1. CMSC 104 0201

Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR

Instructor: BERGERON, RYAN

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 427 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	mier	ncies			Tnet	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.evel	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NΔ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	2	4	4	6	3.42	1560/1670	4.10	4.26	4.31	4.23	3.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	4	2	8	3.72	1424/1666	4.23	4.23	4.27	4.30	3.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	7	8	4.05	1027/1406	4.41	4.31	4.32	4.31	4.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	9	5	4.06	1055/1615	4.43	4.36	4.24	4.17	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	2	0	2	2	1	3.00	1478/1566	3.83	3.72	4.07	4.03	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	3	4	3	2	3.15	1426/1528	3.83	4.22	4.12	4.00	3.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	2	4	8	3.83	1314/1650	4.33	4.30	4.22	4.28	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	405/1667	4.96	4.79	4.67	4.61	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	1	2	5	3	3.46	1405/1626	4.01	4.11	4.11	4.07	3.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	0	4	4	7	3 83	1387/1559	4.34	4.45	4.46	4.47	3.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	3	2	4	8		1467/1560	4.50	4.73	4.72	4.68	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	1	3	3	7		1369/1549			4.31	4.32	3.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	3	3	7		1337/1546		4.25	4.32	4.32	3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	4	1	1	3			1082/1323		4.15	4.00		3.40
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	4	1	Т	3	0	3.40	1002/1323	3.95	4.15	4.00	3.91	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	0	4	2		1049/1384		4.06	4.10	3.92	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	1265/1378	3.79	4.19	4.29	4.09	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	867/1378	4.28	4.23	4.31	4.08	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	1	2	1	1	1	2.83	850/ 904	2.83	3.94	4.03	3.94	2.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.13	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 239	****	4.38	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 230	****	4.78	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 231	****	4.59	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 218	****	4.42	4.18	4.47	***
Quarter var														
Seminar	1.0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	**** 0 0	****	F 00	4 65	4 60	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 75	****	4.33	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0 1	1	0	4.00	****/ 79 ****/ 80	****	4.33	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	U	U	U	1	0	U	3.00	***/ 80		2.07	3.97	3.99	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.19	4.07	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.67	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	4.46	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	1	0	-		****/ 6			4.92	4.75	****
J. Here there enough proctors for all the students	10	U	U	U	_	U	U	3.00	, 0		3.00	1.94	1.03	

Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR

Instructor: BERGERON, RYAN

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 427 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	 6	0.00-0.99	1	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	С	2	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR

Title PROB SOL & COMP

Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M

Enrollment: 46
Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 428 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	2		Inst	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	I.evel	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
x														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	7	24	4.77	338/1670	4.10	4.26	4.31	4.23	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	24	4.74	323/1666	4.23	4.23	4.27	4.30	4.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	24	4.77	295/1406	4.41	4.31	4.32	4.31	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	254/1615	4.43	4.36	4.24	4.17	4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	18	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	295/1566	3.83	3.72	4.07	4.03	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	1	0	1	5	15	4.50	421/1528	3.83	4.22	4.12	4.00	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	5	25	4.83	208/1650	4.33	4.30	4.22	4.28	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	270/1667	4.96	4.79	4.67	4.61	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	12	15	4.56	363/1626	4.01	4.11	4.11	4.07	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	2	24	4.85	355/1559	4.34	4.45	4.46	4.47	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1560	4.50	4.73	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	381/1549	4.16		4.31	4.32	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	2		4.70	470/1546	4.18	4.25	4.32	4.32	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	7	1	0	2	2	15	4.50	326/1323	3.95	4.15	4.00	3.91	4.50
1									,					
Discussion				_	_	_	_		= 40 /4004					
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	740/1384	3.90	4.06	4.10	3.92	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	797/1378	3.79	4.19	4.29	4.09	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	840/1378	4.28	4.23	4.31	4.08	4.31
4. Were special techniques successful	20	5	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	****/ 904	2.83	3.94	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.13	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	4.38	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	4.78	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	4.59	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	4.42	4.18	4.47	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.33	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.33	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	2.67	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 38	****	4.00	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 38	****	4.00	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31	****	4.00	4.47	4.28	****
2 time_condens near you cally out from detivious	-	ŭ	Ū	J	ŭ	ŭ	-	3.00	, 31		1.00	/	1.20	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	4.83	****

Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR

Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M

Enrollment: 46
Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 428 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons	Type			Majors		
00-27	 7	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	23	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	3	
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	2							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	32	Non-major	29	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	13					
				?	0							

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I

BLOCK, DAWN M Instructor:

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 429 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	eane	ncie	q		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	4 50	F70/1670	1 ()	1 26	1 21	4 20	4 50
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1 0	3	8	4.58	578/1670	4.62	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1					5	6	4.55	569/1666	4.63	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	-,		4.31	4.32	4.39	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3 7	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	499/1615		4.36	4.24	4.29	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1		0	0	1	0	3	4.50	389/1566	4.03	3.72	4.07	4.00	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	221/1528	4.58	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	298/1650		4.30	4.22	4.20	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1667		4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	371/1626	4.45	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	387/1559	4.81	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1560	4.97	4.73	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	266/1549	4.56	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	231/1546	4.57	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	529/1323	4.35	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	579/1384	4.05	4.06	4.10	4.07	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	935/1378	3.72	4.19	4.29	4.25	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	2	3	4		1125/1378	3.82	4.23	4.31	4.26	3.73
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	0	3	0		3.50	718/ 904		3.94			3.50
1. Nete special techniques successivi	_	,	O	O	5	O	_	3.30	7107 501	3.00	3.71	1.05	1.01	3.30
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	80/ 232		4.13	4.19	4.35	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	62/ 239	4.39	4.38	4.21	4.33	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 230	4.75	4.78	4.44	4.61	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 231		4.59	4.31	4.52	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 218	4.25	4.42	4.18	4.25	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.33	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.33	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	2.67	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 38	****	4.00	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 38	****	4.00	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31	****	4.00	4.47	4.00	***
3. Did conferences help you carry out freid activities	11	O	U	U	U	U	1	3.00	/ 31		4.00	1.1/	1.00	
Self Paced		_	_	_	_	_	_							
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0101
Title COMPUTER SCIENCE

COMPUTER SCIENCE I BLOCK, DAWN M

Instructor: BLOCK,
Enrollment: 20

Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 429 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6	
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	3							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	6	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough		
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant		
				I	0	Other	11					
				?	0							

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0102 Title

COMPUTER SCIENCE I

BLOCK, DAWN M Instructor:

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 430 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

			Frequencies		3	Ins		ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	_			_		_								
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	325/1670			4.31	4.32	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	355/1666	4.63	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	525/1406	4.59	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	158/1615	4.73	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	752/1566	4.03	3.72	4.07	4.00	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1528	4.58	4.22	4.12	4.11	5.00
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	194/1650	4.73	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	131/1626	4.45	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	589/1559	4.81	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1560	4.97	4.73	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	248/1549	4.56	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	457/1546	4.57	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	235/1323	4.35	4.15	4.00		4.67
J. Did addiovisual techniques emmance your understanding			U	U	_	2	,	1.07	233/1323	1.55	4.13	1.00	1.00	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	249/1384	4.05	4.06	4.10	4.07	4.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	872/1378	3.72	4.19	4.29	4.25	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	692/1378	3.82	4.23	4.31	4.26	4.46
4. Were special techniques successful	1	11	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 904	3.88	3.94	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	Λ	4	5.00	1/ 232	4.50	4.13	4.19	4.35	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 239	4.39	4.38	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 230	4.75	4.78	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 231	4.83	4.78	4.31	4.52	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	2	0	0	0	0	ے 1		****/ 218	4.03	4.39	4.18	4.25	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports creatry specified	11	4	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 210	4.25	7.42	4.10	4.23	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-			
				?	0						

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 5

Spring 2008

Page 431 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Question	naire
---------	--------	------------	----------	-------

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

	<u> </u>							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1670	4.62	4.26	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1666		4.23	4.27	4.27	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1406		4.31	4.32	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1615	4.73	4.36	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1566	4.03	3.72	4.07	4.00	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1528	4.58	4.22	4.12	4.11	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	429/1650	4.73	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	167/1626	4.45	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.80
T a selection														
Lecture	^	0	0	0	0	^	_	F 00	1 /1 5 5 0	4 01	4 45	1 10	4 40	г оо
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1559		4.45	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560		4.73	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	Τ	0	4	4.60	562/1549		4.24	4.31	4.25	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	Τ.	0	0	4	4.40	849/1546		4.25	4.32	4.30	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	273/1323	4.35	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1384	4.05	4.06	4.10	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	970/1378	3.72	4.19	4.29	4.25	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1147/1378	3.82	4.23	4.31	4.26	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	3.88	3.94	4.03	4.01	****
-														

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0104 Title

COMPUTER SCIENCE I

BLOCK, DAWN M Instructor:

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 432 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

	1				Inst	tructor	Course	_	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	6	4.86	253/1670	4.62	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1666	4.63	4.23	4.27	4.27	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1406	4.59	4.31	4.32	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1615	4.73	4.36	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1566	4.03	3.72	4.07	4.00	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1528	4.58	4.22	4.12	4.11	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	194/1650	4.73	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	347/1626	4.45	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.57
Lecture														
. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared		0	0	0	0	Ο	6	5.00	1/1559	4.81	4.45	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	4.97	4.73	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	266/1549	4.56	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	310/1546	4.57	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1323		4.15	4.00	4.08	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	2		1033/1384		4.06	4.10	4.07	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	0	1		1247/1378	3.72	4.19	4.29	4.25	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	0	0	2		1147/1378	3.82	4.23	4.31	4.26	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	3.88	3.94	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 232	4.50	4.13	4.19	4.35	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	62/ 239	4.39	4.38	4.21	4.33	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 230	4.75	4.78	4.44	4.61	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 231	4.83	4.59	4.31	4.52	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 218	4.25	4.42	4.18	4.25	5.00

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

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 433 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies							Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1216/1670	4.62	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	967/1666		4.23	4.27	4.27	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	876/1406	4.59	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	775/1615	4.73	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1478/1566	4.03	3.72	4.07	4.00	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	272/1650	4.73	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	637/1626	4.45	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1559	4.81	4.45	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560		4.73	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	1		,	4.56	4.24	4.31	4.25	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	987/1546		4.25	4.32	4.30	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	692/1323	4.35	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.00
Discussion														
	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4 50	424/1204	4 05	1 00	4 10	4 07	4 50
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	0	U T	4.50	434/1384 1297/1378		4.06 4.19	4.10 4.29	4.07 4.25	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	∠ 1	0	1	4.00	977/1378		4.19	4.29	4.25	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage rair and open discussion	۷	U	U	U	1	U	1	4.00	9///13/0	3.04	4.23	4.31	4.20	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 232	4.50	4.13	4.19	4.35	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 239	4.39	4.38	4.21	4.33	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 230	4.75	4.78	4.44	4.61	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 231	4.83	4.59	4.31	4.52	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 218	4.25	4.42	4.18	4.25	5.00

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

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

Title Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A (Instr. A) Spring 2008

Enrollment: 19

Questionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 434

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	300/1670	4.62	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	784/1666	4.63	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	924/1406	4.59	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	290/1615	4.73	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	851/1566	4.03	3.72	4.07	4.00	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	899/1528	4.58	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	429/1650	4.73	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	797/1626	4.45	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1022/1559	4.81	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	4.97	4.73	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	562/1549	4.56	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	849/1546	4.57	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	183/1323	4.35	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1260/1384	4.05	4.06	4.10	4.07	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	0	1		1193/1378	3.72	4.19	4.29	4.25	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1255/1378	3.82	4.23	4.31	4.26	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful		1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	718/ 904	3.88	3.94	4.03	4.01	3.50
Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	ı									

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Ρ

I

0

0

1

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0201 Page 435 AUG 6, 2008 Title Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A (Instr. B) Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

	,	
Enrollment:	19	

Ouestionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	§ 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did	. godn now	General insights,skil		m thia acurac	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	300/1670	4.62	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.80
		or make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	784/1666	4.62	4.23	4.31	4.32	4.40
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	924/1406	4.59	4.23	4.32	4.39	4.20
	_	tions reflect		_	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	290/1615	4.73	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.75
				what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.75	,	4.03	3.72	4.07	4.00	4.75
				o what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	899/1528	4.58	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.00
		system clearly		-	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	,	4.73	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.60
	-	as class cance	_	IIIed	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
				hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	,		4.11	4.11	4.06	4.35
J. 110W WOO	ila you gi	ade the overa.	LI CCAC	ning circuit veness	J	O	U	O	O	_	_	1.50	103/1020	1.15	1.11	1.11	1.00	1.33
1. Were th	ne instruc	prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	896/1559	4.81	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.45		
	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared ?. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	4.97		4.72	4.73	5.00
	 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearl 						0	0	0	1		4.50	,	4.56	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.55
		contribute to			3	0	0	0	0	1		4.50		4.57	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.45
				our understanding	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	326/1323	4.35		4.00	4.08	4.63
		1000											,					
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discus	sions contribu	ite to	what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1260/1384	4.05	4.06	4.10	4.07	3.00
2. Were al	ll student	s actively end	courage	d to participate	1	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1193/1378	3.72	4.19	4.29	4.25	3.50
3. Did the	e instruct	or encourage i	air an	d open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1255/1378	3.82	4.23	4.31	4.26	3.33
4. Were sp	pecial tec	hniques succes	ssful	_	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	718/ 904	3.88	3.94	4.03	4.01	3.50
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	ı									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Major						3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General							0	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives							0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h

Other

5

responses to be significant

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 436 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Frequencies						Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new		rom this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	479/1670	4.62	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instruct			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	4.63	4.23	4.27	4.27	5.00
3. Did the exam que			0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	423/1406	4.59	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.67
4. Did other evalua	tions reflect the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1615	4.73	4.36	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned rea	dings contribute to	o what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1478/1566	4.03	3.72	4.07	4.00	3.00
6. Did written assi	gnments contribute	to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1528	4.58	4.22	4.12	4.11	5.00
7. Was the grading	system clearly exp	lained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1650	4.73	4.30	4.22	4.20	5.00
8. How many times w	as class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you gr	ade the overall tea	aching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	953/1626	4.45	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.00
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruc	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	4.81	4.45	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instruct	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	1	2	4.67	1090/1560	4.97	4.73	4.72	4.73	4.67
3. Was lecture mate	 Was lecture material presented and explained clearl 					0	1	0	2	4.33	900/1549	4.56	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.33
4. Did the lectures	contribute to what	t you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1546	4.57	4.25	4.32	4.30	5.00
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1179/1323	4.35	4.15	4.00	4.08	3.00
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	sions contribute to	o what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1103/1384	4.05	4.06	4.10	4.07	3.50
2. Were all student	s actively encourag	ged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1297/1378	3.72	4.19	4.29	4.25	3.00
3. Did the instruct	or encourage fair a	and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1304/1378	3.82	4.23	4.31	4.26	3.00
	Laboratory															
1. Did the lab incr	-	of the material	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	147/ 232	4.50	4.13	4.19	4.35	4.00
	ckground information	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	147/ 239	4.39	4.38	4.21	4.33	4.00	
3. Were necessary m	_	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	120/ 230	4.75	4.78	4.44	4.61	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance				0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 231	4.83	4.59	4.31	4.52	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified					0	1	0	0	0	2.00	214/ 218	4.25	4.42	4.18	4.25	2.00
		Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	GPA Expected Grades Reasons									Tv	pe			Majors	

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

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 437 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	479/1670	4.62	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	415/1666	4.63	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	423/1406	4.59	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	4.73	4.36	4.24	4.29	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	4.58	4.22	4.12	4.11	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1650	4.73	4.30	4.22	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	278/1626	4.45	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.67
Lecture	•	•	0	0	0	0	_	F 00	1 /1 5 5 0	4 01	4 45	1 16	4 40	F 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	4.81	4.45	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	4.97	4.73	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1549	4.56	4.24	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1546	4.57	4.25	4.32	4.30	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	1/1323	4.35	4.15	4.00	4.08	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1384	4.05	4.06	4.10	4.07	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	970/1378	3.72	4.19	4.29	4.25	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	653/1378	3.82	4.23	4.31	4.26	4.50
- •														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 232	4.50	4.13	4.19	4.35	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 239	4.39	4.38	4.21	4.33	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 230	4.75	4.78	4.44	4.61	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 231		4.59	4.31	4.52	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 218	4.25	4.42	4.18	4.25	5.00

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0206 Title

COMPUTER SCIENCE I

Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A

Enrollment: 20 Ouestionnaires: 3

28-55

56-83

Grad.

