76  4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  2 10 10  4.36  779/1411  4.36  4.21  4.31  4.35  4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  0  0  1  5 16  4.68  432/1405  4.68  4.22  4.32  4.34  4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0  0  0  1  4 17  4.73  142/1236  4.73  4.00  4.00  4.03  4.73


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 20 0  1  0  2  1  0  2.75 ****/1260  ****  3.91  4.14  4.25  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 20 0  0  0  2  1  1  3.75 ****/1255  ****  3.98  4.33  4.46  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 20 0  0  0  1  2  1  4.00 ****/1258  ****  4.25  4.38  4.51  ****


                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  89  ****  ****  4.49  4.71  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.54  4.83  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  90  ****  ****  4.50  4.69  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  93  ****  ****  4.06  4.32  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27       0      0.00-0.99    0      A    8      Required for Majors  12    Graduate      4      Major        20
 28-55       0      1.00-1.99    0      B    8                                Under-grad   20      Non-major     4
 56-83       1      2.00-2.99    1      C    5      General               0
 84-150      9      3.00-3.49    2      D    0
 Grad.       4      3.50-4.00   10      F    0      Electives             9      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                 0
                                        ?    1
```

Questionnaires: 12   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                               Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                 NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean      Rank       Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   0   2  10  4.83   218/1509   4.59  4.31  4.31  4.39  4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   3   8  4.58   447/1509   4.50  4.28  4.26  4.26  4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   1   0   0   3   8  4.42   626/1287   4.50  4.05  4.30  4.38  4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   5   0   0   0   3   4  4.57   378/1459   4.59  4.06  4.22  4.32  4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1   0   1   1   4   5  4.18   665/1406   4.09  3.62  4.09  4.11  4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  2   1   0   0   5   4  4.10   751/1384   4.23  3.92  4.11  4.23  4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   1   1   2   8  4.42   583/1489   4.44  4.10  4.17  4.18  4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1   0   0   0   0  11  5.00     1/1506   5.00  4.49  4.67  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0   0   0   1   2   7  4.60   248/1463   4.43  4.11  4.09  4.18  4.60

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0   0   0   1   9  4.90   219/1438   4.66  4.41  4.46  4.50  4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   0   0   1   9  4.90   537/1421   4.80  4.65  4.73  4.76  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   0   0   1   1   8  4.70   376/1411   4.56  4.21  4.31  4.35  4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   0   0   0   1   9  4.90   172/1405   4.54  4.22  4.32  4.34  4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  3   0   1   0   3   2  4.00   664/1236   3.75  4.00  4.00  4.03  4.00

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0   0   0   2   0   1  3.67   982/1260   3.67  3.91  4.14  4.25  3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0   0   0   0   2   1  4.33   723/1255   4.33  3.98  4.33  4.46  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9  0   0   0   1   2   0  3.67  1102/1258   3.67  4.25  4.38  4.51  3.67
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 441  2                    University of Maryland                              Page  410
Title       Algorithms                          Baltimore County                                  MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Lawner,Richard                        Fall   2009                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    21
Questionnaires:  17                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions            NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
        -------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  1  0  4 11  4.35  778/1509  4.59  4.31  4.31 4.39  4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  0  1  4 11  4.41  683/1509  4.50  4.28  4.26 4.26  4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  1  2 13  4.59  444/1287  4.50  4.05  4.30 4.38  4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   4  0  1  0  2 10  4.62  335/1459  4.59  4.06  4.22 4.32  4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  0  2  3  4  7  4.00  813/1406  4.09  3.62  4.09 4.11  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2  0  1  2  2  9  4.36  505/1384  4.23  3.92  4.11 4.23  4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  1  1  4 11  4.47  499/1489  4.44  4.10  4.17 4.18  4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0 17  5.00    1/1506  5.00  4.49  4.67 4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  1  3  3  9  4.25  628/1463  4.43  4.11  4.09 4.18  4.25


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  1  2  3 11  4.41  917/1438  4.66  4.41  4.46 4.50  4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  1  0  2 14  4.71  968/1421  4.80  4.65  4.73 4.76  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  1  2  3 11  4.41  725/1411  4.56  4.21  4.31 4.35  4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  3  1  3 10  4.18  954/1405  4.54  4.22  4.32 4.34  4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 9  2  1  0  1  4  3.50  984/1236  3.75  4.00  4.00 4.03  3.50


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0  0  0  1  2  1  4.00 ****/1260  3.67  3.91  4.14 4.25  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0  0  1  1  0  2  3.75 ****/1255  4.33  3.98  4.33 4.46  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0  1  0  1  2  4.00 ****/1258  3.67  4.25  4.38 4.51  ****

                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0       A   6      Required for Majors  13    Graduate      0     Major        16
 28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0       B   5
 56-83      0       2.00-2.99    1       C   3      General               0    Under-grad   17     Non-major     1
 84-150     8       3.00-3.49    3       D   0
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    3       F   0      Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I   0      Other                 0
                                        ?   2