84-150

0

1

0

0

1.00-1.99

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

0

1

0

1

В

С

D

F

Ρ

Ι

2

0

0

0

0

0

0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2008

Page 438 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies	5 1	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
Questions	1417													
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1216/1670	4.62	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	870/1666	4.63	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	423/1406	4.59	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1083/1615	4.73	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1200/1566	4.03	3.72	4.07	4.00	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1274/1528	4.58	4.22	4.12	4.11	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	806/1650	4.73	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	953/1626	4.45	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	673/1559	4.81	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	4.97	4.73	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	900/1549	4.56	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1329/1546	4.57	4.25	4.32	4.30	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	960/1323	4.35	4.15	4.00	4.08	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	820/1384	4.05	4.06	4.10	4.07	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	603/1378	3.72	4.19	4.29	4.25	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	653/1378	3.82	4.23	4.31	4.26	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	3.88	3.94	4.03	4.01	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	226/ 232		4.13	4.19	4.35	3.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	230/ 239	4.39	4.38	4.21	4.33	3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	188/ 230	4.75	4.78	4.44	4.61	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	159/ 231	4.83	4.59	4.31	4.52	4.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	\$
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	 s	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	0

General

Other

Electives

0

0

3

Under-grad

3

responses to be significant

- Means there are not enough

Non-major

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0101 Universitie COMPUTER SCIENCE II Ba

Instructor: FREY, DENNIS (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 19

Questionnaires: 3

0

Grad.

3.50-4.00

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 439 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fre	equei	ncie	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1583/1670	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.32	3.33
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	415/1666	4.45	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.67
3. Did the	e exam q	estions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	423/1406	4.46	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.67
4. Did oth	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	4.47	4.36	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1478/1566	3.23	3.72	4.07	4.00	3.00
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	4.57	4.22	4.12	4.11	5.00
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1404/1650	4.39	4.30	4.22	4.20	3.67
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	4.77	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	673/1559	4.69	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.67
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	4.82	4.73	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was led	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	900/1549	4.51	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.33
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1425/1546	4.39	4.25	4.32	4.30	3.33
5. Did aud	diovisua	our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	692/1323	4.41	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.00		
	Discussion																	
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	4.26	4.06	4.10	4.07	5.00
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	4.31	4.19	4.29	4.25	5.00
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	653/1378		4.23	4.31		4.50
		Labora	torv															
1 Did the	e lah ind	crease understa	_	of the material	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	192/ 232	3.98	4.13	4.19	4.35	3.67
			_	ground information	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 239	4.31	4.38	4.21	4.33	5.00
_	_	_		for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 230	4.80	4.78	4.44	4.61	5.00
	_	structor provid			0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 231	4.45	4.59	4.31	4.52	5.00
		-		early specified	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 218		4.42	4.18		5.00
		a .																
1. Were as	ssigned t	Semina: topics relevant		announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	5.00	4.65	5.00	5.00
	1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme																	
	Frequ	lency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n												
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	ason	3			Ty	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 1					Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r or	1
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 1																		
56-83	56-83 1 2.00-2.99 2 C 1						nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
~ 1	^	2 50 4 00										^			,			

Electives

Other

0

3

0

0

0

Ρ

Ι

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0101 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II Instructor: FREY, DENNIS (Instr. B)

University of Maryland Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 440

En	rollme	nt:	19	
			_	

Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	eque	ncies	\$		Inst	tructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	2	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1																
1. Did yo	u qain ne	w insights,ski	– lls from	m this course	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1583/16	570	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.32	3.33
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	415/16	566	4.45	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.67
3. Did th	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	423/14	106	4.46	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.67
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/16	515	4.47	4.36	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did as	signed re	adings contrib	ute to i	what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1478/15	566	3.23	3.72	4.07	4.00	3.00
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/15	528	4.57	4.22	4.12	4.11	5.00
7. Was th	e grading	system clearl	y expla:	ined	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1404/16	550	4.39	4.30	4.22	4.20	3.67
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/16	567	4.77	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	953/16	526	4.23	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.00
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cl	ass discu			what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/13	384	4.26	4.06	4.10	4.07	5.00
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/13		4.31		4.29	4.25	5.00
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	653/13					4.26	
		Labora	.																
1 Did +h	o lah ind	rease understa	-	E the material	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	192/ 2	222	3.98	4.13	4.19	4.35	3.67
			_	ground information	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 2		4.31	4.13	4.19	4.33	5.00
_	_	_	_	or lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 2		4.80	4.78	4.44	4.61	5.00
	_	structor provid			0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 2		4.45	4.59	4.31	4.52	5.00
		_		early specified	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 2			4.42			5.00
1. Were a	ssigned t	Semina opics relevant		announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	87	5.00	5.00	4.65	5.00	5.00
													-,						
				Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gr							Rea	asons	3				Тур	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 1						auir	ed fo	or Ma	iors		0	 Gradu	ıate		0	Majo	 or	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 1								-				-	- 100) (-
56-83						Ger	nera	1				0	Under	r-qı	rad	3	Non-	-major	2
84-150														J-				3	
Grad.						Ele	ecti	ves				0	####	- N	Means t	here a	are not	enou	ıh
	P 0														es to b				•
	I 0						her					3				. 5-			
				? 0															

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0102 University of Mar Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II Baltimore Cour Instructor: FREY, DENNIS Spring 2008

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 441 AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	15	
Questionnaires:	13	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequenc					ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did voi	ı gəin ne	Genera w insights,ski		m this gourse	0	0	0	1	1	6	5	4 15	1105/167	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.15
		w insignes,ski tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	582/166		4.23	4.27	4.27	4.54
		estions reflec			0	0	1	0	1	5	6	4.15			4.31	4.32	4.39	4.15
	_	ations reflect		_	0	0	0	2	0	5	6	4.15	981/161		4.36	4.24	4.29	4.15
				what you learned	0	10	0	1	2	0	0		****/156		3.72	4.07	4.00	****
				o what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	2	4	4.67			4.22	4.12	4.11	4.67
		system clearl		_	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46			4.30	4.22	4.20	4.46
		was class canc			0	1	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/166		4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
	_			hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	,		4.11		4.06	4.18
1 77 11		Lectur			0	0	0	_	1	4	0	4 54	050/155	. 4.60	4 45	1 16	4 40	4 54
		ctor's lecture tor seem inter			0	0	0	0 1	1 0	4	8 9	4.54	,		4.45	4.46 4.72	4.40	4.54 4.54
				_	0	0	0	1	0	6	9 6	4.34	1222/1560		4.73 4.24	4.72	4.73	4.34
		eriai presente s contribute t		explained clearly	0	1	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	,		4.24	4.31	4.25 4.30	4.42
				our understanding	0	0	1	1	0	6	5	4.42	, -			4.00		4.42
5. Did aud	ilovisuai	techniques en	nance y	our understanding	U	U	Τ	Τ	U	ь	Э	4.00	692/132	3 4.41	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	Did class discussions contribute to what you learn				5	0	2	0	3	1	2	3.13	1247/138	4.26	4.06	4.10	4.07	3.13
2. Were al	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned Were all students actively encouraged to participate				5	0	1	2	0	2	3	3.50	1193/1378	3 4.31	4.19	4.29	4.25	3.50
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	5	0	0	1	3	4	0	3.38	1240/1378	3 4.23	4.23	4.31	4.26	3.38
		Labora	-															
				f the material	3	1	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	182/ 23:		4.13	4.19	4.35	3.78
				ground information	4	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	,				4.33	4.22
				or lab activities	4	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	53/ 23		4.78	4.44	4.61	4.86
		tructor provid			4	1	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	- ,		4.59	4.31	4.52	3.88
5. Were re	equiremen	ts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	5	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	3 4.49	4.42	4.18	4.25	***
		Self	Paced															
1. Did sel	lf-paced :	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
				Frequ	onat	Diat	- wib	ıtior	2									
	rrequ	iency	DIS	LIDI	16101	1												
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad								Rea	asons				T	/pe			Majors	
00-27	00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 3					Rec	าบา่า	 ed fo	or Ma	iore		0	Gradua	 -e	0	Majo	 r	8
	28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 6					1000	1411	-u 1)	، د د ر	_		Gradua		J	1.10) (J
	56-83 3 2.00-2.99 3 C 4					Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-	arad 1	L3	Non-	major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D 0		001						-	2-2-0-2	,	-		,	-
Grad.						Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoua	h
P 0														ses to b				
	P 0 I 0					Oth	ner				1	3	_		3			
				? 0														

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Instructor: Enrollment:

FREY, DENNIS (Instr. A)

19 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 442 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	401/1670	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	344/1666	4.45	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	352/1406	4.46	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	176/1615	4.47	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	1108/1566	3.23	3.72	4.07	4.00	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	368/1528	4.57	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	159/1650	4.39	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1667		4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	670/1626	4.23	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	572/1559	4.69	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	829/1560	4.82	4.73	4.72	4.73	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	410/1549	4.51	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	231/1546	4.39	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	326/1323	4.41	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	519/1384	4.26	4.06	4.10	4.07	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	316/1378	4.31	4.19	4.29	4.25	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	531/1378	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.26	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	27/ 232	3.98	4.13	4.19	4.35	4.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	70/ 239	4.31	4.38	4.21	4.33	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 230	4.80	4.78	4.44	4.61	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	95/ 231		4.59	4.31	4.52	4.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	143/ 218	4.49	4.42	4.18	4.25	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 87	5.00	5.00	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 75	****	4.33	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 79	****	4.33	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	2.67	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 38	****	4.00	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 38	****	4.00	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	***	****

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0201 Title

COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Instructor: FREY, DENNIS (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 442 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 11

FREY, DENNIS (Instr. B) Enrollment: 19

Baltimore County Spring 2008

University of Maryland

Page 443 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	3 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean			Sect Mean
General	0	^	0	0	0	2	0	4.73	401/1670	4 00	1 26	4 21	4 22	4 72
 Did you gain new insights, skills from this course Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 	0	0	0	0	0	3 3	8 8	4.73	401/1670 344/1666	4.28 4.45	4.26 4.23	4.31 4.27	4.32 4.27	4.73 4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	352/1406	4.45	4.23	4.32	4.39	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	176/1615	4.47	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	1	5		1108/1566	3.23	3.72	4.07	4.00	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	368/1528	4.57	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0		10	4.91		4.39	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1667	4.77	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1626		4.11			4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	673/1559	4.69	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1560	4.82	4.73	4.72	4.73	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1549	4.51	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1546	4.39	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1323	4.41	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	519/1384		4.06	4.10	4.07	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	316/1378	4.31	4.19	4.29	4.25	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	531/1378	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.26	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	27/ 232	3.98	4.13	4.19	4.35	4.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	70/ 239	4.31	4.38	4.21	4.33	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 230	4.80	4.78	4.44	4.61	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	95/ 231	4.45	4.59	4.31	4.52	4.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	143/ 218	4.49	4.42	4.18	4.25	4.00
Seminar							_				= 00		= 00	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 87	5.00	5.00	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.75	****
 Did research projects contribute to what you learned Did presentations contribute to what you learned 	10 10	0	0	0	1	0 1	0		****/ 75 ****/ 79	****	4.33	4.57	4.25 3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	2.67	4.45 3.97	4.30	***
· · ·	10	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00			2.07	3.91	4.30	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	2.00	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 38	****	4.00	4.19	2.50	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 38	****	4.00	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	****	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	***	***

COMPUTER SCIENCE II

Title Instructor: FREY, DENNIS (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 443 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0202 University of Maryl Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II Baltimore County Instructor: FREY, DENNIS Spring 2008

University of Maryland Page 444

Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 11 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	1	0	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	665/1670	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.50
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	622/1666	4.45	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.50
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	387/1406	4.46	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.70
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	687/1615	4.47	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.40
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	7	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1478/1566	3.23	3.72	4.07	4.00	3.00
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	221/1528	4.57	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.75
		g system clearly		ined	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	570/1650	4.39	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.50
		was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667		4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	877/1626	4.23	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.13
		Lectur	е															
		uctor's lecture			1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	276/1559	4.69	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.90
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	596/1560	4.82	4.73	4.72	4.73	4.90
		-		xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	451/1549	4.51	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.70
		es contribute t		±	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	345/1546	4.39	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.80
5. Did au	udiovisual	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	423/1323	4.41	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.40
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1384	4.26	4.06	4.10	4.07	4.67
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1378	4.31	4.19	4.29	4.25	****
3. Did th	ne instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1378	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.26	****
		Labora	tory															
1. Did th	ne lab ind	crease understa	nding o	f the material	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	95/ 232	3.98	4.13	4.19	4.35	4.38
2. Were y	ou provid	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	3	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	147/ 239	4.31	4.38	4.21	4.33	4.00
3. Were n	necessary	materials avai	lable f	or lab activities	4	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	120/ 230	4.80	4.78	4.44	4.61	4.50
4. Did th	ne lab ins	structor provid	e assis	tance	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	100/ 231	4.45	4.59	4.31	4.52	4.57
5. Were r	requiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	4	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	52/ 218	4.49	4.42	4.18	4.25	4.67
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 0				ed fo				0	 Graduat		0	Majo		4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 8		кес	quir(=u 10	יב ויו∂	ajori	5	U	Graduat	E	U	Ma JC	JΤ	4
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 2		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D 0								0			1			1-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Εle	ecti	ves				0	#### - :				_	n
				P 0		0-1	h				-	0	respons	es to D	e sign	ııııcar	1L	
				T 0		Oti	her				1	. 0						

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0301 University of Maryland Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II Baltimore County Instructor: FREY, DENNIS (Instr. A) Spring 2008

Enrollment:	⊥4
Questionnaires:	13

Page 445 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Quescionnaires: 13	II SC	Eval	uacı	JII Q	icsc.	LOIIII	alle							
			Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	835/1670	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	477/1666	4.45	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	566/1406	4.46	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	509/1615	4.47	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	3	2	2	0	2.86	1518/1566	3.23	3.72	4.07	4.00	2.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	202/1528	4.57	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	417/1650	4.39	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1667	4.77	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	278/1626	4.23	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	371/1559	4.69	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	929/1560	4.82	4.73	4.72	4.73	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	451/1549	4.51	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	395/1546	4.39	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	439/1323	4.41	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	820/1384	4.26	4.06	4.10	4.07	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 0 1 3 3 4.29 842/1378 4.31 4.19 4.29 4.25 4.29 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 608/1378 4.23 4.23 4.31 4.26 4.57 4. Were special techniques successful 6 5 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 904 **** 3.94 4.03 4.01 ****

Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	1	7	2	3.91	166/ 232	3.98	4.13	4.19	4.35	3.91
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	5	5	1	3.64	206/ 239	4.31	4.38	4.21	4.33	3.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	1	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	120/ 230	4.80	4.78	4.44	4.61	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	200/ 231	4.45	4.59	4.31	4.52	3.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	4	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	131/ 218	4.49	4.42	4.18	4.25	4.14

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0301 University of Maryland Page 446
Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Instructor: FREY, DENNIS (Instr. B) Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 14

FILL OT THICHE.	T-T		
Questionnaires:	13	Student Course Evaluation Questionnair	сe

			E-20	0 0001 0	naio	a		Tnat	- mil at on	Courac	Dont	TIMDO	T orrol	Coa
Questions	NR	NA	1	eque: 2		s 4	5	Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Mean			Sec Mea
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	Ω	4.38	835/1670	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.3
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	477/1666		4.23	4.27	4.27	4.6
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	566/1406		4.31	4.32	4.39	4.
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	7		509/1615		4.36	4.24	4.29	4.
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	3	2	2	0		1518/1566		3.72	4.07	4.00	2.
5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learne	d 0	4	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	202/1528		4.22	4.12	4.11	4.
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	417/1650	4.39	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.
3. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1667		4.79	4.67	4.64	5.
. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes	s 7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	151/1626	4.23	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1559	4.69	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.
. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	777/1560		4.73	4.72	4.73	4.
. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	488/1549	4.51	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.
. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	310/1546	4.39	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	326/1323	4.41	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	820/1384	4.26	4.06	4.10	4.07	4.
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	842/1378	4.31	4.19	4.29	4.25	4.
. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	. 6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	608/1378	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.26	4.
. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.01	* *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	1	7	2	3.91	166/ 232	3.98	4.13	4.19	4.35	3.
. Were you provided with adequate background informatio	n 2	0	0	0	5	5	1	3.64	206/ 239	4.31	4.38	4.21	4.33	3.
. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	1	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	120/ 230	4.80	4.78	4.44	4.61	4.
1. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	200/ 231	4.45	4.59	4.31	4.52	3.
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	4	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	131/ 218	4.49	4.42	4.18	4.25	4.
Fre	quenc	y Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	s			Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27 4 0.00-0.99 0 A 5		 Pe	auir	ed f		 ador		0	 Graduat		0	Majo		

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0302 University of Maryl Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II Baltimore County Instructor: FREY, DENNIS Spring 2008

Enrollment:

16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 447

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Ouestionnaires:	12	St.udent.	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
Queberonnari eb	10	Deadcire	COULDC	I Varacton	Queberonnarie

P

I

0

0

0

						Fr	eque	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did	you gain n	ew insights, skills	from this course	0	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	1094/1670	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.17
		ctor make clear the		0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	233/1666	4.45	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.83
3. Did	the exam q	uestions reflect th	e expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	948/1406	4.46	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.17
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect the	expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	874/1615	4.47	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.25
5. Did	assigned r	eadings contribute	to what you learned	0	9	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	851/1566	3.23	3.72	4.07	4.00	4.00
6. Did	written as	signments contribut	e to what you learned	0	6	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	899/1528	4.57	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.00
7. Was	the gradin	g system clearly ex	plained	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	272/1650	4.39	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.75
8. How	many times	was class cancelle	d	0	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1667	4.77	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How	would you	grade the overall t	eaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	403/1626	4.23	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.50
		Lecture															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lectures we	ll prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	387/1559	4.69	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.83
2. Did	the instru	ctor seem intereste	d in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	777/1560	4.82	4.73	4.72	4.73	4.83
3. Was	lecture ma	terial presented an	d explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	366/1549	4.51	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.75
4. Did	the lectur	es contribute to wh	at you learned	0	1	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	971/1546	4.39	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.27
5. Did	audiovisua	l techniques enhanc	e your understanding	1	2	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	384/1323	4.41	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.44
		Discussion															
			to what you learned	6	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1103/1384	4.26	4.06	4.10	4.07	3.50
			aged to participate	7	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1092/1378		4.19	4.29	4.25	3.80
			and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	751/1378	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.26	4.40
4. Were	special t	echniques successfu	1	7	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.01	****
		Laboratory															
		crease understandin	9	5	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	199/ 232	3.98	4.13	4.19	4.35	3.57
		_	ackground information	5	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	105/ 239	4.31	4.38	4.21	4.33	4.43
	_		e for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 230		4.78	4.44	4.61	5.00
		structor provide as		5	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 231	4.45	4.59	4.31	4.52	5.00
5. Were	e requireme	nts for lab reports	clearly specified	5	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 218	4.49	4.42	4.18	4.25	5.00
			Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	S			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
			-														
00-27 28-55	1 2	0.00-0.99 0 1.00-1.99 1	A 2 B 5		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	S	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	7
28-55 56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 3		G o	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad 1	.2	Non	-major	5
84-150		3.00-3.49 2	D 1		GE	пета					_	onder -9	ıau 1	. 4	MOI1-	ilia JUI	5
Grad.	, 0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0		r1	ecti	17AC				0	#### -	Meanc +	here =	re not	enous	rh
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00 2	F 0		ъT	CCLI	veb				U	#### -	ricalis t	illere c		. emoug	111

Other

10

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0401 University of Maryland COMPUTER SCIENCE II Baltimore County

Title Spring 2008 Instructor: MITCHELL, SUSAN (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 10

	Evaluation	

Page 448

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

		O	_			MTD	3.7.7		eque: 2	ncie		_		ructor	Course	_			
		Question	S 			NR	NA			3	4	5 	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	меа
		Genera	1																
L. Did you	gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this cou	rse	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	557/1670	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.6
2. Did the	instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goal	Ls	0	0	1	0	2	7	0	3.50	1508/1666	4.45	4.23	4.27	4.27	3.5
3. Did the	exam qu	estions reflect	t the e	expected goa	als	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	924/1406	4.46	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.2
. Did othe	r evalu	ations reflect	the ex	spected goal	Ls	0	2	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	552/1615	4.47	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.
. Did assi	gned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you le	earned	0	2	1	0	5	1	1	3.13	1453/1566	3.23	3.72	4.07	4.00	3.
. Did writ	ten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you	learned	0	7	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	631/1528	4.57	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.
. Was the	grading	g system clearly	y expla	ained		0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	844/1650	4.39	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.
. How many	r times	was class cance	elled			0	0	0	0	0	10	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.77	4.79	4.67	4.64	4.
. How woul	.d you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effect	iveness	1	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	953/1626	4.23	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.
		Lecture	e																
. Were the	instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared		0	0	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	1256/1559	4.69	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.
. Did the	instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subje	ect	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	1054/1560	4.82	4.73	4.72	4.73	4.
. Was lect	Was lecture material presented and explained clear						0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	1104/1549	4.51	4.24	4.31	4.25	4
. Did the	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	1032/1546	4.39	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.
. Did audi	ovisual.	techniques en	hance y	our underst	anding	0	1	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	567/1323	4.41	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.
		Discus	sion																
. Did clas	s discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you le	earned	2	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	777/1384	4.26	4.06	4.10	4.07	4.
. Were all	studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to partio	cipate	2	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1110/1378	4.31	4.19	4.29	4.25	3.
. Did the	instruc	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open disc	cussion	2	0	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	1189/1378	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.26	3.
		Labora	tory																
. Did the	lab inc	rease understa	nding o	of the mater	rial	8	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 232	3.98	4.13	4.19	4.35	* *
. Were you	provid	ded with adequa	te back	ground info	ormation	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 239	4.31	4.38	4.21	4.33	* *
. Were nec	essary	materials avail	lable f	or lab acti	ivities	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	4.80	4.78	4.44	4.61	* *
. Did the	lab ins	structor provid	e assis	stance		8	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 231	4.45	4.59	4.31	4.52	* *
					Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad				d Grades				Rea	ason	5			Ty	pe			Majors	3	
00.07	1																		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2		Red	quir	ea I	or Ma	ajor	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	6	General													
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2								0	Under-g		0		-major	

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0401 University of Maryland Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II Baltimore County

Baltimore County
Spring 2008

Instructor: MITCHELL, SUSAN (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 10

Page 449 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	557/1670	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	7	0	3.50	1508/1666	4.45	4.23	4.27	4.27	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	924/1406	4.46	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	552/1615	4.47	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	5	1	1	3.13	1453/1566	3.23	3.72	4.07	4.00	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	631/1528	4.57	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	844/1650	4.39	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.77	4.79	4.67	4.64	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	953/1626	4.23	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1559	4.69	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1560	4.82	4.73	4.72	4.73	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1549	4.51	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1546	4.39	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	235/1323	4.41	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	1	5	4 13	777/1384	4.26	4.06	4.10	4.07	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	3	1	3		1110/1378		4.19	4.29	4.25	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	1	3	2		1189/1378			4.31	4.26	
·														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 232		4.13	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 239		4.38	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 230		4.78	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 231	4.45	4.59	4.31	4.52	****
To a second		D.L.												

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0402 University of Maryland Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II Instructor: MITCHELL, SUSAN

Baltimore County Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 450

AUG 6, 2008

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 4 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Frequencies					Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	665/1670	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.50
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	622/1666	4.45	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.50
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	876/1406	4.46	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.25
4. Did otl	her evalı	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1565/1615	4.47	4.36	4.24	4.29	3.00
				what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1478/1566	3.23	3.72	4.07	4.00	3.00
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	o what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	899/1528	4.57	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.00
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla:	ined	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1135/1650	4.39	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.00
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1368/1667	4.77	4.79	4.67	4.64	4.25
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teacl	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1312/1626	4.23	4.11	4.11	4.06	3.67
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well]	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	673/1559	4.69	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.67
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested in	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	4.82	4.73	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and ex	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	900/1549	4.51	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.33
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1139/1546	4.39	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.00
5. Did au	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi					1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1323	4.41	4.15	4.00	4.08	5.00
	Discussion																	
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1384	4.26	4.06	4.10	4.07	4.67
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	797/1378	4.31	4.19	4.29	4.25	4.33
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair and	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	813/1378	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.26	4.33
		Labora	tory															
1. Did the	e lab ind	crease understa	nding o	f the material	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	215/ 232	3.98	4.13	4.19	4.35	3.25
2. Were yo	ou provid	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	147/ 239	4.31	4.38	4.21	4.33	4.00
3. Were no	ecessary	materials avai	lable fo	or lab activities	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	92/ 230	4.80	4.78	4.44	4.61	4.67
4. Did the	e lab ins	structor provid	e assis	tance	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	86/ 231	4.45	4.59	4.31	4.52	4.6
5. Were re	equiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	78/ 218	4.49	4.42	4.18	4.25	4.50
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	 3	0.00-0.99	0	 A 1		Red	anir	ed fo	 or Ma		. – – – !	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo		 3
28-55						1100	2411	ca I	J_ 1'10	ء ـ ب	,	J	Gradat	_		1.10.)	/ <u>_</u>	3
56-83						Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		CCI	c. a	-				5	011401 -9		-	14011	, 0 -	_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		E14	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	rh
craa.	Ü	3.30 1.00	4	P 0								-	respons				_	,
				I O		∩+1	her					4	T CBPOHB	-2 -CO L	5191			
				? 0		ULI	TICI					1						
				f U														

Course-Section: CMSC 203 0101 University of Maryland Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES Baltimore County

Instructor: ARTOLA, PAUL Enrollment: 38 Spring 2008

Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 451

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	794/1670	4.39	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	4	8		1059/1666	4.15	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	306/1406		4.31	4.32	4.39	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	800/1615	4.37	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	2	0	0	1	3		1285/1566	3.67	3.72	4.07	4.00	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	688/1528	4.29	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	316/1650	4.39	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	405/1667	4.94	4.79	4.67		4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	10	2	3.93	1089/1626	4.00	4.11	4.11	4.06	3.93
. 3														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	6	10	4.47	933/1559	4.50	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	1042/1560	4.77	4.73	4.72	4.73	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	1044/1549	4.10	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	755/1546	4.43	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1082/1323	3.80	4.15	4.00	4.08	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	2	4		820/1384		4.06	4.10	4.07	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	0	3	4		923/1378	4.13	4.19	4.29	4.25	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	777/1378	4.38	4.23	4.31	4.26	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	3.94	4.03	4.01	4.00
Laboratory														
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 231	****	4.59	4.31	4.52	****
1. Did the indiactor provide abbideance		J	_	J	0	J	J	1.00	, 231		1.55	1.51	1.52	
Frem	anas	, Die	rib	1+ i 0r	2									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17	=			
				2	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 203 0201 University of Maryland Page 452
Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Instructor: CHANG, RICHARD Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	42	
Questionnaires:	31	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 544		General	=	444	^	^	1	1	1	11	1 17	4 25	076/1670	4 20	1 06	4 21	4 20	4 25
		w insights,ski			0	0	1 0	1 1	Τ.	11 12	17	4.35	876/1670 1037/1666		4.26	4.31	4.32	4.35
		tor make clear			0	-	-	1	5		13					4.27	4.27	4.19
	_	estions reflect		_	0	0	0	_	1	11	18	4.48	620/1406		4.31	4.32	4.39	4.48
		ations reflect	_	5	0	8 6	0	0	4	6	13	4.39	699/1615		4.36	4.24	4.29	4.39
	_	_		hat you learned	0	_	2 1	3	8	8	4		1362/1566		3.72 4.22	4.07	4.00	3.36
		_		what you learned	0	8 1	0	0	0	10	12 18	4.39	570/1528 630/1650		4.22	4.12	4.11	4.39
		system clearly		.nea	-	U T	0	-	4	8								
		was class cance			0	-	-	0	0	2	29	4.94	,		4.79	4.67	4.64	4.94
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa.	ll teach	ing effectiveness	5	0	0	1	4	13	8	4.08	915/1626	4.00	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.08
		Lecture																
1 Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures		renared	1	0	0	1	Λ	6	23	4.70	623/1559	4.50	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.70
		tor seem intere			1	0	0	0	1	4	25	4.80	855/1560		4.73	4.72	4.73	4.80
				plained clearly	1	0	0	1	7	9	13		1078/1549		4.24	4.31	4.25	4.13
		_			1	0	1	0	0	13	16	4.43	808/1546		4.25	4.32	4.30	4.43
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand						0	1	4	4	6	4.00	692/1323		4.15	4.00	4.08	4.00
5. Did au	ulovisual	teciniiques em	lance yo	our understanding	3	13	U	Τ	4	4	0	4.00	092/1323	3.00	4.15	4.00	4.00	4.00
		Discuss	sion															
1 Did cla	agg digen			hat you learned	25	0	0	0	Ο	1	5	4 83	****/1384	4.00	4 06	4.10	4.07	****
				to participate	26	0	0	0	1	2	2		****/1378		4.19	4.29	4.25	****
		_	_	l open discussion	25	0	0	1	2	0	3		****/1378		4.23	4.31	4.26	****
		chniques succes		open arseassion	24	3	0	1	0	1	2		****/ 904		3.94	4.03	4.01	****
i. Were bi	peciai ec	ciniiques succei	BLUI		21	3	O	_	O	_	2	1.00	, 501	1.00	3.71	1.05	1.01	
				Freq	uency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 13		Re	quire	ed fo	or M	lajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	15
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В 12														
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C 5		Ge:	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 3	31	Non-	major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D 0														_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot:	her				2	8.8						
				? 0														

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 453

Course-Section: CMSC 203 0301 University of Maryland AUG 6, 2008 Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES Job IRBR3029 Instructor: SHERMAN, ALAN

Enrollment:	33		
Questionnaires:	15	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

	Ouestions							_	ncies		_		tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	809/1670	4.39	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.40
_	-	ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	3	5	6		1161/1666	4.15	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.07
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	715/1406	4.55	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.40
	_	uations reflect		_	0	5	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	687/1615	4.37	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.40
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	743/1566	3.67	3.72	4.07	4.00	4.15
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	5	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	760/1528	4.29	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.20
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	1135/1650	4.39	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.00
8. How mar	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	472/1667	4.94	4.79	4.67	4.64	4.93
9. How wou	uld you 🤉	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.00
		Lectur	е															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	1092/1559	4.50	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.33
		ctor seem inter		_	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	855/1560	4.77	4.73	4.72	4.73	4.80
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	8	3	4.00	1146/1549	4.10	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.00
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	1	7	7			4.43	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.40
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	6	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	692/1323	3.80	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.00
			_															
		Discus																
				what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/1384					****
				d to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1378			4.29	4.25	****
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1378	4.38	4.23	4.31	4.26	****
				_														
				Frequ	lency	, Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	•	Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 6		_		-					1	, .	_			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 2		Gei	nera	Τ				0	Under-g	rad 1	5	Non-	major	12
84-150														_				
Grad.							ecti	ves				0	#### - 1					n
	P 0										_	0	respons	es to b	e sign	nitican	ıt	
	I 0						her				1	.2						
				? 0														

Course-Section: CMSC 291V 0101 University of Maryland Title TPCS IN ANIMATION & IM Baltimore County

Instructor: HIRSCH, KATHERI

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 15

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 454

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies							T b		G	Damb	Dept UMBC Level		0	
Over the barre				1	equer 2	3	5 1	_		ructor	Course Mean	-	Mean		Sect
Questions	NR	NA		2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from thi	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.26	4.31	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expecte	ed goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	415/1666	4.67	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expect	ed goals	0	13	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1406	****	4.31	4.32	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expecte	ed goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	477/1615	4.57	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what	you learned	0	4	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	621/1566	4.27	3.72	4.07	4.00	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to wha	3 3				0	4	1	6	4.18	769/1528	4.18	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	Was the grading system clearly explained				0	4	5	5	4.07	1095/1650	4.07	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	183/1626	4.79	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepa	ired	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	469/1559	4.79	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the	subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.73	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explai	ned clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	248/1549	4.86	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you l	earned	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	185/1546	4.93	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your u	ınderstanding	2	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	107/1323	4.92	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.92
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what	you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	372/1384	4.60	4.06	4.10	4.07	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to	participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	348/1378	4.80	4.19	4.29	4.25	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and ope	n discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	501/1378	4.70	4.23	4.31	4.26	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful		5	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	179/ 904	4.67	3.94	4.03	4.01	4.67
	Freque	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						sons	3			Tvi	pe			Majors	

Credits Earned Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	9	Under-grad	15	Non-major	11
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				?	2						

Course-Section: CMSC 304 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 SOCIAL/ETHICAL ISS IN Job IRBR3029

Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD Spring 2008

Enrollment: 37 Questionnaires: 31

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 455

							Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions				NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General																		
1. Did vo	1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course						0	1	4	9	17	4.35	876/1670	4.35	4.26	4.31	4.24	4.35
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	4	4	22	4.52	608/1666		4.23	4.27	4.18	4.52
		questions reflec			1	0	0	1	5	6	18	4.37	763/1406		4.31	4.32	4.22	4.37
	-	uations reflect		_	0	0	1	0	3	6	21	4.48	579/1615	4.48	4.36	4.24	4.18	4.48
				what you learned	0	7	0	3	3	6	12	4.13	771/1566	4.13	3.72	4.07	4.04	4.13
	_	_		to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	8	18	4.35	611/1528	4.35	4.22	4.12	4.07	4.35
		ng system clearl		_	0	0	1	4	5	10	11	3.84	1314/1650	3.84	4.30	4.22	4.12	3.84
	-	was class cand			1	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	749/1667	4.87	4.79	4.67	4.67	4.87
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	.ll teac	hing effectiveness	8	0	1	0	4	9	9	4.09	910/1626	4.09	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.09
		T	_															
1 Wome +	the insta	Lectur cuctor's lecture		nanarad	2	0	2	0	6	5	16	1 11	1237/1559	4.14	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.14
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	1	1	3	16 24		1004/1560		4.43	4.72	4.40	4.72
				3	2	0	0	2	5	5 6	16	4.72	985/1549		4.73	4.72	4.25	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					2	0	1	1	2	5	20		795/1549		4.25	4.31	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					2	14	0	1	1	5	5	3.93	781/1323		4.15	4.00		3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					۷	14	U		-1	5	5	3.93	761/1323	3.93	4.13	4.00	3.99	3.93
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/1384	****	4.06	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	25	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	****/1378	****	4.19	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did th	he instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	25	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1378	****	4.23	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful		24	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.03	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
a 1'	- 1	a an-						_					_					
Credits E	Earned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 21		Re	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	28
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 4														
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	5	C 2		Ger	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 3	1	Non-	major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - Means there			re not	ıh	
				P 0									responses to be significa				ıt	
				I 0		Other					2	24						