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 445  1                 University of Maryland                              Page  411
Title      Software Engineering             Baltimore County                                   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Raouf,Sa'ad                   Fall  2009                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      9
Questionnaires:  7                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean      Rank      Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00     1/1509   5.00  4.31  4.31  4.39  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71   300/1509   4.71  4.28  4.26  4.26  4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86   167/1287   4.86  4.05  4.30  4.38  4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  1  0  0  0  2  4  4.67   280/1459   4.67  4.06  4.22  4.32  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  2  1  3  3.86   971/1406   3.86  3.62  4.09  4.11  3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0  0  2  1  3  4.17   701/1384   4.17  3.92  4.11  4.23  4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86   121/1489   4.86  4.10  4.17  4.18  4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71   896/1506   4.71  4.49  4.67  4.67  4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  0  0  0  7  5.00     1/1463   5.00  4.11  4.09  4.18  5.00


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00     1/1438   5.00  4.41  4.46  4.50  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00     1/1421   5.00  4.65  4.73  4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00     1/1411   5.00  4.21  4.31  4.35  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00     1/1405   5.00  4.22  4.32  4.34  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0  0  0  0  7  5.00     1/1236   5.00  4.00  4.00  4.03  5.00


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1260   ****  3.91  4.14  4.25  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1255   ****  3.98  4.33  4.46  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1258   ****  4.25  4.38  4.51  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   6  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 873   ****  4.16  4.03  4.26  ****

                                       Frequency Distribution

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

Title   Automata Thry& Form La   Baltimore County   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor: Yesha,Yaacov   Fall   2009   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 9   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                                  Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                  NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   1   1   1   3   3  3.67 1340/1509  3.67  4.31  4.31  4.39  3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   3   0   3   3  3.67 1306/1509  3.67  4.28  4.26  4.26  3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   0   1   1   2   5  4.22  803/1287  4.22  4.05  4.30  4.38  4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   4   0   0   1   2   2  4.20  834/1459  4.20  4.06  4.22  4.32  4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0   1   3   1   3   1  3.00 1333/1406  3.00  3.62  4.09  4.11  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2 0 1   0   4   1  3.83  993/1384  3.83  3.92  4.11  4.23  3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0   0   2   1   6  4.44  541/1489  4.44  4.10  4.17  4.18  4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0   0   0   1   8  4.89  622/1506  4.89  4.49  4.67  4.67  4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0   2   2   2  4.00  853/1463  4.00  4.11  4.09  4.18  4.00


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   1   1   0   1   6  4.11 1166/1438  4.11  4.41  4.46  4.50  4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0   1   0   2   6  4.44 1195/1421  4.44  4.65  4.73  4.76  4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0   1   2   1   5  4.11  992/1411  4.11  4.21  4.31  4.35  4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   1   0   2   2   4  3.89 1141/1405  3.89  4.22  4.32  4.34  3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 7 0 0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/1236  ****  4.00  4.00  4.03  ****


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 1   1   0   1  3.33 1102/1260  3.33  3.91  4.14  4.25  3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 0   1   1   1  4.00  904/1255  4.00  3.98  4.33  4.46  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0   0   2   1  4.33  770/1258  4.33  4.25  4.38  4.51  4.33
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 455  1                 University of Maryland                        Page  413
Title        Numerical Computations          Baltimore County                          MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Stephens,Arthur                     Fall  2009                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires: 12                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions            NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   2   0  1  0  3  3  3  3.70 1321/1509  3.70  4.31  4.31  4.39  3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  2  3  2  1  3  3.00 1463/1509  3.00  4.28  4.26  4.26  3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  2  1  4  4  3.91 1020/1287  3.91  4.05  4.30  4.38  3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   1  0  0  3  1  6  4.30  715/1459  4.30  4.06  4.22  4.32  4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  3  3  1  0  2  2  2.88 1364/1406  2.88  3.62  4.09  4.11  2.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 4 1 0 0 3 3  4.00  807/1384  4.00  3.92  4.11  4.23  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  1  3  5  2  3.73 1210/1489  3.73  4.10  4.17  4.18  3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  1  6  4  4.27 1243/1506  4.27  4.49  4.67  4.67  4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 1 1 3 2 0 2.86 1416/1463  2.86  4.11  4.09  4.18  2.86


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  1  1  2  3  4  3.73 1326/1438  3.73  4.41  4.46  4.50  3.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  2  5  4  4.18 1314/1421  4.18  4.65  4.73  4.76  4.18
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  1  3  2  3  2  3.18 1343/1411  3.18  4.21  4.31  4.35  3.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  2  1  3  2  3  3.27 1317/1405  3.27  4.22  4.32  4.34  3.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 3 2 1 3 0 1  2.57 1194/1236  2.57  4.00  4.00  4.03  2.57


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 2 0 0 0 0  1.00 ****/1260  ****  3.91  4.14  4.25  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 2 0 0 0  2.00 ****/1255  ****  3.98  4.33  4.46  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/1258  ****  4.25  4.38  4.51  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 461  1                    University of Maryland                              Page  414
Title        Database Mangmt System               Baltimore County                                MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Grasso,Michael                       Fall  2009                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     40
Questionnaires:  21                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank       Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  1  2  7 11  4.33   800/1509   4.33  4.31  4.31  4.39  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  1  4  5 11  4.24   880/1509   4.24  4.28  4.26  4.26  4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  1  2  7 11  4.33   708/1287   4.33  4.05  4.30  4.38  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2  0  0  3  3 13  4.53   432/1459   4.53  4.06  4.22  4.32  4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   2  0  3  5  2  9  3.89   941/1406   3.89  3.62  4.09  4.11  3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7  1  0  0  4  9  4.43   421/1384   4.43  3.92  4.11  4.23  4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  0  5 16  4.76   183/1489   4.76  4.10  4.17  4.18  4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0 13  8  4.38  1177/1506   4.38  4.49  4.67  4.67  4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  5  6  8  4.16   738/1463   4.16  4.11  4.09  4.18  4.16


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  1  6 14  4.62   660/1438   4.62  4.41  4.46  4.50  4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  2  3 16  4.67  1014/1421   4.67  4.65  4.73  4.76  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  2  6 13  4.52   592/1411   4.52  4.21  4.31  4.35  4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  1  3  5 12  4.33   828/1405   4.33  4.22  4.32  4.34  4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  2  0  1  6  6  6  3.89   779/1236   3.89  4.00  4.00  4.03  3.89


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  ****/1260   ****  3.91  4.14  4.25  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18  0  1  0  0  0  2  3.67  ****/1255   ****  3.98  4.33  4.46  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0  0  1  0  0  2  4.00  ****/1258   ****  4.25  4.38  4.51  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   18  1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/ 873   ****  4.16  4.03  4.26  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades           Reasons                    Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0      A  12         Required for Majors  12      Graduate     0        Major        20
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0      B   6                                                            
  56-83      0        2.00-2.99    4      C   3         General               1      Under-grad  21        Non-major     1
  84-150    12        3.00-3.49    6      D   0
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    5      F   0         Electives             8      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P   0                                     responses to be significant
                                          I   0         Other                 0
                                          ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 471  1                      University of Maryland                                    Page  415
Title        Artificial Intelligenc                Baltimore County                                      MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  desJardins,Mari                       Fall   2009                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    41
Questionnaires:  36                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


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

            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course     0   0   0   0   3  16  17  4.39   745/1509  4.39  4.31  4.31  4.39  4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      0   0   1   0   5  14  16  4.22   891/1509  4.22  4.28  4.26  4.26  4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     0   1   0   3   3  17  12  4.09   890/1287  4.09  4.05  4.30  4.38  4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      0   2   0   1   4  13  16  4.29   726/1459  4.29  4.06  4.22  4.32  4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  1   0   3   3   9   9  11  3.63  1128/1406  3.63  3.62  4.09  4.11  3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  5   1   1   5   7  15  4.17   693/1384  4.17  3.92  4.11  4.23  4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              0   0   0   1   4  13  18  4.33   674/1489  4.33  4.10  4.17  4.18  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                    0   0   0   0   0   1  35  4.97   175/1506  4.97  4.49  4.67  4.67  4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5  0   0   0   2  15  14  4.39   489/1463  4.39  4.11  4.09  4.18  4.39


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          0   0   0   1   0  15  20  4.50   800/1438  4.50  4.41  4.46  4.50  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     0   0   0   0   0   5  31  4.86   639/1421  4.86  4.65  4.73  4.76  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0   0   0   1   4  17  14  4.22   911/1411  4.22  4.21  4.31  4.35  4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       0   0   0   1   4   8  23  4.47   671/1405  4.47  4.22  4.32  4.34  4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  5   0   1   2   8  18  4.48   290/1236  4.48  4.00  4.00  4.03  4.48


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 23  0   0   1   1   9   2  3.92   844/1260  3.92  3.91  4.14  4.25  3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23  0   0   0   2   1  10  4.62   494/1255  4.62  3.98  4.33  4.46  4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0   0   0   1   1  11  4.77   409/1258  4.77  4.25  4.38  4.51  4.77
4. Were special techniques successful                   23  4   0   0   2   4   3  4.11   411/ 873  4.11  4.16  4.03  4.26  4.11


                                      Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades            Reasons                    Type                     Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0      A   15       Required for Majors  13       Graduate     0        Major          32
  28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0      B   10                                                           
  56-83      3       2.00-2.99    1      C    4       General               0       Under-grad   36       Non-major       4
  84-150    17       3.00-3.49   10      D    0