PRIN OF PROG LANGUAGES

Title VICK, SHON

Instructor: Enrollment:

30 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 456 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	Frequencies			Inst	tructor	Course Dep		UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	2	4	8	8	3.87	1372/1670	3.97	4.26	4.31	4.24	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	6	10	4.09	1148/1666	4.24	4.23	4.27	4.18	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	7	7	8	3.91	1123/1406	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.22	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	2	1	1	7	9	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.36	4.24	4.18	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	15	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	752/1566	3.68	3.72	4.07	4.04	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	580/1528	4.38	4.22	4.12	4.07	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	2	3	6	3	6	3.40	1503/1650	3.80	4.30	4.22	4.12	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	749/1667	4.93	4.79	4.67	4.67	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	5	5	5	3.88	1152/1626	3.88	4.11	4.11	4.06	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	5	7	7	3.86	1374/1559	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.40	3.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	1090/1560	4.60	4.73	4.72	4.67	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	3	3	5	6	4	3.24	1463/1549	3.78	4.24	4.31	4.25	3.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	4	5	6	6	3.67	1329/1546	3.89	4.25	4.32	4.24	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	1	1	4	3	5	3.71	936/1323	3.88	4.15	4.00	3.99	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	758/1384	4.02	4.06	4.10	4.12	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	295/1378	4.43	4.19	4.29	4.30	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	608/1378	4.54	4.23	4.31	4.33	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	17	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.13	4.19	4.04	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	4.38	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	4.78	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	4.59	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	4.42	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.33	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.33	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	2.67	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.00	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	2.63	****

Title PRIN OF PROG LANGUAGES

Instructor: VICK, SHON

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 456 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned Cum. GPA				Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	24	Non-major	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 331 0201 University of Maryland Page 457 Baltimore County Spring 2008 AUG 6, 2008 Title PRIN OF PROG LANGUAGES Job IRBR3029

Instructor: NIRENBURG, SERG

Enrollment: 54 Questionnaires: 26

G+	a	The second second second	0
Student	course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	2	11	10	4.08	1178/1670	3.97	4.26	4.31	4.24	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	15	10	4.40	784/1666	4.24	4.23	4.27	4.18	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	483/1406	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	23	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1615	4.00	4.36	4.24	4.18	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	3	3	3	5	4	3.22	1419/1566	3.68	3.72	4.07	4.04	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	23	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1528	4.38	4.22	4.12	4.07	***
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	0	9	13	4.19	973/1650	3.80	4.30	4.22	4.12	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1667	4.93	4.79	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	8	12	5	3.88	1143/1626	3.88	4.11	4.11	4.06	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	8	17	4.62	755/1559	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	7	17	4.54	1222/1560	4.60	4.73	4.72	4.67	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	11	11	4.32	912/1549	3.78	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	1	9	12	4.12	1095/1546	3.89	4.25	4.32	4.24	4.12
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	0	6	3	10	4.05	674/1323	3.88	4.15	4.00	3.99	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	940/1384	4.02	4.06	4.10	4.12	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	970/1378		4.19	4.29	4.30	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	653/1378	4.54	4.23	4.31	4.33	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	18	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.03	****
Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Reasons				Type Majors				;		

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	•	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	25	=			
				2	1						

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0101

17

DATA STRUCTURES

BERGERON, RYAN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland

Page 458

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fr	equei	ncies	;		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1344/1670	3.84	4.26	4.31	4.24	3.90
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	5	3	2	3.70	1435/1666	3.80	4.23	4.27	4.18	3.70
3. Did th	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1131/1406	3.97	4.31	4.32	4.22	3.90
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	2	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	1448/1615	3.68	4.36	4.24	4.18	3.50
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	4	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1440/1566	3.06	3.72	4.07	4.04	3.17
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	6	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1152/1528	3.72	4.22	4.12	4.07	3.75
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	429/1650	4.22	4.30	4.22	4.12	4.60
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	675/1667	4.92	4.79	4.67	4.67	4.90
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	0	0	0	2	3	4	1	3.40	1438/1626	3.32	4.11	4.11	4.06	3.40
		Lectur	2															
1 Were t	he instri	uctor's lecture		orenared	0	0	1	0	1	4	4	4 00	1280/1559	4.12	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.00
					0	0	0	1	0	2	7		1248/1560	4.56	4.73	4.72	4.67	4.50
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	1	1	3	2	3		1389/1549	3.61	4.24	4.31	4.25	3.50
		es contribute t		-	0	0	0	2	2	3	3		1313/1546		4.25	4.32		3.70
				our understanding	0	2	1	0	0	3	_		641/1323			4.00	3.99	4.13
		_	_	_														
		Discus				_					_							
				what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1384		4.06	4.10	4.12	****
				d to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1378	****	4.19	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	tair an	d open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1378	****	4.23	4.31	4.33	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Constitution D		G GDA		Provident of Consider				D -									26	
Credits E	arnea 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				кеа	asons	; . – – – -			Ту	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	в 4														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 3		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	0	Non-	-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49																
Grad.					Electives							0	#### -				_	rh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner					9						
				? 0														

University of Maryland Page 459
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaire

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0201

29

DATA STRUCTURES

KARGUPTA, HILLO

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 13

								_	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	_	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	2	1	5	3	2	3.15	1609/1670	3.84	4.26	4.31	4.24	3.15
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	3	3	4	2		1579/1666		4.23	4.27	4.18	3.23
		estions reflec			0	0	0	2	5	4	2		1288/1406		4.31	4.32	4.22	3.46
	_	ations reflect		_	0	2	0	3	2	4	2	3.45	1472/1615	3.68	4.36	4.24	4.18	3.45
				what you learned	0	3	2	3	4	0	1	2.50	1537/1566	3.06	3.72	4.07	4.04	2.50
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	8	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1328/1528	3.72	4.22	4.12	4.07	3.40
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	1309/1650	4.22	4.30	4.22	4.12	3.85
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	540/1667	4.92	4.79	4.67	4.67	4.92
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	4	1	6	0	1	2.42	1601/1626	3.32	4.11	4.11	4.06	2.42
		Lectur	е															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	1	2	2	4	4	3.62	1445/1559	4.12	4.45	4.46	4.40	3.62
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	1222/1560	4.56	4.73	4.72	4.67	4.54
3. Was led	as lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	1	3	3	5	1	3.15	1476/1549	3.61	4.24	4.31	4.25	3.15
4. Did the	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				0	0	2	3	2	3	3	3.15	1460/1546	3.83	4.25	4.32	4.24	3.15
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	864/1323	4.08	4.15	4.00	3.99	3.85
		Discus																
				what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	0	1		****/1384		4.06	4.10	4.12	***
		_	_	d to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/1378		4.19	4.29	4.30	****
				d open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	1		****/1378		4.23	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		10	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.03	****
				Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	auir	ed f	or Ma	aiors	3	0	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r	9
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В 3			= .			J								-
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 5		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 1									3				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
				P 0									respons				_	
I 0				Otl	her				1	.0	_		_					

? 0

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0301

44

DATA STRUCTURES

EDELMAN, MITCHE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 28

Spring 2008

Page 460 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

	Questions			MD	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		Question	5 									Mean			Mean	Mean	Mean	
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,ski	lls from	this course	0	0	0	1	2	8	17	4.46	722/1670	3.84	4.26	4.31	4.24	4.46
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	17	4.46	686/1666	3.80	4.23	4.27	4.18	4.46
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	18	4.54	566/1406	3.97	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.54
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	2	3	0	1	6	6	10	4.09	1039/1615	3.68	4.36	4.24	4.18	4.09
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to v	hat you learned	1	6	1	4	4	7	5	3.52	1274/1566	3.06	3.72	4.07	4.04	3.52
		_		what you learned	0	14	1	0	4	2	7	4.00	899/1528	3.72	4.22	4.12	4.07	4.00
		system clearly		ned	0	0	0	1	6	7	14	4.21	950/1650	4.22	4.30	4.22	4.12	4.21
	-	was class canc			0	1	0	0	0	2	25		540/1667		4.79	4.67	4.67	
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	1	0	0	1	4	12	10	4.15	854/1626	3.32	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.15
		Lectur																
		ctor's lecture			1	0	-	0	0	7			538/1559				4.40	
		tor seem inter		3	1			0	2				1138/1560					
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	1	5				1036/1549		4.24	4.31	4.25	4.19
			_		1	0	0	0					570/1546			4.32		
5. Did aud	diovisual	. techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	1	4	0	1	3	8	ΤŢ	4.26	537/1323	4.08	4.15	4.00	3.99	4.26
		Discus																
سات المات 1				hat you learned	2.4	0	0	1	1	1	1	2 50	++++/120/	****	1 00	4.10	4.12	****
				nat you learned l to participate	24 24	0	0	0	1	1			****/1384 ****/1378		4.19	4.10	4.12	****
				l open discussion	24	0	0	-	_	_			****/1378				4.33	
3. Dia che	= IIISCI uC	ctor encourage	Lail and	open discussion	24	U	U	U		U	3	4.50	/13/6		4.23	4.31	4.33	
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	ı									
				-	-													
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Re	guir	 ed fo	 or M	 aior		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 8		-110	4422	J		w)01	_	Ü	OZ dadao	_	Ü	1100) 0	-	
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	1	C 9		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 2	8	Non-	major	14
84-150	-	3.00-3.49	4	D 0				_				-	011001 9		-	2.021		
Grad.						El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoua	h
	P 0				210001100							respons				_		
	I O				Ot.	her				2	16			3				
				? 0														

Course-Section: CMSC 345 0101 University of Maryland Title SOFTWARE DESIGN/DEVELO Baltimore County Spring 2008

Instructor: MITCHELL, SUSAN

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 461

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect			
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	~ 1															
	General		_				_	_								
1. Did you gain new i	-		2	0	0	0	Ι	-7	12	4.55	611/1670	4.10	4.26	4.31	4.24	4.55
2. Did the instructor			2	0	0	0	Τ	-7	12	4.55	556/1666	4.01	4.23	4.27	4.18	4.55
3. Did the exam quest			2	4	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	679/1406	4.10	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.44
4. Did other evaluati			2	0	0	1	4	2	13	4.35	750/1615	4.04	4.36	4.24	4.18	4.35
Did assigned readi	-	-	3	2	0	3	6	3	5		1241/1566	3.33	3.72	4.07	4.04	3.59
6. Did written assign		-	2	0	1	1	5	4	9	3.95	969/1528	3.73	4.22	4.12	4.07	3.95
Was the grading sy	stem clearly expl	ained	2	0	0	1	3	2	14	4.45	660/1650	3.77	4.30	4.22	4.12	4.45
8. How many times was	class cancelled		2	1	0	1	0	1	17	4.79	885/1667	4.62	4.79	4.67	4.67	4.79
9. How would you grad	de the overall tea	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	11	9	4.45	499/1626	3.94	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.45
	T = = +															
1	Lecture		0	_	^	0	1	-	11	4 65	600/1550	4 0 5	4 45	1 10	4 40	4 65
1. Were the instructo			2	0	0	0	Τ	5	14	4.65	689/1559	4.05	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.65
2. Did the instructor		•	2	0	0	0	2	3	15		1102/1560	4.57	4.73	4.72	4.67	4.65
3. Was lecture materi	_	-	3	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	658/1549	3.98	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.53
4. Did the lectures of		-	2	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	595/1546	4.08	4.25	4.32	4.24	4.60
5. Did audiovisual te	echniques enhance	your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	299/1323	4.05	4.15	4.00	3.99	4.55
	Discussion															
1. Did class discussi		what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	690/1384	4.17	4.06	4.10	4.12	4.22
		-	13	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	481/1378	4.46	4.19	4.29	4.30	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion				0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	531/1378	4.46	4.23	4.31	4.33	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful			13 13	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	138/ 904	4.53	3.94	4.03	4.03	4.78
		Frequ	ıency	Dist	cribu	ution	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Tyr	pe			Majors	

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	20	_			
				?	2						

Course-Section: CMSC 345 0201 University of Maryland Page 462 Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Title SOFTWARE DESIGN/DEVELO

Instructor: VICK, SHON

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 26

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

							T. T.	cquc	.11010	0		1115	CIUCCOI	COULDC	DCPC	OLIDO	псуст	טככנ
	Questions				NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did you	u qain ne	w insights,skil	ls fro	m this course	0	0	1	3	7	8	7	3.65	1490/1670	4.10	4.26	4.31	4.24	3.65
		tor make clear			0	0	2	1	11	7	5	3.46	1522/1666	4.01	4.23	4.27	4.18	3.46
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	13	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	1202/1406	4.10	4.31	4.32	4.22	3.77
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	4	8	5	9	3.73	1337/1615	4.04	4.36	4.24	4.18	3.73
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	1	10	2	2	6	3	2	3.07	1467/1566	3.33	3.72	4.07	4.04	3.07
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contri	bute t	o what you learned	1	1	1	4	7	6	6	3.50	1274/1528	3.73	4.22	4.12	4.07	3.50
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	expla	ined	1	4	2	5	6	5	3	3.10	1569/1650	3.77	4.30	4.22	4.12	3.10
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		2	2	0	0	0	12	10	4.45	1206/1667	4.62	4.79	4.67	4.67	4.45
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overal	l teac	hing effectiveness	4	1	0	4	8	5	4	3.43	1427/1626	3.94	4.11	4.11	4.06	3.43
1 Noro +1	no inatro	Lecture actor's lectures		nronarod	1	0	1	4	7	۵	1	2 11	1473/1559	4.05	1 15	4.46	4.40	3.44
		ctor seem intere			1	0	0	1	2	6			1263/1560	4.57		4.72	4.40	
				xplained clearly	1	0	3	0					1414/1549	3.98	4.73	4.72	4.25	3.44
		es contribute to			1	0	3	3	5	5			1364/1546	4.08		4.32		3.56
				our understanding	1	5	2	2	4	7			1015/1323			4.00	3.99	
J. DIG au	alovisuai	ceciniiques em	iance y	our understanding		J	2	2	-	,	J	3.33	1013/1323	1.05	4.13	1.00	3.99	3.33
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contribu	ite to	what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	777/1384	4.17	4.06	4.10	4.12	4.13
2. Were al	ll studen	nts actively end	ourage	d to participate	18	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	860/1378	4.46	4.19	4.29	4.30	4.25
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage f	air an	d open discussion	18	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	867/1378	4.46	4.23	4.31	4.33	4.25
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	sful		18	1	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	356/ 904	4.53	3.94	4.03	4.03	4.29
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utic	n									
				-	_													
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	S			Туј	pe			Majors	1
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	`s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	25
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 12			_											
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General					0	Under-g	rad 2	6	Non-	-major	1		
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D 0														
Grad.				Electives			0		0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h			
				P 0							respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt			
	I 0					Otl	her				2	4						

? 2

Course-Section: CMSC 411 0101 University of Maryland
Title COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE Baltimore County

Instructor: SOUIRE, JON S

Enrollment: 45
Ouestionnaires: 30

Spring 2008
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 463 AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 3 2 8 17 4.30 943/1670 4.03 4.26 4.31 4.45 4.30 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 0 1 6 22 4.60 490/1666 4.01 4.23 4.27 4.35 4.60 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 0 1 1 27 4.77 306/1406 4.13 4.31 4.32 4.48 4.77 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 8 1 0 1 5 15 4.50 552/1615 3.93 4.36 4.24 4.37 4.50 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 8 5 1 4 6 6 3.32 1381/1566 3.39 3.72 4.07 4.17 3.32 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 12 0 1 2 4 11 4.39 580/1528 3.83 4.22 4.12 4.26 4.39 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 4 25 4.80 229/1650 4.35 4.30 4.22 4.28 4.80 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 29 4.97 270/1667 4.80 4.79 4.67 4.73 4.97 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 1 0 3 7 11 4.23 762/1626 3.50 4.11 4.11 4.28 4.23 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 6 23 4.79 452/1559 4.02 4.45 4.46 4.58 4.79 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 1 0 2 26 4.83 803/1560 4.21 4.73 4.72 4.80 4.83 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 3 1 6 19 4.41 802/1549 3.96 4.24 4.31 4.43 4.41 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 1 1 6 18 4.32 929/1546 3.91 4.25 4.32 4.43 4.32 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 5 1 0 2 6 14 4.39 431/1323 3.97 4.15 4.00 4.10 4.39 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 22 0 2 2 1 1 2 2.88 1301/1384 2.60 4.06 4.10 4.32 2.88 1 0 2 1 4 3.88 1067/1378 3.10 4.19 4.29 4.55 3.88 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 1 0 1 1 5 4.13 937/1378 3.40 4.23 4.31 4.60 4.13 4. Were special techniques successful 22 4 0 0 2 0 2 4.00 ****/ 904 **** 3.94 4.03 4.22 **** Field Work 29 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 **** 41 **** 5.00 4.50 4.98 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 29 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 28 **** 5.00 4.64 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 29 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 16 **** 4.00 4.67 4.80 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 23 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 14 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 3 84-150 14 3.00-3.49 10 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 9 в 4 General C 0 2 Under-grad 30 Non-major 16 D 0 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant