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   14      F    0       Electives            17       #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                 1
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 475  1                      University of Maryland                              Page  416
Title        Neural Networks                     Baltimore County                                   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Peng,Yun                            Fall  2009                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     15
Questionnaires:  9                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  2   0  0  0  0  4  3  4.43  698/1509  4.43  4.31  4.31  4.39  4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   2   0  0  0  1  2  4  4.43  667/1509  4.43  4.28  4.26  4.26  4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  2   0  0  0  2  0  5  4.43  614/1287  4.43  4.05  4.30  4.38  4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   2   0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  227/1459  4.71  4.06  4.22  4.32  4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  1  0  0  3  3  0  3.50 1178/1406  3.50  3.62  4.09  4.11  3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 2  0  0  1  0  3  4.50  349/1384  4.50  3.92  4.11  4.23  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           2   0  0  0  1  2  4  4.43  569/1489  4.43  4.10  4.17  4.18  4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled                 2   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1506  5.00  4.49  4.67  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  0  6  1  4.14  750/1463  4.14  4.11  4.09  4.18  4.14


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2   0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  291/1438  4.86  4.41  4.46  4.50  4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1421  5.00  4.65  4.73  4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0  0  0  2  2  3  4.14  971/1411  4.14  4.21  4.31  4.35  4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2   0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  228/1405  4.86  4.22  4.32  4.34  4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 1  0  0  0  1  5  4.83   90/1236  4.83  4.00  4.00  4.03  4.83


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  0  1  0  2  1  3.75  936/1260  3.75  3.91  4.14  4.25  3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  0  0  2  1  1  3.75 1054/1255  3.75  3.98  4.33  4.46  3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  421/1258  4.75  4.25  4.38  4.51  4.75
4. Were special techniques successful                 5   3  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 873  ****  4.16  4.03  4.26  ****

                                   Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 481  1                    University of Maryland                              Page  417
Title        Computer Networks                 Baltimore County                                   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Parker,James B                    Fall   2009                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     36
Questionnaires: 27                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                  Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  2   0  0  0  4  8 13  4.36  767/1509  4.36  4.31  4.31  4.39  4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   2   0  0  1  0  7 17  4.60  424/1509  4.60  4.28  4.26  4.26  4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  2   0  0  0  1  9 15  4.56  463/1287  4.56  4.05  4.30  4.38  4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   2   5  0  0  2  5 13  4.55  400/1459  4.55  4.06  4.22  4.32  4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  1  0  1  2  8 13  4.38  470/1406  4.38  3.62  4.09  4.11  4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 15 0 1 1 2 6  4.30  570/1384  4.30  3.92  4.11  4.23  4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           2   0  0  2  2  7 14  4.32  685/1489  4.32  4.10  4.17  4.18  4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled                 2   0  0  0  1 17  7  4.24 1273/1506  4.24  4.49  4.67  4.67  4.24
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 4 7 13  4.38  500/1463  4.38  4.11  4.09  4.18  4.38


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2   0  0  0  1  9 15  4.56  725/1438  4.56  4.41  4.46  4.50  4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2   0  0  1  1  2 21  4.72  950/1421  4.72  4.65  4.73  4.76  4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 2 6 17  4.60  496/1411  4.60  4.21  4.31  4.35  4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2   0  1  1  3  6 14  4.24  911/1405  4.24  4.22  4.32  4.34  4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 1 2 1 5 8 8  3.79  829/1236  3.79  4.00  4.00  4.03  3.79


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 0 3 4  4.57  370/1260  4.57  3.91  4.14  4.25  4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 20 0 0 0 1 0 6  4.71  390/1255  4.71  3.98  4.33  4.46  4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 20 0 1 0 0 0 6  4.43  700/1258  4.43  4.25  4.38  4.51  4.43


                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  23  0  0  0  1  2  1  4.00 ****/ 184  ****  4.29  4.16  4.62  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 23 0 0 0 0 0 4  5.00 ****/ 198  ****  4.25  4.22  4.37  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 23 0 0 0 0 0 4  5.00 ****/ 184  ****  4.68  4.48  4.66  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           23  0  0  1  0  0  3  4.25 ****/ 177  ****  4.86  4.36  4.47  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 23 1 0 0 0 0 3  5.00 ****/ 165  ****  4.17  4.18  4.29  ****


                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 26 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  89  ****  ****  4.49  4.71  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 26 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.54  4.83  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 26 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  90  ****  ****  4.50  4.69  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    26  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.38  4.64  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                26  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  93  ****  ****  4.06  4.32  ****


                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 26 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.39  4.75  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 26 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.41  4.54  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       26  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.51  4.51  ****


                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 26 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.26  4.67  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    26  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.14  4.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      26  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.31  4.67  ****
```

Title   Computer Networks   Baltimore County   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor: Parker,James B   Fall   2009   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 27   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   1   0.00-0.99   0   A   9   Required for Majors 12   Graduate   0   Major   22
 28-55   0   1.00-1.99   0   B   11
 56-83   1   2.00-2.99   4   C   3   General   0   Under-grad   27   Non-major   5
 84-150   10   3.00-3.49   6   D   0
 Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   4   F   0   Electives   12   #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P   0   responses to be significant
                                            I   0   Other   1
                                            ?   2

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

             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   3   0  1  2  0  2  2  3.29 1443/1509  4.09  4.31  4.31  4.39  3.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    3   0  1  1  1  2  2  3.43 1397/1509  4.14  4.28  4.26  4.26  3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   3   0  1  2  0  3  1  3.14 1239/1287  3.14  4.05  4.30  4.38  3.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    3   2  1  2  0  1  1  2.80 1450/1459  3.69  4.06  4.22  4.32  2.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  0  1  1  2  1  2  3.29 1273/1406  3.39  3.62  4.09  4.11  3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 3  1  0  1  2  2.71 1364/1384  3.40  3.92  4.11  4.23  2.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            3   0  4  1  1  0  1  2.00 1481/1489  3.32  4.10  4.17  4.18  2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  3   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1506  5.00  4.49  4.67  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 1  1  1  2  0  2.80 1423/1463  3.82  4.11  4.09  4.18  2.80


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0  1  0  2  1  3  3.71 1330/1438  4.30  4.41  4.46  4.50  3.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0  1  0  1  0  5  4.14 1322/1421  4.57  4.65  4.73  4.76  4.14
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  1  1  1  1  3  3.57 1262/1411  4.23  4.21  4.31  4.35  3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0  1  1  1  1  3  3.57 1248/1405  4.20  4.22  4.32  4.34  3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0 2  0  1  2  2  3.29 1072/1236  4.14  4.00  4.00  4.03  3.29


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/1260  ****  3.91  4.14  4.25  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1255  ****  3.98  4.33  4.46  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1258  ****  4.25  4.38  4.51  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  8   0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 873  ****  4.16  4.03  4.26  ****
```

                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMSC 491  5                      University of Maryland                               Page  419
Title      Spec Topics In Comp Sc                Baltimore County                                     MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Hood,Daniel J                       Fall   2009                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    32
Questionnaires:  20                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank       Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0   0   0   0   2  17  4.89  167/1509   4.09  4.31  4.31  4.39  4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0   0   0   0   3  16  4.84  167/1509   4.14  4.28  4.26  4.26  4.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1  18   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/1287   3.14  4.05  4.30  4.38  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   0   0   0   0   8  11  4.58  378/1459   3.69  4.06  4.22  4.32  4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  11   1   0   3   2   2  3.50 1178/1406   3.39  3.62  4.09  4.11  3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  7   0   1   3   2   6  4.08  762/1384   3.40  3.92  4.11  4.23  4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0   0   0   1   5  13  4.63  308/1489   3.32  4.10  4.17  4.18  4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0   0   0   0  19  5.00    1/1506   5.00  4.49  4.67  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0   0   0   0   3  16  4.84  103/1463   3.82  4.11  4.09  4.18  4.84


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0   0   0   0   2  16  4.89  247/1438   4.30  4.41  4.46  4.50  4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0   0   0   0   0  18  5.00    1/1421   4.57  4.65  4.73  4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0   0   0   0   2  16  4.89  159/1411   4.23  4.21  4.31  4.35  4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0   0   0   0   3  15  4.83  251/1405   4.20  4.22  4.32  4.34  4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  1   0   0   0   0  17  5.00    1/1236   4.14  4.00  4.00  4.03  5.00


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17  0   0   0   0   3   0  4.00  ****/1260   ****  3.91  4.14  4.25  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17  0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67  ****/1255   ****  3.98  4.33  4.46  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00  ****/1258   ****  4.25  4.38  4.51  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   17  2   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/ 873   ****  4.16  4.03  4.26  ****

                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   19  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 184   ****  4.29  4.16  4.62  ****


                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades           Reasons                 Type                    Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0       0.00-0.99     0        A   13        Required for Majors   3     Graduate      0       Major        16
  28-55      0       1.00-1.99     0        B    3
  56-83      3       2.00-2.99     2        C    1        General               0     Under-grad   20       Non-major     4
  84-150     4       3.00-3.49     2        D    0
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00     5        F    0        Electives            14     #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                           I    0        Other                 1