Other

2.4

Ι 0

Course-Section: CMSC 411 0201 University of Marylar Title COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE Baltimore County Instructor: CASALE, DAVID A Spring 2008

University of Maryland Page 464
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Instructor:	CASALE, DAVID A	Spring 2008
Enrollment:	16	
Questionnaires:	12	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					LTC	=quei	TCTES	•		TIID	LIUCLUI		Course	Debr	OMPC	телет	Sect		
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ranl	2	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did	. aain na	Genera		m this source	0	0	1	0	3	5	2	2 75	1442/16	-70	4 02	4.26	1 21	1 1E	2 75
		w insights,ski			0	0	1	1	4	4	2					4.20	4.31		3.75
		tor make clear					1	1	4	3			1539/16				4.27	4.35	3.42
	_	estions reflect		_	0	0	1	0	4 6	2			1275/14		4.13			4.48	3.50
		ations reflect			0	1 0	1	1	4	2			1505/16		3.93			4.37	3.36
				what you learned	1	0	1	1	_	2			1316/15		3.39	3.72		4.17	3.45
		ignments contr system clearl		o what you learned	1	0	T	2	5 0	2 6			1394/15		3.83	4.22		4.26	3.27
				inea	1	0	0	0	0		3 7		1278/16			4.30		4.28	3.91
		was class canc		1-1	1	0	2	0	5	4 2			1052/16			4.79		4.73	
9. HOW WO	uia you g	rade the overa	II teac	hing effectiveness	3	U	2	U	5	2	0	2.78	1577/16	026	3.50	4.11	4.11	4.28	2.78
		Lecture	е																
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	1	2	4	3	2	3.25	1499/15	559	4.02	4.45	4.46	4.58	3.25
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	1	1	2	6	2	3.58	1520/15	560	4.21	4.73	4.72	4.80	3.58
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	3	2	5	2	3.50	1389/19	549	3.96	4.24	4.31	4.43	3.50
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute to	o what	you learned	0	0	2	0	3	4	3	3.50	1379/15	546	3.91	4.25	4.32	4.43	3.50
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	1	2	0	1	6	2	3.55	1020/13	323	3.97	4.15	4.00	4.10	3.55
1 754 -1		Discus			0	0	1	0	2	^	0	2 22	1252/11	0.04	2 (0	1 00	4 10	4 20	2 22
				what you learned	9 9	0 0	1	0	2	0	0		1352/13		2.60	4.06	4.10	4.32	2.33
	2. Were all students actively encouraged to partici						1	0	2	0	0		1358/13		3.10	4.19	4.29	4.55	2.33
	B. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discus						0	1	2	0	0		1340/13		3.40	4.23		4.60	2.67
4. Were s	4. Were special techniques successful						U	U	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 9	904	****	3.94	4.03	4.22	****
		Labora	tory																
2. Were ye	ou provid	ed with adequa	te back	ground information	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 2	239	****	4.38	4.21	4.26	****
		Semina:	_																
2 Was th	o inatmia			ividual attention	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/	79	****	5.00	4.64	4.60	****
				what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/	75	****	4.33	4.57	4.56	****
		ns contribute			11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/	75 79	****	4.33	4.57		****
		ns contribute or grading made			11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/		****	2.67		4.53	****
5. were c.	riteria i	or grading made	e clear		11	U	U	U	Τ	U	U	3.00	***/	80		2.07	3.97	3.67	
	Frequ	ency	Dis	tribu	ıtioı	n													
Crodita E	arnod	Expected Grades				Po:	asons					Ф. гг				Majors			
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gr										. – – – –				Тур	·				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Gradu	ıate	:	0	Majo	or	10
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 5																			
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 3 C 4						Gei	neral	L				0	Under	r-gr	ad 1	2	Non-	major	2
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 4 D 0																			
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0						Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	####	- N	leans t	here a	re not	enoug	h
P 0													respo	onse	s to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
I 0						Otl	her				1	2	_						
? 0																			

Frequencies

Course-Section: CMSC 421 0101 University of Maryland PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS Baltimore County

Title Instructor: YESHA, YELENA Spring 2008

Enrollment:	29	
Questionnaires:	8	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1518/1670	4.23	4.26	4.31	4.45	3.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	1	3.50	1508/1666	4.08	4.23	4.27	4.35	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	751/1406	4.63	4.31	4.32	4.48	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	1405/1615	4.10	4.36	4.24	4.37	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	851/1566	4.04	3.72	4.07	4.17	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	1274/1528	3.84	4.22	4.12	4.26	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	1	1	3.13	1565/1650	3.79	4.30	4.22	4.28	3.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	970/1667	4.47	4.79	4.67	4.73	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	4	0	1	3.17	1517/1626	4.00	4.11	4.11	4.28	3.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1461/1559	4.15	4.45	4.46	4.58	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	1532/1560	4.21	4.73	4.72	4.80	3.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	0	1	3.14	1477/1549	3.97	4.24	4.31	4.43	3.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	4	0	1	3.00	1473/1546	3.94	4.25	4.32	4.43	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	3	1			1005/1323			4.00	4.10	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1314/1384	3.44	4.06	4.10	4.32	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	1193/1378	4.19	4.19	4.29	4.55	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	1276/1378	4.06	4.23	4.31	4.60	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.22	***
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						5			Ту	pe			Majors	1

Page 465

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

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

Course-Section: CMSC 421 0201

Title PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS

Instructor: JOSHI, ANUPAM

Enrollment: 47 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 466 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	2		Tnet	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.exre l	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	224/1670	4.23	4.26	4.31	4.45	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	17	4.65	428/1666	4.08	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	205/1406	4.63	4.31	4.32	4.48	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	467/1615	4.10	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	1	1	4	14	4.09	802/1566	4.04	3.72	4.07	4.17	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	2	3	3	14	4.17	778/1528	3.84	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	8	14	4.46	645/1650	3.79	4.30	4.22	4.28	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	18	5	4.22	1395/1667	4.47	4.79	4.67	4.73	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	151/1626	4.00	4.11	4.11	4.28	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	435/1559	4.15	4.45	4.46	4.58	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1560	4.21	4.73	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	294/1549	3.97		4.31	4.43	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	253/1546	3.94	4.25	4.32	4.43	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	507/1323	3.94	4.15	4.00	4.10	4.30
5.														
Discussion	1.0	0	0	1	1	2	1	1 12	777/1204	2 44	1 00	4 10	4.32	4.13
 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned Were all students actively encouraged to participate 	18	0	0	1 0	1 0	2 1	4 7	4.13	777/1384	3.44	4.06	4.10		
	18 18	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	274/1378 312/1378	4.19 4.06	4.19	4.29 4.31	4.55	4.88 4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	5	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 904	4.00 ****	4.23		4.60 4.22	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	19	5	U	U	U	U	4	5.00	^^^/ 904		3.94	4.03	4.22	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 232	****	4.13	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	4.38	4.21	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 230	****	4.78	4.44	4.30	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 231	****	4.59	4.31	4.24	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 218	****	4.42	4.18	4.09	****
									,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.80	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.60	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.33	4.57	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.33	4.45	4.53	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	2.67	3.97	3.67	****
Field Work		_		_	_									
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 38	****	4.00	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 38	****	4.00	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.02	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.47	4.49	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	0	_		****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****
5. Here shere changin proceeds for all the seadenes	23	0	J	J	J	J	_	3.00	, 0		3.00	1.72		

Course-Section: CMSC 421 0201 Title

PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS

Instructor: JOSHI, ANUPAM

Enrollment: 47 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 466 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	2
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	3						

Course-Section: CMSC 433 0101 University of Maryland Title SCRIPTING LANGUAGES Baltimore County Instructor: HOOD, DANIEL J Spring 2008

Enrollment:

84-150

Grad.

16

0

Ouestionnaires: 27

56

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00 11

D

F

Р

I

0

0

0

1

versity of Maryland Page 467
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaire

General General General Company General Did you gain new insights, skills from this course O 0 1 0 0 5 21 4.67 479/1670 4.67 4.26 4.31 4.45 4.67 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals O 0 1 1 0 0 0 5 21 4.67 479/1670 4.67 4.26 4.31 4.45 4.67 Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals O 1 1 1 2 2 8 13 4.15 956/1406 4.15 4.21 4.31 4.32 4.48 4.15 Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals O 0 0 0 2 4 15 4.62 4.36 4.59 4.23 4.27 4.35 4.59 Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals O 0 0 0 2 4 15 4.62 4.36 4.59 4.23 4.27 4.35 4.59 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned O 11 2 3 1 4 6 3.56 1252/1566 3.56 3.72 4.07 4.17 3.56 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned O 1 0 0 1 1 8 17 4.52 555/166 3.68 3.72 4.07 4.17 3.56 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned O 1 0 0 0 1 1 8 17 4.52 555/1650 4.52 4.30 4.22 4.28 4.25 How many times was class cancelled D 1 0 0 0 1 1 2 2 3 4.85 371/1559 4.85 4.38 4.22 4.28 4.25 Did the instructor's lectures well prepared D 0 0 0 1 1 2 2 3 4.85 371/1559 4.85 4.45 4.46 4.58 4.85 Lecture Lecture Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Discussion Disc	Quartiena						Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 0 0 5 21 4.67 479/1670 4.67 4.26 4.31 4.45 4.67 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 4 3 20 4.59 503/1666 4.59 4.23 4.27 4.35 4.59 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10			Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 4 3 20 4.59 503/1666 4.59 4.23 4.27 4.35 4.59 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 1 2 2 8 13 4.15 956/1406 4.15 4.31 4.32 4.48 4.15 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 6 0 0 2 4 15 4.62 434/1615 4.62 4.36 4.24 4.37 4.62 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 11 0 1 2 3 1 4 6 3.56 1252/1566 3.56 3.72 4.07 4.17 3.56 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 14 0 1 2 1 9 4.38 580/1528 4.38 4.22 4.12 4.26 4.38 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 8 17 4.52 555/1650 4.52 4.30 4.22 4.28 4.52 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 1 25 4.96 270/1667 4.96 4.79 4.67 4.73 4.96 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 2 0 0 2 9 10 4.38 584/1626 4.38 4.11 4.11 4.28 4.38 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 23 4.85 371/1559 4.85 4.45 4.46 4.58 4.85 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 22 4.81 855/1560 4.81 4.73 4.72 4.80 4.81 4.73 4.75 4.80 4.81 4.73 4.73 4.76 4.80 4.81 4.73 4.74 4.75 4.75 4.80 4.81 4.75 4.80 4.81 4.75 4.80 4.81 4.75 4.80 4.81 4.75 4.80 4.81 4.75 4.80 4.85 4.85 4.85 4.85 4.85 4.85 4.85 4.85			Genera	 1															
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1. Did you	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	1	0	0	5	21	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.26	4.31	4.45	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	20	4.59	503/1666	4.59	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 14 0 1 2 1 9 4.38 580/1528 4.38 4.22 4.12 4.26 4.38 4.22 4.28 4.52 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 25 4.96 270/1667 4.96 4.79 4.67 4.73 4.96 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 2 0 0 2 9 10 4.38 584/1626 4.38 4.11 4.11 4.28 4.38	3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the	expected goals	0	1	1	2	2	8	13	4.15	956/1406	4.15	4.31	4.32	4.48	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 14 0 1 2 1 9 4.38 580/1528 4.38 4.22 4.12 4.26 4.38 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 1 8 17 4.52 555/1650 4.52 4.30 4.22 4.28 4.52 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 25 4.96 270/1667 4.96 4.79 4.67 4.73 4.96 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 2 0 0 2 9 10 4.38 584/1626 4.38 4.11 4.11 4.28 4.38 Lecture	4. Did oth	ner evalı	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	6	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	434/1615	4.62	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 1 8 17 4.52 555/1650 4.52 4.30 4.22 4.28 4.52 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 1 25 4.96 270/1667 4.96 4.79 4.67 4.73 4.96 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 2 0 0 0 2 9 10 4.38 584/1626 4.38 4.11 4.11 4.28 4.38 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 23 4.85 371/1559 4.85 4.45 4.46 4.58 4.85 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 22 4.81 855/1560 4.81 4.73 4.72 4.80 4.81 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 3 5 18 4.58 598/1549 4.58 4.24 4.31 4.43 4.58 4.58 598/1549 4.58 4.24 4.31 4.43 4.58 4.59 4.59 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 2 1 0 2 6 14 4.39 431/1323 4.39 4.15 4.00 4.10 4.39 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 23 0 2 0 0 0 2 3.00 ****/1384 **** 4.06 4.10 4.32 **** 4.06 4.00 4.10 4.32 **** 4.06 4.00 4.10 4.32 **** 4.06 4.00 4.10 4.32 **** 4.06 4.00 4.10 4.32 **** 4.06 4.00 4.10 4.32 **** 4.06 4.00 4.10 4.32 **** 4.06 4.00 4.10 4.32 **** 4.06 4.00 4.10 4.32 **** 4.06 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00	5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	11	2	3	1	4	6	3.56	1252/1566	3.56	3.72	4.07	4.17	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 1 25 4.96 270/1667 4.96 4.79 4.67 4.73 4.96 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 2 0 0 0 2 9 10 4.38 584/1626 4.38 4.11 4.11 4.28 4.38 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 23 4.85 371/1559 4.85 4.45 4.46 4.58 4.85 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 22 4.81 855/1560 4.81 4.73 4.72 4.80 4.81 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 3 5 18 4.58 598/1549 4.58 4.24 4.31 4.43 4.58 4.20 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 2 1 0 2 6 14 4.39 431/1323 4.39 4.15 4.00 4.10 4.39 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 23 0 2 0 0 0 2 3.00 ****/1384 **** 4.06 4.10 4.32 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 ****/1378 **** 4.19 4.29 4.55 **** 4.84 Were special techniques successful 23 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 ****/1378 **** 4.23 4.31 4.60 **** 4.84 Were special techniques successful 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 ****/1378 **** 4.23 4.31 4.60 **** 4.84 Were special techniques successful 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 ****/1378 **** 4.23 4.31 4.60 **** 4.85 4.85 4.45 4.46 4.58	6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ribute 1	to what you learned	0	14	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	580/1528	4.38	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.38
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. O 0 0 1 2 2 3 4.85 371/1559 4.85 4.45 4.46 4.58 4.85 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. O 0 0 1 3 22 3 4.85 371/1559 4.85 4.45 4.46 4.58 4.85 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Discussion 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Did class discussions contribute to a participate 7. Did the instructor encouraged fair and open discussion 7. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did field experience contribute to what yo	7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	1	1	8	17	4.52	555/1650	4.52	4.30	4.22	4.28	4.52
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. 0 0 0 1 2 23 4.85 371/1559 4.85 4.45 4.46 4.58 4.85 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. 0 0 0 1 3 22 4.81 855/1560 4.81 4.73 4.72 4.80 4.81 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1. 0 0 0 0 3 5 18 4.58 598/1549 4.58 4.24 4.31 4.43 4.58 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1. 1 0 4 3 2 16 4.20 1032/1546 4.20 4.25 4.32 4.43 4.20 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2. 2 1 0 2 6 14 4.39 431/1323 4.39 4.15 4.00 4.10 4.39 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful 23 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 ****/1378 **** 4.19 4.29 4.55 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 23 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1378 **** 4.23 4.31 4.60 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 23 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 904 **** 3.94 4.03 4.22 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 26 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.00 4.62 4.58 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 26 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.00 4.62 4.58 ****	8. How man	ny times	was class cand	celled		0	1	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	270/1667	4.96	4.79	4.67	4.73	4.96
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 1 2 23 4.85 371/1559 4.85 4.45 4.46 4.58 4.85 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 3 22 4.81 855/1560 4.81 4.73 4.72 4.80 4.81 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Discussion 7. Discussion 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Did the instructor encouraged to participate 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. 2 0 0 0 0 2 3.00 ****/1384 **** 4.06 4.10 4.32 **** 9. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. 2 0 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 ****/1378 **** 4.19 4.29 4.55 **** 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9.	9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	all tead	ching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	2	9	10	4.38	584/1626	4.38	4.11	4.11	4.28	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 3 22 4.81 855/1560 4.81 4.73 4.72 4.80 4.81 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 3 5 18 4.58 598/1549 4.58 4.24 4.31 4.43 4.58 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 4 3 2 16 4.20 1032/1546 4.20 4.25 4.32 4.43 4.20 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 2 1 0 2 6 14 4.39 431/1323 4.39 4.15 4.00 4.10 4.39 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 23 0 2 0 0 0 2 3.00 ****/1384 **** 4.06 4.10 4.32 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 ****/1378 **** 4.19 4.29 4.55 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 ****/1378 **** 4.23 4.31 4.60 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 23 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/904 **** 3.94 4.03 4.22 **** 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 26 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.50 4.98 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 26 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.00 4.62 4.58 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 26 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.00 4.62 4.58 ****			Lectur	re															
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 3 22 4.81 855/1560 4.81 4.73 4.72 4.80 4.81 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 3 5 18 4.58 598/1549 4.58 4.24 4.31 4.43 4.58 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 4 3 2 16 4.20 1032/1546 4.20 4.25 4.32 4.43 4.20 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 2 1 0 2 6 14 4.39 431/1323 4.39 4.15 4.00 4.10 4.39 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 23 0 2 0 0 0 2 3.00 ****/1384 **** 4.06 4.10 4.32 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 ****/1378 **** 4.19 4.29 4.55 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 ****/1378 **** 4.23 4.31 4.60 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 23 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/904 **** 3.94 4.03 4.22 **** 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 26 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.50 4.98 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 26 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.00 4.62 4.58 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 26 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.00 4.62 4.58 ****	1. Were th	ne instru	actor's lecture	es well	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	371/1559	4.85	4.45	4.46	4.58	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 3 5 18 4.58 598/1549 4.58 4.24 4.31 4.43 4.58 4.01 dthe lectures contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 4 3 2 16 4.20 1032/1546 4.20 4.25 4.32 4.43 4.20 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 2 1 0 2 6 14 4.39 431/1323 4.39 4.15 4.00 4.10 4.39 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 23 0 2 0 0 0 2 3.00 ****/1384 **** 4.06 4.10 4.32 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 ****/1378 **** 4.19 4.29 4.55 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 ****/1378 **** 4.23 4.31 4.60 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 23 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 904 **** 3.94 4.03 4.22 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 26 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.50 4.98 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 26 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.00 4.62 4.58 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 26 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.00 4.62 4.58 ****						1	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	855/1560	4.81	4.73	4.72	4.80	4.81
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 23 0 2 0 0 0 2 3.00 ****/1384 **** 4.06 4.10 4.32 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 ****/1378 **** 4.19 4.29 4.55 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 ****/1378 **** 4.23 4.31 4.60 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 23 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 904 **** 3.94 4.03 4.22 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 26 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.50 4.98 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 26 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.00 4.62 4.58 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 26 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.00 4.62 4.58 ****						1	0	0	0	3	5	18	4.58	598/1549	4.58	4.24	4.31	4.43	4.58
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 23 0 2 0 0 0 2 3.00 ****/1384 **** 4.06 4.10 4.32 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 ***/1378 **** 4.19 4.29 4.55 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 ***/1378 **** 4.23 4.31 4.60 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 23 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 904 **** 3.94 4.03 4.22 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 26 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.50 4.98 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 26 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.00 4.19 4.36 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 26 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.00 4.62 4.58 ****		-						0	4	3	2	16	4.20	1032/1546	4.20	4.25	4.32	4.43	4.20
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 23 0 2 0 0 0 2 3.00 ****/1384 **** 4.06 4.10 4.32 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 ****/1378 **** 4.19 4.29 4.55 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 ****/1378 **** 4.23 4.31 4.60 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 23 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 904 **** 3.94 4.03 4.22 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 26 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.50 4.98 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 26 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.00 4.19 4.36 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 26 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.00 4.62 4.58 ****	5. Did aud	•						1	0	2	6	14	4.39	431/1323	4.39	4.15	4.00	4.10	4.39
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 23 0 2 0 0 0 2 3.00 ****/1384 **** 4.06 4.10 4.32 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 ****/1378 **** 4.19 4.29 4.55 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 ****/1378 **** 4.23 4.31 4.60 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 23 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 904 **** 3.94 4.03 4.22 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 26 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.50 4.98 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 26 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.00 4.19 4.36 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 26 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.00 4.62 4.58 ****	Discussion																		
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 ****/1378 **** 4.19 4.29 4.55 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 ****/1378 **** 4.23 4.31 4.60 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 23 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 904 **** 3.94 4.03 4.22 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 26 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.50 4.98 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 26 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.00 4.19 4.36 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 26 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.00 4.62 4.58 ****					23	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/1384	****	4.06	4.10	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 ****/1378 **** 4.23 4.31 4.60 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 23 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 904 **** 3.94 4.03 4.22 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 26 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.50 4.98 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 26 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.00 4.19 4.36 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 26 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.00 4.62 4.58 ****		<u>-</u>								1	0	3		,					****
4. Were special techniques successful 23 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 904 **** 3.94 4.03 4.22 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 26 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.50 4.98 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 26 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.00 4.19 4.36 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 26 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.00 4.62 4.58 ****						23	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1378	****	4.23	4.31	4.60	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 26 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.50 4.98 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 26 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.00 4.19 4.36 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 26 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.00 4.62 4.58 ****			_				3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****				***
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 26 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.50 4.98 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 26 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.00 4.19 4.36 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 26 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.00 4.62 4.58 ****	•																		
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 26 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.00 4.19 4.36 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 26 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.00 4.62 4.58 ****						26	0	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	1	5 00	****/ 41	****	5 00	4 50	4 98	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 26 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 38 **** 4.00 4.62 4.58 ****		-					-	-		-	•	0							****
										1		-		,					****
		Frequ	ienai	, Die	+rih	utio	2												
riequency Discribation							DIS	CIID	ucio.	.1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							Re	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	}
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 12 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 25	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 12				Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	 or	25		
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 9	28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 9	Regalied for Major													
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 3 C 3 General 12 Under-grad 27 Non-major 2	56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 3	General				1	.2	Under-g	rad 2	7	Non-	-major	2		