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 611  1                    University of Maryland                              Page 420
Title       Adv Computer Architect              Baltimore County                                  MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Younis,Mohamed                     Fall  2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   53
Questionnaires: 30                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


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

            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    7   0  0  1  6  4 12  4.17   964/1509  4.17  4.31  4.31  4.39  4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     7   0  0  2  2  6 13  4.30   807/1509  4.30  4.28  4.26  4.25  4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    7   0  1  1  2  5 14  4.30   739/1287  4.30  4.05  4.30  4.22  4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     8   1  1  1  6  4  9  3.90  1088/1459  3.90  4.06  4.22  4.16  3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 8   1  0  1  4  8  8  4.10   746/1406  4.10  3.62  4.09  4.12  4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8 0  1  1  6  5  9  3.91   939/1384  3.91  3.92  4.11  4.16  3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             7   1  1  1  3  6 11  4.14   885/1489  4.14  4.10  4.17  4.14  4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled                   8   0  0  0  0  2 20  4.91   583/1506  4.91  4.49  4.67  4.71  4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 0  0  0  3 10  8  4.24   648/1463  4.24  4.11  4.09  4.15  4.24


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         8   0  0  0  2  6 14  4.55   750/1438  4.55  4.41  4.46  4.49  4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    7   0  0  0  1  5 17  4.70   979/1421  4.70  4.65  4.73  4.78  4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8   0  0  0  4  7 11  4.32   830/1411  4.32  4.21  4.31  4.33  4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      8   0  0  1  4  5 12  4.27   881/1405  4.27  4.22  4.32  4.33  4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8  0  1  1  6  5  9  3.91   774/1236  3.91  4.00  4.00  3.98  3.91


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14  0  0  2  4  2  8  4.00   746/1260  4.00  3.91  4.14  4.21  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14  0  0  2  5  2  7  3.88  1005/1255  3.88  3.98  4.33  4.43  3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0  1  0  3  5  7  4.06   913/1258  4.06  4.25  4.38  4.50  4.06
4. Were special techniques successful                   14 11  1  1  2  0  1  2.80  ****/ 873  ****  4.16  4.03  4.01  ****


            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 29 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 198  ****  4.25  4.22  4.31  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA            Expected Grades        Reasons                  Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      8        0.00-0.99    3          A   17         Required for Majors  22      Graduate    10      Major       17
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0          B    3
  56-83      0        2.00-2.99    0          C    1         General               0      Under-grad  20      Non-major   13
  84-150     1        3.00-3.49    0          D    0
  Grad.     10        3.50-4.00    8          F    0         Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                              P    0                                      responses to be significant
                                              I    0         Other                 0
                                              ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 621  1                    University of Maryland                                 Page  421
Title        Adv Operating Systems             Baltimore County                                      MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Kalpakis,Konsta                   Fall   2009                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      52
Questionnaires:  38                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                   NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   5   0   0   0   3  10  20  4.52  586/1509   4.52  4.31  4.31 4.39  4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    5   0   0   0  10   7  16  4.18  932/1509   4.18  4.28  4.26 4.25  4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   5   0   1   4   6  11  11  3.82 1069/1287   3.82  4.05  4.30 4.22  3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    5   1   0   2   8  15   7  3.84 1135/1459   3.84  4.06  4.22 4.16  3.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6  0   0   1  12  12   7  3.78 1023/1406   3.78  3.62  4.09 4.12  3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 3  1   2   6  12   8  3.83 1001/1384   3.83  3.92  4.11 4.16  3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            5   0   0   0   7   9  17  4.30  707/1489   4.30  4.10  4.17 4.14  4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled                  6   0   0   0   0   1  31  4.97  233/1506   4.97  4.49  4.67 4.71  4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 3 0   0   3   7  17  4.52  317/1463   4.52  4.11  4.09 4.15  4.52


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        5   0   0   0   1  14  18  4.52  787/1438   4.52  4.41  4.46 4.49  4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   5   0   0   0   0   0  33  5.00    1/1421   5.00  4.65  4.73 4.78  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5  0   0   2   1  13  17  4.36  779/1411   4.36  4.21  4.31 4.33  4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     5   0   0   1   5   6  21  4.42  733/1405   4.42  4.22  4.32 4.33  4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 2  1   3   2  10  14  4.10  616/1236   4.10  4.00  4.00 3.98  4.10


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17 0  0   0   1  11   9  4.38  520/1260   4.38  3.91  4.14 4.21  4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0  0   2   2   3  14  4.38  681/1255   4.38  3.98  4.33 4.43  4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0 0   0   1   2  18  4.81  363/1258   4.81  4.25  4.38 4.50  4.81
4. Were special techniques successful                  18  14  2   0   1   2   1  3.00 ****/ 873   ****  4.16  4.03 4.01  ****


                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  33   2  0   0   1   0   2  4.33 ****/ 184   ****  4.29  4.16 4.07  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 34 0 0   1   0   2   1  3.75 ****/ 198   ****  4.25  4.22 4.31  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 34 1 0   1   0   1   1  3.67 ****/ 184   ****  4.68  4.48 4.11  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           34   1  0   1   0   1   1  3.67 ****/ 177   ****  4.86  4.36 4.41  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 34   1  0   1   0   2   0  3.33 ****/ 165   ****  4.17  4.18 4.25  ****


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 34  3  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  89   ****  ****  4.49 4.39  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 35 1 0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/  92   ****  ****  4.54 4.52  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 35  1  0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  90   ****  ****  4.50 4.48  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    35   2  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  92   ****  ****  4.38 4.30  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                35   1  0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/  93   ****  ****  4.06 4.04  ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 34   0  2   0   1   0   1  2.50 ****/  48   ****  ****  4.39 4.36  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 35   0  0   0   2   1   0  3.33 ****/  48   ****  ****  4.41 4.40  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       35   0  0   0   1   1   1  4.00 ****/  47   ****  ****  4.51 4.43  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   35   1  0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  47   ****  ****  4.18 4.03  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 35   1  0   1   1   0   0  2.50 ****/  44   ****  ****  4.32 4.45  ****


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 34  0  0   1   0   1   2  4.00 ****/  49   ****  ****  4.26 4.16  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    35   0  0   1   1   0   1  3.33 ****/  41   ****  ****  4.14 4.08  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      35   1  0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  46   ****  ****  4.31 4.11  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       35   1  0   1   0   1   0  3.00 ****/  37   ****  ****  4.05 3.69  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     35   2  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  30   ****  ****  4.27 4.26  ****
```

Enrollment: 52
Questionnaires: 38   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                  Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   7   0.00-0.99   3   A   23   Required for Majors 29   Graduate   19   Major   32
28-55   0   1.00-1.99   0   B   6
56-83   0   2.00-2.99   0   C   1   General   1   Under-grad 19   Non-major   6
84-150   1   3.00-3.49   2   D   0
Grad.   19   3.50-4.00   11   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0   responses to be significant
                                        I   0   Other   0
                                        ?   2

```
Course-Section: CMSC 671  1                   University of Maryland                                    Page  422
Title        Prin Artificial Intell             Baltimore County                                       MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Finin,Timothy W                    Fall   2009                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    43
Questionnaires:  31                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies       Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                  NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0   0   0   3  14  13  4.33  800/1509  4.33  4.31  4.31  4.39  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2   0   0   2   2  10  15  4.31  796/1509  4.31  4.28  4.26  4.25  4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0   0   1   1   8  20  4.57  463/1287  4.57  4.05  4.30  4.22  4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   2   0   1   3   8  16  4.39  628/1459  4.39  4.06  4.22  4.16  4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  0   1   1   5   9  13  4.10  739/1406  4.10  3.62  4.09  4.12  4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0   1   1  10  18  4.50  349/1384  4.50  3.92  4.11  4.16  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0   1   1   5   7  15  4.17  844/1489  4.17  4.10  4.17  4.14  4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   2   2  26  4.80  782/1506  4.80  4.49  4.67  4.71  4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 2 0   1   2   9   7  4.16  738/1463  4.16  4.11  4.09  4.15  4.16

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   0   1   9  20  4.63  631/1438  4.63  4.41  4.46  4.49  4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   4  27  4.87  614/1421  4.87  4.65  4.73  4.78  4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   1   3  11  16  4.35  789/1411  4.35  4.21  4.31  4.33  4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   4   8  19  4.48  658/1405  4.48  4.22  4.32  4.33  4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  2  0   4   5   9  11  3.93  741/1236  3.93  4.00  4.00  3.98  3.93

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0   1   0   5   8  11  4.12  701/1260  4.12  3.91  4.14  4.21  4.12
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0   1   1   4  10   9  4.00  904/1255  4.00  3.98  4.33  4.43  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0  1   1   1  10  12  4.24  829/1258  4.24  4.25  4.38  4.50  4.24
4. Were special techniques successful                  7  13   1   0   7   2   1  3.18  782/ 873  3.18  4.16  4.03  4.01  3.18

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  22   6   0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/ 184  ****  4.29  4.16  4.07  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 26 0  0   0   0   2   3  4.60 ****/ 198  ****  4.25  4.22  4.31  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 26 1  0   0   1   1   2  4.25 ****/ 184  ****  4.68  4.48  4.11  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           26   3   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/ 177  ****  4.86  4.36  4.41  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 26   2   0   0   1   0   2  4.33 ****/ 165  ****  4.17  4.18  4.25  ****

                Seminar
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    27   3   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.38  4.30  ****

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 27   0   2   0   1   0   1  2.50 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.39  4.36  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 28   0   1   0   1   0   1  3.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.41  4.40  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       27   1   1   1   0   0   1  2.67 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.51  4.43  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   28   1   1   1   0   0   0  1.50 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.18  4.03  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 27   1   1   0   0   1   1  3.33 ****/  44  ****  ****  4.32  4.45  ****