Electives

Other

0

13

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: CMSC 435 0101 University of Maryland COMPUTER GRAPHICS OLANO, MARC Instructor:

Title

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 468 AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	36				
Questionnaires:	20	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Frequencies									Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did 1101	aain na	Genera w insights,ski		n this source	0	0	1	0	3	2	14	4.40	809/1670	4.40	4.26	4.31	4.45	4.40
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	<i>5</i>	6	9		1037/1666	4.40	4.23	4.31	4.45	4.40
		estions reflect			0	0	0	2	4	4	10	4.10	997/1406	4.20	4.23	4.32	4.33	4.20
		ations reflect			0	-	0	0	2	5	8	4.10	687/1615	4.10	4.31	4.32	4.40	4.10
			-	what you learned	0	4	2	4	4	3	3		1467/1566		3.72	4.24	4.17	3.06
	_	_		what you learned what you learned	0	10	0	0	3	1	5 6	4.30	662/1528	4.30	4.22	4.12	4.17	4.30
		g system clearly		2	0	0	1	0	2	7	10	4.25	903/1650	4.25	4.22	4.12	4.28	4.25
		was class cance		rnea	0	1	0	0	0	3	16	4.25		4.25	4.79	4.22	4.73	4.25
	_				0	0	1	0	2	8			,					
9. HOW WOI	uia you g	grade the overa	II teaci	ning effectiveness	U	U	Τ	U	2	8	9	4.20	797/1626	4.20	4.11	4.11	4.28	4.20
		Lectur	ے															
1 Were th	he instri	actor's lecture		renared	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.45	4.46	4.58	4.50
		ctor seem inter	-		0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	358/1560	4.95	4.73	4.72	4.80	4.95
				plained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	8	9		1027/1549	4.20	4.24	4.31	4.43	4.20
		es contribute to		-	0	1	1	0	2	5	11	4.32	939/1546	4.32	4.25	4.32	4.43	4.32
			-	0	1	1	0	1	4	13	4.47	355/1323		4.15	4.00	4.10		
5. Did aud	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi						Т	U	1	4	13	4.4/	355/1323	4.4/	4.15	4.00	4.10	4.4/
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	16	0 0 0 1 2 1					1	4.00	****/1384	****	4.06	4.10	4.32	****
				d to participate	16	0 0 0 1 2 1					2		****/1378	****	4.19	4.29	4.55	****
		-	_	d open discussion	16	0							****/1378	****	4.23	4.31	4.60	****
		echniques succes		a open discussion	16						1		****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.22	****
1	poorar oc	Joining and Dagoon	55242			2 0 0 1 0 1					_	1.00	, , , , ,		3.71	1.05	1.22	
				Frequ	ıency	y Distribution												
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons							Туј	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Required for Majors						2	Graduate		0	Majo		17
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 8		Required for Majors					5	2	Graduate	=	U	Maje	,T	1/
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 6		General						9	Under-q	rad ?	0	Non-	major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D 0		General						,	onder -g.	Luu Z	U	11011	ilia JOI	ی
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	Б 0 F 1		Electives						2	#### - I	Meane +	here s	re not	enoud	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	J	P 0		Electives						4	response				_	1++
				I 0		Other					8	r capona (-B CO L	C 51911	ıııcaı			
				? 1		Other					U							
				t T														

Course-Section: CMSC 437 0101 University of Maryland Page 469
Title GRAPH USE INTERFACE PR Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Instructor: SQUIRE, JON S

Enrollment: 37
Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Spring 2008

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	1407/1670	3.82	4.26	4.31	4.45	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1142/1666	4.09	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	1131/1406	3.91	4.31	4.32	4.48	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	910/1615	4.22	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	851/1566	4.00	3.72	4.07	4.17	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	787/1528	4.17	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	879/1650	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.28	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	888/1626	4.11	4.11	4.11	4.28	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	2	0	7	4.09	1258/1559	4.09	4.45	4.46	4.58	4.09
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	1214/1560	4.55	4.73	4.72	4.80	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	1	7	4.09	1108/1549	4.09	4.24	4.31	4.43	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	949/1546	4.30	4.25	4.32	4.43	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	648/1323	4.11	4.15	4.00	4.10	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1384	****	4.06	4.10	4.32	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1378	****	4.19	4.29	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1378	****	4.23	4.31	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.22	***
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	\$

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	11	Non-major	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section:CMSC 441 0101University of MarylandPage 470TitleALGORITHMSBaltimore CountyAUG 6, 2008Instructor:YESHA, YAACOVSpring 2008Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	28				
Questionnaires:	13	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

		Question	S		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
		Genera																
		w insights,ski			1		0	2	3	5	2		1516/1670			4.31		3.58
		tor make clear	_	_	1		0	3	2	4	3		1484/1666			4.27	4.35	3.58
		estions reflec			1	-	0	0	1	6	5		799/1406		4.31	4.32	4.48	4.33
		ations reflect	_	9	1	_	0	1	1	2			1009/1615		4.36	4.24	4.37	4.13
	_	-		hat you learned	1		1	0	1	3	3		1039/1566		3.72	4.07	4.17	3.88
				what you learned	2	3 0	0	1 1	1 5	3 2	3		899/1528		4.22	4.12	4.26	4.00
	_	g system clearly was class canc		nea	2	1	0	T	0	2	3 8		1417/1650 861/1667		4.30 4.79	4.22	4.28	3.64 4.80
	-			ing effectiveness	3	1	1	0	7	1	0		1563/1626					
9. HOW WOL	ara you g	grade the overa	II teaci	ing effectiveness	3	1	Τ	U	/	Τ	U	2.09	1503/1020	3.44	4.11	4.11	4.20	2.09
		Lectur	_															
1 Were th	ne instri	ctor's lecture		repared	1	0	1	0	0	5	6	4 25	1157/1559	4 41	4 45	4 46	4 58	4.25
		tor seem inter	_	-	2	0	0	0	1	3			1214/1560			4.72	4.80	4.55
				plained clearly	3	0	1		2				1332/1549			4.31	4.43	3.70
		es contribute t			2	1	1	2					1379/1546			4.32	4.43	3.50
			_	ur understanding	2	10	0	0	1	0			****/1323			4.00	4.10	****
		1																
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1384	4.00	4.06	4.10	4.32	***
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively en	couraged	to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1378	4.83	4.19	4.29	4.55	***
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair and	open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1378	4.83	4.23	4.31	4.60	***
				Frequ	ıency	7 Dist	cribu	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	1
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 0	A 6		Red		 ed f	or Ma	iors	. – – –	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3		1000	1411	- L	J_ 110	. ,	,	Ü	Gradade	_	· ·	110000	-	
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Gei	nera:	1				1	Under-q	rad 1	3	Non-	major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D 0				_				_	011001 9		-	2.011		-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoua	rh
				P 0									respons				_	•
				I 0		Otl	ner				1	.0	-		3			
				? 1														

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Course-Section: CMSC 441 0201 University of Maryland Page 471 AUG 6, 2008 Title ALGORITHMS LOMONACO JR, SA Job IRBR3029 Instructor:

Enrollment:	21	
Questionnaires:	14	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

~								~										
								-	ncies				tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Question	1S 		NR	NA	1	2	3 	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	al															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	ills fr	om this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	1116/1670	3.86	4.26	4.31	4.45	4.14
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	846/1666	3.97	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.36
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	ct the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	363/1406	4.52	4.31	4.32	4.48	4.7
4. Did ot	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	5	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	910/1615	4.17	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.22
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	3	6	3.71	1173/1566	3.79	3.72	4.07	4.17	3.7
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments conti	ribute 1	to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	221/1528	4.38	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.7
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	ly expla	ained	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	471/1650	4.10	4.30	4.22	4.28	4.5
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	celled		0	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1667	4.90	4.79	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	all tead	ching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	8	2	4.00	953/1626	3.44	4.11	4.11	4.28	4.00
		Lectur	re															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	es well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	809/1559	4.41	4.45	4.46	4.58	4.5
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	rested :	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	477/1560	4.74	4.73	4.72	4.80	4.9
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presente	ed and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	1070/1549	3.92	4.24	4.31	4.43	4.1
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	822/1546	3.96	4.25	4.32	4.43	4.43
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques er	nhance y	your understanding	1	6	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1005/1323	3.57	4.15	4.00	4.10	3.5
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.06	4.10	4.32	4.00
2. Were a	all stude:	nts actively er	ncourage	ed to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	316/1378	4.83	4.19	4.29	4.55	4.83
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	354/1378	4.83	4.23	4.31	4.60	4.83
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	essful		9	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.22	***
		Field	Work															
1. Did fi	ield expe	rience contribu	ate to v	what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.98	***
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	Ą	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00 27		0 00 0 00										1	Craduat					11
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7 B 5		Re	quir	eu I	or Ma	ıjor	ъ	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo)T	11
28-55 56-83	U 1	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0 1	В 5 С 1		Car	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad 1	4	Non	-major	3
50-03	Т	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ge.	nera	Τ.				Τ.	under-9	rau I	7	MOII-	-ma Jor	3

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_			
				?	1						

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Course-Section: CMSC 443H 0101

13

CRYPTOLOGY

STEPHENS, ARTHU

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Page 472 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaire	

							Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vou	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	737/1670	4.45	4.26	4.31	4.45	4.45
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	0	6	4	4.18	1048/1666		4.23	4.27	4.35	4.18
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	656/1406	4.45	4.31	4.32	4.48	4.45
	_	ations reflect			0	2	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	633/1615	4.44	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.44
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to v	hat you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	796/1566	4.09	3.72	4.07	4.17	4.09
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	823/1528	4.13	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.13
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y explai	ned	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	769/1650	4.36	4.30	4.22	4.28	4.36
8. How mar	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How wou	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	0	0	0	1	3	5	2	3.73	1275/1626	3.73	4.11	4.11	4.28	3.73
		Lectur	_															
		actor's lecture			0	0	0	0	3	5	3		1280/1559		4.45	4.46	4.58	4.00
		ctor seem inter		3	0	0	0	0	1	1	9		1004/1560		4.73	4.72	4.80	4.73
		_		plained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	4	4		1237/1549		4.24	4.31	4.43	3.91
		es contribute t	-		0	1	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	949/1546		4.25	4.32	4.43	4.30
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	0	3	0	1	4	3	0	3.25	1125/1323	3.25	4.15	4.00	4.10	3.25
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu			hat you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1384	****	4.06	4.10	4.32	****
				to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/1378		4.19	4.29	4.55	****
				l open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1378		4.23	4.31	4.60	****
		3		-														
				Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	:
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 4														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad 1	1	Non-	major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner					7						
				? 0														

Course-Section: CMSC 444 0101 University of Mary Title INFORMATION ASSURANCE Baltimore Count Instructor: SHERMAN, ALAN (Instr. A) Spring 2008

University of Maryland Page 473
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	4				-	
Questionnaires:	3		Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