                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 26  0   0   0   2   0   3  4.20 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.26  4.16  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    26   1   0   0   1   1   2  4.25 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.14  4.08  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      25   2   0   1   1   2   0  3.25 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.31  4.11  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       25   3   0   1   1   1   0  3.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.05  3.69  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     25   3   1   0   1   1   0  2.67 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.27  4.26  ****
```

```
Course-Section: CMSC 671  1                      University of Maryland                              Page  422
Title          Prin Artificial Intell               Baltimore County                            MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Finin,Timothy W                        Fall   2009                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      43
Questionnaires:  31                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	3	A	22	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	20	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	11	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	20	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	13	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: CMSC 691  1              University of Maryland                          Page  423
Title      Spec Topics In Comp Sc        Baltimore County                             MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Halem,Milton               Fall   2009                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    17
Questionnaires: 13              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   4   5   4  4.00 1114/1509  4.00 4.31  4.31 4.39  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   2   6   5  4.23  880/1509  4.23 4.28  4.26 4.25  4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   4   0   0   0   6   3  4.33  708/1287  4.33 4.05  4.30 4.22  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   4   4   5  4.08  931/1459  4.08 4.06  4.22 4.16  4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2   0   1   4   2   4  3.82 1001/1406  3.82 3.62  4.09 4.12  3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6  0   0   1   2   4  4.43  421/1384  4.43 3.92  4.11 4.16  4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   2   1  10  4.62  330/1489  4.62 4.10  4.17 4.14  4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   1  12  4.92  466/1506  4.92 4.49  4.67 4.71  4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1  0   0   2   6   2  4.00  853/1463  4.00 4.11  4.09 4.15  4.00


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   0   0   4   8  4.67  588/1438  4.67 4.41  4.46 4.49  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   3  10  4.77  863/1421  4.77 4.65  4.73 4.78  4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   2   5   6  4.31  841/1411  4.31 4.21  4.31 4.33  4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   1   0   1   5   6  4.15  967/1405  4.15 4.22  4.32 4.33  4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3  0   1   2   2   4  4.00  664/1236  4.00 4.00  4.00 3.98  4.00


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0   0   1   5   1   4  3.73  952/1260  3.73 3.91  4.14 4.21  3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0   0   0   3   4   4  4.09  877/1255  4.09 3.98  4.33 4.43  4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0   0   1   3   7  4.55  591/1258  4.55 4.25  4.38 4.50  4.55
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   6   0   0   0   1   3  4.75  114/ 873  4.75 4.16  4.03 4.01  4.75


            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0  1   0   0   1   0  2.50 ****/ 198  **** 4.25  4.22 4.31  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 11 1  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 184  **** 4.68  4.48 4.11  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           11   1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 177  **** 4.86  4.36 4.41  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  11  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 165  **** 4.17  4.18 4.25  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10 2  0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  89  **** ****  4.49 4.39  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0  0   1   0   2   0  3.33 ****/  92  **** ****  4.54 4.52  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10  0   0   0   0   2   1  4.33 ****/  90  **** ****  4.50 4.48  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    10   0   0   0   1   1   1  4.00 ****/  92  **** ****  4.38 4.30  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                10   0   0   0   1   0   2  4.33 ****/  93  **** ****  4.06 4.04  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 11  0   0   0   2   0   0  3.00 ****/  48  **** ****  4.39 4.36  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  11  0   0   0   2   0   0  3.00 ****/  48  **** ****  4.41 4.40  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       11   0   0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/  47  **** ****  4.51 4.43  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   11   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  47  **** ****  4.18 4.03  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  11  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  44  **** ****  4.32 4.45  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 11  0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  49  **** ****  4.26 4.16  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    11   1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  41  **** ****  4.14 4.08  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      11   1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  46  **** ****  4.31 4.11  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       11   1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  37  **** ****  4.05 3.69  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     11   1   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  30  **** ****  4.27 4.26  ****
```

Questionnaires: 13   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                    Frequency Distribution

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