~				~										
			Fr	eaue:	ncies	S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	-		4	5	Mean			_	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1486/1670	3.67	4.26	4.31	4.45	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1564/1666	3.33	4.23	4.27	4.35	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.36	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	559/1566	4.33	3.72	4.07	4.17	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1		4.00	,					4.00
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	0	2	0	0	0	0		5.00	,	5.00				
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	,					
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	637/1626	4.67	4.11	4.11	4.28	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1431/1559	3.67	4.45	4.46	4.58	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.73	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0			1	0	0	2	4.00	1146/1549	4.00	4.24	4.31	4.43	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1329/1546	3.67	4.25	4.32	4.43	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	326/1323	4.50	4.15	4.00	4.10	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.06	4.10	4.32	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.19	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.23	4.31	4.60	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.80	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.60	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	58/ 75	4.00	4.33	4.57	4.56	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	62/ 79	4.00	4.33	4.45	4.53	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	76/ 80	2.00	2.67	3.97	3.67	2.00
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credita Farned Cum CDA Expected Credea				Во	2020	a .			Тъ	no.			Majora	,

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

Course-Section: CMSC 444 0101 University of Maryland
Title INFORMATION ASSURANCE Baltimore County
Instructor: SHERMAN, ALAN (Instr. B) Spring 2008

Enrollment:

4

iversity of Maryland Page 474
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	3	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0	Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean												
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0	2 3	4 5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean				
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0													
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0	0 1	2 0	3.67	1486/1670	3.67	4.26	4.31	4.45	3.67				
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0	0 0	1 1		1564/1666	3.33	4.23	4.27	4.35	3.33				
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0	0 0	0 2	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.36	4.24	4.37	5.00				
	0 1	0 2	4.33	559/1566	4.33	3.72	4.07	4.17	4.33				
	0 0	1 0	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.00				
	0 0	0 1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.30	4.22	4.28	5.00				
	0 0	0 3	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.73	5.00				
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0	0 0	0 1	5.00	1/1626	4.67	4.11	4.11	4.28	4.67				
Discussion													
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0	0 0	1 0	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.06	4.10	4.32	4.00				
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0	0 0	0 1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.19	4.29	4.55	5.00				
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	0 0	0 1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.23	4.31	4.60	5.00				
Seminar													
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme $$ 2 $$ 0 $$	0 0	0 1	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.80	5.00				
	-	0 1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.60	5.00				
	0 0	1 0	4.00	58/ 75	4.00	4.33	4.57	4.56	4.00				
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 2 0 0	0 0	1 0	4.00	62/ 79	4.00	4.33	4.45	4.53	4.00				
5. Were criteria for grading made clear 2 0 0	1 0			02, .,									
Frequency Distribut:		0 0	2.00	76/ 80	2.00	2.67	3.97	3.67	2.00				

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

Course-Section: CMSC 451 0101 University of Maryland Title AUTOMATA THRY& FORM LA Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

STEPHENS, ARTHU

Instructor:

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 475

	Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	1017/1670	4.23	4.26	4.31	4.45	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	582/1666	4.54	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	644/1406	4.46	4.31	4.32	4.48	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	687/1615	4.40	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	6	5	4.17	734/1566	4.17	3.72	4.07	4.17	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	832/1528	4.11	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	143/1650	4.92	4.30	4.22	4.28	4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	805/1667	4.83	4.79	4.67	4.73	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	910/1626	4.08	4.11	4.11	4.28	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	623/1559		4.45	4.46	4.58	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	10		1054/1560	4.69	4.73	4.72	4.80	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	840/1549	4.38	4.24	4.31	4.43	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	679/1546	4.54	4.25	4.32	4.43	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	648/1323	4.11	4.15	4.00	4.10	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	Ω	1	2	2	4.20	712/1384	4.20	4.06	4.10	4.32	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	718/1378	4.40	4.19	4.29	4.55	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	590/1378	4.60	4.23	4.31	4.60	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	373/ 904	4.25	3.94	4.03	4.22	4.25
- -														
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0	Electives		responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 461 0101 Title

DATABASE MANGMT SYSTEM

Instructor: Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 28

ARMSTRONG, THOM

Baltimore County Spring 2008

University of Maryland

Page 476 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Fre	equer	ncie	g		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
x														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	10	13	4.33	902/1670	4.33	4.26	4.31	4.45	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	6	16	4.42	751/1666	4.42	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	2	8	15	4.38	739/1406	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.48	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	4	3	15	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	1	2	3	7	7	3.85	1059/1566	3.85	3.72	4.07	4.17	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	4	1	1	3	6	9	4.05	870/1528	4.05	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	0	2	5	16	4.46	645/1650	4.46	4.30	4.22	4.28	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	5	16	3	3.92	1600/1667	3.92	4.79	4.67	4.73	3.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	2	11	8	4.29	693/1626	4.29	4.11	4.11	4.28	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	2	8	12		1082/1559	4.35	4.45	4.46	4.58	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	873/1560	4.79	4.73	4.72	4.80	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	9		4.33	900/1549	4.33	4.24	4.31	4.43	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	4	4	13	4.17	1048/1546	4.17	4.25	4.32	4.43	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	1	5	7	7	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.15	4.00	4.10	4.00
5.														
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	690/1384	4.22	4.06	4.10	4.32	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.22	970/1378	4.22	4.19	4.10	4.55	4.22
	20	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.00	777/1378	4.00		4.29		4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	2	0	0	1	1	_		****/ 904	4.38	4.23		$4.60 \\ 4.22$	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	20	2	U	U	Τ.	Т	4	4.50	^^^/ 904		3.94	4.03	4.22	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	1	0	0	0	1	3 00	****/ 232	****	4.13	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 239	****	4.38	4.21	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 230	****	4.78	4.44	4.30	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 231	****	4.59	4.31	4.24	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 218	****	4.42	4.18	4.09	****
									,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.80	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.33	4.57	4.56	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.33	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	2.67	3.97	3.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 38	****	4.00	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 38	****	4.00	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.02	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.47	4.49	****
Cole Dorod														
Self Paced 1. Did golf paged gygtom contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	^	1	E 00	****/ 20	****	E 00	1 61	E 00	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27				0	0	1		****/ 28 ****/		5.00	4.64	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16 ****/ 27	****	4.00	4.67	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27 ****/ 10	****	4.00	4.54	5.00 ***	****
 Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful Were there enough proctors for all the students 	27 27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	۷ /	U	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	/		5.00	4.72		

Course-Section: CMSC 461 0101

Title DATABASE MANGMT SYSTEM

Instructor: ARMSTRONG, THOM

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 476 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	7	Under-grad	28	Non-major	5
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	_			
				?	0						

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: CMSC 481 0101 University of Maryland Page 477 Title COMPUTER NETWORKS AUG 6, 2008 Instructor: YOUNIS, MOHAMED Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 27

49

General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 0 4 9 13 4.22 1027/1670 4.22 4.26 4.31 4.45 4.22 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 10 6 10 3.93 1294/1666 3.93 4.23 4.27 4.35 3.93 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 3 5 12 7 3.85 1158/1406 3.85 4.31 4.32 4.48 3.85 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 2 0 3 9 6 7 3.68 1368/1615 3.68 4.36 4.24 4.37 3.68
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 0 4 9 13 4.22 1027/1670 4.22 4.26 4.31 4.45 4.22 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 10 6 10 3.93 1294/1666 3.93 4.23 4.27 4.35 3.93 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 3 5 12 7 3.85 1158/1406 3.85 4.31 4.32 4.48 3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 10 6 10 3.93 1294/1666 3.93 4.23 4.27 4.35 3.93 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 3 5 12 7 3.85 1158/1406 3.85 4.31 4.32 4.48 3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 3 5 12 7 3.85 1158/1406 3.85 4.31 4.32 4.48 3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 6 0 2 5 8 6 3.86 1059/1566 3.86 3.72 4.07 4.17 3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5 0 2 4 7 9 4.05 876/1528 4.05 4.22 4.12 4.26 4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 6 9 12 4.22 938/1650 4.22 4.30 4.22 4.28 4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 27 5.00 1/1667 5.00 4.79 4.67 4.73 5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 8 13 3 3.79 1226/1626 3.79 4.11 4.11 4.28 3.79
Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 0 3 6 16 4.52 871/1559 4.52 4.45 4.46 4.58 4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 1 6 18 4.68 1078/1560 4.68 4.73 4.72 4.80 4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 8 6 11 4.12 1087/1549 4.12 4.24 4.31 4.43 4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 4 5 4 12 3.96 1176/1546 3.96 4.25 4.32 4.43 3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 0 1 5 5 11 4.18 597/1323 4.18 4.15 4.00 4.10 4.18
Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 24 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 ****/1384 **** 4.06 4.10 4.32 ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 24 0 0 1 0 2 0 3.33 ****/1378 **** 4.19 4.29 4.55 ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 24 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/1378 **** 4.23 4.31 4.60 ****
Frequency Distribution
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 8 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 25
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 10
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 5 General 11 Under-grad 27 Non-major 2
84-150 13 3.00-3.49 5 D 0
Grad. 0 $3.50-4.00$ 8 F 0 Electives 0 $\#\#\#$ - Means there are not enough
P 1 responses to be significant
I 0 Other 12
? 1

Course-Section: CMSC 484 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 JAVA SERVER TECHNOLOGI Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: TARR, ROBERT M

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 478

Ouestions	NR	1	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0		0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57			4.26	4.31	4.45	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0		0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	751/1666		4.23	4.27	4.35	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0		0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	525/1406		4.31	4.32	4.48	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0		1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	224/1615		4.36	4.24	4.37	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0		1	0	0	3	1	2		1078/1566		3.72	4.07	4.17	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned			0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	,		4.22	4.12	4.26	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0		0	0	0	0	2	5		307/1650		4.30	4.22	4.28	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0		0	0	0	0	4	3		1236/1667		4.79	4.67	4.73	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes	s 2		0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1220/1626	3.80	4.11	4.11	4.28	3.80
Lecture			•	_			_	_		0== /4==0					
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0		0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	,		4.45	4.46	4.58	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0		0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	725/1560		4.73	4.72	4.80	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0		0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	,		4.24	4.31	4.43	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0		0	0	0	3	0	4		1071/1546		4.25	4.32	4.43	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0		0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	403/1323	4.43	4.15	4.00	4.10	4.43
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	_		0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.06	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5 6		0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1378		4.19	4.10	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1378		4.19	4.29	4.60	****
3. Did the instructor encourage rair and open discussion	. 6		U	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	/13/0		4.23	4.31	4.00	
Fre	quency	y I	Dist	ribu	atior	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	·s				Rea	sons				Ту	rpe			Majors	3
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4			Req	uire	ed fo	r Ma	jors	5	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	7
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1															
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 2 C 2			Gen	eral	-				5	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	0
84-150 6 3.00-3.49 3 D 0															
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0			Ele	ctiv	res				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
P 0										respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
I O		Other							_						
1 0			Otn	.er					1						

Course-Section: CMSC 486 0101 MOBILE RADIO COMM GREEN, FRANK E.

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

20

University of Maryland Page 479 Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

							Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1 Did vo	u dain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	876/1670	4.35	4.26	4.31	4.45	4.35
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41			4.23	4.27	4.35	4.41
		estions reflec			0	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35			4.31	4.32	4.48	4.35
	_	ations reflect		_	1	3	1	1	3	4	4		1362/1615		4.36	4.24	4.37	3.69
				what you learned	0	4	1	1	5	4	2		1355/1566		3.72	4.07	4.17	3.38
	_	_		what you learned	2	0	0	0	7	5	3		1164/1528		4.22	4.12	4.26	3.73
		g system clearl			1	0	0	0	3	5	8		831/1650		4.30	4.22	4.28	4.31
		was class canc			1	0	0	0	2	12	2		1524/1667		4.79	4.67		4.00
	-			ning effectiveness	2	0	0	0	8	7			1405/1626				4.28	3.47
	•			3														
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	s well j	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	1009/1559	4.41	4.45	4.46	4.58	4.41
2. Did th	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	1	2	14	4.76	929/1560	4.76	4.73	4.72	4.80	4.76
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	2	2	8	4	3.88	1251/1549	3.88	4.24	4.31	4.43	3.88
4. Did th	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						1	0	1	7	8	4.24	1002/1546	4.24	4.25	4.32	4.43	4.24
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	3	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	481/1323	4.33	4.15	4.00	4.10	4.33
		Discus																
				what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/1384		4.06	4.10	4.32	****
				d to participate	14	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/1378		4.19	4.29	4.55	****
		_		d open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/1378		4.23	4.31	4.60	****
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssiul		14	2	0	Τ	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.22	****
				T		- D.:			_									
				Frequ	iency	DIST	tribu	11101	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	
	00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 6					Red	quire	ed i	or M	ajor	`S	2	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	1
	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3					a						0	TTm d a sa au		7	Man		1.0
56-83	6-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 5 4-150 7 3.00-3.49 9 D 0					Gei	neral	L				8	Under-g	rad 1	7	Non-	major	16
84-150 Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9 1	F 0		רים.	ectiv	TO G				0	#### - 1	Moona +	horo o	ro not	onomo	h
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	Т	F 0		E16	=CLI\	/es				U	respons				_	11
		I O					ner					2	respons	co LU L	e sign	iiiidl	16	
	3 U T U					ULI	161					4						
		: U																

Course-Section: CMSC 491A 0101 University of Maryland Title CELL PROCESSORS & APPL Baltimore County Spring 2008

YESHA, YELENA

Instructor: Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 480

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

				F۳	eanei	ncies			Tns	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	-	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	996/1670	4.25	4.26	4.31	4.45	4.25
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	967/1666	4.25	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.25
3. Did th	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.31	4.32	4.48	4.67
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	2	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	687/1615	4.40	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.40
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1108/1566	3.80	3.72	4.07	4.17	3.80
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	532/1528	4.43	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.43
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	867/1650	4.29	4.30	4.22	4.28	4.29
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	2	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.11	4.11	4.28	4.50
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	3	4	4.57	809/1559	4.57	4.45	4.46	4.58	4.57
2. Did th	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1138/1560	4.63	4.73	4.72	4.80	4.63
3. Was le	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	598/1549	4.57	4.24	4.31	4.43	4.57
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	457/1546	4.71	4.25	4.32	4.43	4.71
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	626/1323	4.14	4.15	4.00	4.10	4.14
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1103/1384	3.50	4.06	4.10	4.32	3.50
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.19	4.29	4.55	4.50
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1378	****	4.23	4.31	4.60	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	la wa a d	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Do	asons				Ty				Majors	
	arnea	Cuiii. GPA								. – – –			ту	 be			Ma JOIS	·
00-27						Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors		0	Graduat	е	4	Majo	or	6
	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1							_					_					
56-83						Gei	nera	Τ				6	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	-major	2
84-150																		
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	ıh
				P 0								0	respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I O		Ot1	her					2						
? 1																		

Course-Section: CMSC 491S 0101 University of Maryland Page 481
Title SOCIAL WEB TECHNOLOGIE Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Spring 2008

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: CHEN, LIK

Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 13 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncie	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	350/1670	4.77	4.26	4.31	4.45	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	477/1666		4.23	4.27	4.35	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1406	****	4.31	4.32	4.48	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	379/1615	4.67	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	339/1566	4.60	3.72	4.07	4.17	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	ed 1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	300/1528	4.67	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	527/1650	4.54	4.30	4.22	4.28	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivene	ss 2	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	605/1626	4.36	4.11	4.11	4.28	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	221/1559	4.92	4.45	4.46	4.58	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	477/1560	4.92	4.73	4.72	4.80	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	257/1549	4.85	4.24	4.31	4.43	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	185/1546	4.92	4.25	4.32	4.43	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9 0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	95/1323	4.92	4.15	4.00	4.10	4.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	324/1384	4.67	4.06	4.10	4.32	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	316/1378	4.83	4.19	4.29	4.55	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	n 7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.23	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	146/ 904	4.75	3.94	4.03	4.22	4.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.80	****
Fr	equenc	y Dis	strib	utio	n									
Guadita Faurad Guad Guad				De		_			m				Ma dana	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	es 				ason:	3 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 9		Re	equir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	6	Majo	r	9

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	 6	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	7	Non-major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0	Electives		responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				2	1	Jener					

Course-Section: CMSC 491W 0101

WEARABLE COMPUTING

Title

SEGALL, ZARY Instructor:

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 482 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 2 2 8 5 5 3.41 1543/1666 3.41 4.23 4.27 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 16 0 0 1 3 2 4.17 948/1406 4.17 4.31 4.32 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 5 2 2 1 7 5 3.65 1393/1615 3.65 4.36 4.24 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 6 0 5 4 5 2 3.25 1406/1566 3.25 3.72 4.07	Mean Mean 4.45 3.64 4.35 3.41 4.48 4.17 4.37 3.65 4.17 3.25 4.26 2.86 4.28 3.56 4.73 4.41 4.28 4.06
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 2 6 8 5 3.64 1498/1670 3.64 4.26 4.31 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 2 2 8 5 5 3.41 1543/1666 3.41 4.23 4.27 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 16 0 0 1 3 2 4.17 948/1406 4.17 4.31 4.32 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 5 2 2 1 7 5 3.65 1393/1615 3.65 4.36 4.24 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 6 0 5 4 5 2 3.25 1406/1566 3.25 3.72 4.07	4.35 3.41 4.48 4.17 4.37 3.65 4.17 3.25 4.26 2.86 4.28 3.56 4.73 4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 2 2 8 5 5 3.41 1543/1666 3.41 4.23 4.27 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 16 0 0 1 3 2 4.17 948/1406 4.17 4.31 4.32 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 5 2 2 1 7 5 3.65 1393/1615 3.65 4.36 4.24 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 6 0 5 4 5 2 3.25 1406/1566 3.25 3.72 4.07	4.35 3.41 4.48 4.17 4.37 3.65 4.17 3.25 4.26 2.86 4.28 3.56 4.73 4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 16 0 0 1 3 2 4.17 948/1406 4.17 4.31 4.32 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 5 2 2 1 7 5 3.65 1393/1615 3.65 4.36 4.24 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 6 0 5 4 5 2 3.25 1406/1566 3.25 3.72 4.07	4.48 4.17 4.37 3.65 4.17 3.25 4.26 2.86 4.28 3.56 4.73 4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 5 2 2 1 7 5 3.65 1393/1615 3.65 4.36 4.24 5 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 6 0 5 4 5 2 3.25 1406/1566 3.25 3.72 4.07	4.37 3.65 4.17 3.25 4.26 2.86 4.28 3.56 4.73 4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 6 0 5 4 5 2 3.25 1406/1566 3.25 3.72 4.07	4.17 3.25 4.26 2.86 4.28 3.56 4.73 4.41
	4.26 2.86 4.28 3.56 4.73 4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 4 2 9 5 1 2.86 1482/1528 2.86 4.22 4.12	4.28 3.56 4.73 4.41
	4.73 4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 1 2 8 5 4.06 $921/1626$ 4.06 4.11 4.11	1.20 4.00
Lecture	
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 2 2 6 10 4.20 1199/1559 4.20 4.45 4.46	4.58 4.20
	4.80 4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 0 6 7 6 4.00 1146/1549 4.00 4.24 4.31	4.43 4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 1 4 5 8 3.95 1194/1546 3.95 4.25 4.32	4.43 3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0 0 0 3 4 12 4.47 355/1323 4.47 4.15 4.00	4.10 4.47
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 2 3 5 4.30 638/1384 4.30 4.06 4.10	4 20 4 20
	4.32 4.30 4.55 4.60
	4.60 4.40
	4.22 4.56
1. Note special commission buccessial 12 1 0 0 0 1 3 1.30 222, 301 1.30 3.31 1.03	1.22 1.50
Laboratory	
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.13 4.19	4.35 ****
	4.26 ****
·	4.30 ****
	4.24 ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 218 **** 4.42 4.18	4.09 ****
Seminar	
	4.80 ****
	4.60 ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 75 **** 4.33 4.57	4.56 ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.33 4.45	4.53 ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 80 **** 2.67 3.97	3.67 ****
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.50	4.98 ****
	4.36 ****
	4.58 ****
	4.02 ****
	4.49 ****
3. Did conferences help you carry out fred decryreres 21 0 0 0 1 0 1.00 / 31 1.00 1.17	1.15
Self Paced	
	5.00 ****
	4.80 ****
<u>.</u>	5.00 ****
4. Was the reemback/tutoring by proceous herpful 21 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 / 10 5.00 4.04	**** **** **** ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 21 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 6 **** 5.00 4.92	****

Course-Section: CMSC 491W 0101 Title

WEARABLE COMPUTING

SEGALL, ZARY Instructor:

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 482 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors 		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	22	Non-major	4
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 601 0101

RESEARCH SKILLS FOR CS

Title Instructor: NICHOLAS, CHARL

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 483 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	mier	ncies	2		Tngt	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	1017/1670	4.23	4.26	4.31	4.46	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	1081/1666	4.15	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	3	2	0	3.00	1343/1406	3.00	4.31	4.32	4.36	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	981/1615		4.36	4.24	4.33	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	-	4.08	808/1566	4.08	3.72	4.07	4.20	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5		4.23	724/1528	4.23	4.22	4.12	4.33	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	1			1249/1650		4.30	4.22	4.30	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	7		1134/1667		4.79	4.67	4.74	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	499/1626	4.44	4.11	4.11	4.20	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	1263/1559	4.08	4.45	4.46	4.49	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	7		1340/1560	4.38	4.73	4.72	4.81	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	840/1549	4.38	4.24		4.37	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	7	4		1113/1546		4.25	4.32	4.40	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	612/1323			4.00	4.03	
5. 21d dddiovibaar ocomingwob cimanoc four anderboanding	ŭ	_	Ü	_	_	J	·		012/1020		1.10	1.00	1.05	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	721/1384		4.06	4.10	4.21	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	571/1378	4.55	4.19	4.29	4.42	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	627/1378	4.55	4.23	4.31	4.51	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	820/ 904	3.00	3.94	4.03	4.04	3.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	4.38	4.21	4.53	****
Seminar		_	_				_							
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.61	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 75	****	4.33	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 79	****	4.33	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	2.67	3.97	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.65	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.62	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.59	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.47	4.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	4.90	****
1. Has the recassion, eacoring by proceeds herprar	- 4	J	5	3	-	J	5	5.00	, 10		5.00	1.01	1.70	

Course-Section: CMSC 601 0101

Title RESEARCH SKILLS FOR CS

Instructor: NICHO
Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 13

NICHOLAS, CHARL 16 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 483 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 628 0101 University of Maryland Page 484
Title INTRO MOBILE COMPUT Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Instructor: SIDHU, DEEPINDE Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Frequencies

Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

responses to be significant

Questionnaires:	10	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------------	----	---------	--------	------------	---------------

P 0

0

I

? 0

Enrollment:

11

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 ı															
1 Did voi	ı gəin ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	Λ	0	1	1	3	4	1	3 30	1591/1670	3.30	4.26	4.31	4.46	3.30
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	1	3	2	3	1		1603/1666	3.00	4.23	4.27	4.34	3.00
		uestions reflect		_	0	7	1	0	0	2	0		1343/1406	3.00	4.31	4.32	4.36	3.00
	_	uations reflect			1	3	1	0	0	3	2		1276/1615	3.83	4.36	4.24	4.33	3.83
				what you learned	0	0	2	1	0	6	1		1385/1566	3.30	3.72	4.07	4.20	3.30
	_	_		to what you learned	1	1	2	1	2	3	0		1494/1528		4.22	4.12	4.33	2.75
		g system clearly		-	0	0	2	1	5	2	0		1613/1650		4.30	4.22	4.30	2.70
	-	was class cance	_	ained	0	0	1	0	0	6	3		1524/1667		4.79	4.67	4.74	4.00
	-			ching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	2	3	1		1427/1626		4.11	4.11	4.20	
J. 110W WOO	ila you s	grade the overa.	LI CEAC	Lilling effectiveness	2		_	U	2	J	_	3.43	142//1020	3.43	7.11	4.11	1.20	3.43
		Lecture	<u> </u>															
1. Were th	ne instru	uctor's lectures	s well	prepared	0	0	2	1	3	3	1	3.00	1518/1559	3.00	4.45	4.46	4.49	3.00
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	in the subject	0	0	2	0	0	3	5	3.90	1493/1560	3.90	4.73	4.72	4.81	3.90
3. Was led	cture mat	terial presented	d and e	explained clearly	0	0	2	0	4	4	0	3.00	1489/1549	3.00	4.24	4.31	4.37	3.00
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to	what	you learned	0	1	1	1	2	5	0	3.22	1448/1546	3.22	4.25	4.32	4.40	3.22
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques enl	nance y	your understanding	0	4	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	871/1323	3.83	4.15	4.00	4.03	3.83
		Discus			_				_	_	_							
				what you learned	2	0	2	0	2	1	3		1154/1384		4.06	4.10	4.21	3.38
				ed to participate	2	0	1	0	3	2	2		1193/1378	3.50	4.19	4.29	4.42	3.50
		_		nd open discussion	2	0 6	2	1	0	3	2		1276/1378		4.23	4.31	4.51	3.25
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	ssiul		2	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.04	****
				Frequ	.ency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	ı									
								_					_					
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	5			Ту]	pe 			Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A 8		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors		3	Graduat	e	3	Majo	r	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			_			-								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	neral	L				3	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	rh

Other

Course-Section: CMSC 635 0101 Title

ADV COMP GRAPHICS

Instructor: OLANO, MARC

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 485 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies		Instructor			Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean			_			Mean
General	0	•	0	0	•	0	•	F 00	1 /1 600	F 00	1 06	4 21	4 46	F 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0 1	2 1	5.00	1/1670 622/1666		4.26	4.31	4.46	5.00 4.50
 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.50	1057/1406		4.23 4.31	4.27 4.32	4.34	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1		1/1615		4.31	4.32	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1515		3.72	4.24	4.33	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1528		4.22	4.12	4.20	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	0		1460/1650	3.50	4.30	4.22	4.30	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1			1157/1667	4.50	4.79	4.67	4.74	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626		4.11	4.11	4.20	5.00
J. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		U	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	1/1020	3.00	7.11	4.11	1.20	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.45	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.73	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.24	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1139/1546	4.00	4.25	4.32	4.40	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.15	4.00	4.03	4.00
_,														
Discussion	-	•	0	0	_		-	F 00	1 /1 2 0 4	F 00	4 06	4 10	4 01	F 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384		4.06	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.19	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.23	4.31	4.51	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	226/ 232	3.00	4.13	4.19	4.30	3.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 239		4.38	4.21		5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.61	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.67	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 75	5.00	4.33	4.57	4.66	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.33	4.45	4.58	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	37/ 80	4.00	2.67	3.97	4.32	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.65	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	26/ 38	4.00	4.00	4.19	4.58	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	33/ 38		4.00	4.62	4.65	4.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.27	4.59	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	21/ 31		4.00	4.47	4.59	4.00
•														
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.82	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	13/ 16		4.00	4.67	4.60	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	21/ 27	4.00	4.00	4.54	4.67	4.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 10	5.00	5.00	4.84	4.90	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 6	5.00	5.00	4.92	5.00	5.00

Course-Section: CMSC 635 0101 Title

ADV COMP GRAPHICS Instructor: OLANO, MARC

Enrollment:

3 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 485 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 641 0101

DESIGN & ANALY ALGORTH

Title CHANG, RICHARD Instructor:

Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 486 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	eque	ncie	:S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
G1														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	23	4.66	492/1670	4.66	4.26	4.31	4.46	4.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	14	15	4.38	821/1666		4.23	4.27	4.34	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	4	6	19	4.43	679/1406		4.31	4.32	4.36	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	4	8	12	4.24	898/1615		4.36	4.24	4.33	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	2	11	14	4.24	653/1566		3.72	4.07	4.20	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	3	7	19	4.55	383/1528		4.22	4.12	4.33	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	2	6	19	4.37	769/1650	4.37	4.30	4.22	4.30	4.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	14	15	4.52	395/1626	4.52	4.11	4.11	4.20	4.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	9	23	4.72	589/1559	4.72	4.45	4.46	4.49	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	27	4.84	751/1560		4.73	4.72	4.81	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	14	14	4.31	924/1549	4.31	4.24	4.31	4.37	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	11	17	4.41	849/1546	4.41	4.25	4.32	4.40	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	2	5	9	10	3.93	794/1323	3.93	4.15	4.00	4.03	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	2	5	7	8	3.95	876/1384	3.95	4.06	4.10	4.21	3.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	2	7	12	4.32	819/1378		4.19	4.29	4.42	4.32
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	10	11	4.45	702/1378	4.45	4.23	4.31	4.51	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	9	13	1	0	4	3	2	3.50	718/ 904	3.50	3.94		4.04	3.50
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 239	****	4.38	4.21	4.53	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 230	****	4.78		4.69	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 231	****	4.59	4.31	4.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.65	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.62	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.59	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.47	4.59	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.60	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	4.67	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	4.90	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ıtio	n									

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	А	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	13	Major	27
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	19	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	13	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	25				
				2	1						

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Course-Section: CMSC 661 0101 University of Maryland Page 487 Title PRIN OF DATABASE SYS AUG 6, 2008 Instructor: KALPAKIS, KONST Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	9	
Questionnaires:	6	

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions				MD	NA	Fre	-	ncies 3	5 4	_		tructor Rank	Course	_	-	Level	Sect	
					NR	NA				-4 		Mean	Kank	mean 	Mean	mean	Mean	Mean
General																		
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course						0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	271/1670	4.83	4.26	4.31	4.46	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals							0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.00
3. Did the	e exam que	estions reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1057/1406	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did oth	ner evalua	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	944/1615	4.20	4.36	4.24	4.33	4.20
5. Did ass	signed rea	adings contribu	te to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	706/1566	4.20	3.72	4.07	4.20	4.20
6. Did wri	itten assi	ignments contri	bute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.22	4.12	4.33	4.00
7. Was the	grading	system clearly	expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	570/1650	4.50	4.30	4.22	4.30	4.50
8. How man	ny times v	vas class cance	lled		0	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.79	4.67	4.74	4.00
9. How wor	ıld you gı	rade the overal	l teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	324/1626	4.60	4.11	4.11	4.20	4.60
	_	Lecture																
		ctor's lectures			0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	387/1559	4.83	4.45	4.46	4.49	4.83
		or seem intere		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.73	4.72	4.81	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	2		1053/1549	4.17	4.24	4.31	4.37	4.17
		s contribute to		-	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	,	4.83	4.25	4.32	4.40	4.83
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enh	ance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	1040/1323	3.50	4.15	4.00	4.03	3.50
1 5 1 1		Discuss			-	0	•	•	0	2	0	2 60	1055/1004	2 60	4 06	4 10	4 01	2 60
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	0		1057/1384	3.60	4.06	4.10	4.21	3.60
		_	_	d to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	-,	4.40	4.19	4.29	4.42	4.40
3. Did the	e instruct	or encourage f	aır an	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	751/1378	4.40	4.23	4.31	4.51	4.40
				Frequ	iency	Dis	tribu	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Reasons Type								Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A 5		Required for Major						2	Graduat	e 3 Major			r or	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	neral	L				1	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - Means there are not enou					h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Other						3						

University of Maryland Baltimore County INTRO NETWORK SECURITY

Course-Section: CMSC 687 0101 Page 488 Title AUG 6, 2008 Instructor: SIDHU, DEEPINDE Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Frequencies

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean

Instructor

Rank

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean

Enrollment:	13	
Ouestionnaires:	7	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions

Questions								_	_	5	-		carr	1.01111								
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course							0	0	1	4	2	0	3.14	1610/1670	3.14	4.26	4.31	4.46	3.14			
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals								2	1	1	3	0	2.71	1638/1666	2.71	4.23	4.27	4.34	2.71			
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals							0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1337/1406	3.14	4.31	4.32	4.36	3.14			
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals								1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1524/1615	3.29	4.36	4.24	4.33	3.29			
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned								0	0	3	4	0	3.57	1246/1566	3.57	3.72	4.07	4.20	3.57			
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned							5	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1447/1528	3.00	4.22	4.12	4.33	3.00			
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined		0	0	0	1	4	2	0	3.14	1562/1650	3.14	4.30	4.22	4.30	3.14			
8. How mar	ny times	was class canc	elled			0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1236/1667	4.43	4.79	4.67	4.74	4.43			
9. How wou	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectivene	ess	1	0	1	1	0	3	1	3.33	1462/1626	3.33	4.11	4.11	4.20	3.33			
		Lectur	e																			
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared		0	0	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1518/1559	3.00	4.45	4.46	4.49	3.00			
		ctor seem inter				0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1310/1560	4.43	4.73	4.72	4.81	4.43			
3. Was led	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	У	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1372/1549	3.57	4.24	4.31	4.37	3.57			
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned		0	0	0	3	1	2	1	3.14	1462/1546	3.14	4.25	4.32	4.40	3.14			
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understandir	ng	0	0	1	2	1	2	1	3.00	1179/1323	3.00	4.15	4.00	4.03	3.00			
		Discus	gion																			
1 Did cla	agg diga			what you learned	A	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1384	4.67	4 06	4.10	4.21	4.67			
				ed to participate		4	0	0	0	0	1		4.67	- ,	4.67		4.29	4.42	4.67			
				id open discussion		4	0	0	0	0	2	1		- ,	4.33			4.51				
		echniques succe				4	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	,								
- -							D															
				F'I	requen	су	Dist	ribi	atio	n												
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades									Rea	ason	S			Typ	e		Majors					
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4			Rec	uire	ed f	or Ma	ajor	 S	0	Graduate 3			Majo	or	4			
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0		Required for Majors																
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		General							4	Under-gr	ad	4	Non-	major	3			
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		001101 01								3				-				
Grad. 3 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						Electives 1							1 #### - Means there an					re not enough				
P 0														response	s to b	e sign	ifican	ıt				
				I 0			Oth	ner					0									
				? 2																		