Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CYBR 620 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 23
Title:	Introduction to Cybersec		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Huhn,Michael S		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	5	8	4.00	1182/1589	4.12	4.36	4.32	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	8	7	5	3.85	1296/1589	4.29	4.35	4.29	4.33	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	6	8	3.95	1105/1391	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.40	3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	4	4	10	4.16	954/1552	4.14	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	3	4	7	3.67	1215/1495	4.09	4.19	4.14	4.18	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	3	9	4.00	886/1457	4.30	4.21	4.15	4.30	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	4	10	4.21	899/1572	4.57	4.40	4.21	4.29	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	1	0	1	4	12	4.44	1174/1589	4.31	4.66	4.66	4.79	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	2	2	4	6	4.00	957/1569	4.04	4.24	4.13	4.18	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	951/1530	4.44	4.59	4.49	4.55	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	872/1533	4.79	4.83	4.75	4.82	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	4	5	9	4.05	1141/1528	4.31	4.53	4.35	4.38	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	956/1529	4.38	4.50	4.36	4.38	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	3	3	8	4	3.58	1104/1393	4.01	4.26	4.06	3.91	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	5	4	7	3.68	1058/1337	4.02	4.37	4.17	4.29	3.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	4	4	10	4.21	853/1331	4.45	4.46	4.35	4.51	4.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	684/1333	4.63	4.66	4.40	4.51	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	1	14	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	429/1014	4.10	4.24	4.05	4.13	4.20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CYBR 620 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 23
Title: Introduction to Cybersec		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Huhn,Michael S		

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/180	****	4.19	4.20	4.40	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/194	****	4.38	4.17	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/178	****	4.09	4.47	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/181	****	4.10	4.40	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	4.28	4.12	4.43	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/62	****	4.20	4.46	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	4.30	4.43	4.61	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.08	4.29	4.42	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.18	4.47	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.04	4.19	4.22	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	3.83	3.85	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	3.93	3.89	4.83	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	4.04	4.30	4.67	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.83	4.15	4.17	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/39	****	3.93	4.00	4.10	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/22	****	4.03	4.12	4.54	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/33	****	3.93	4.42	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/19	****	3.63	4.44	4.06	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CYBR 620 01		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment:	23
Title:	Introduction to Cybersec					Questionnaires:	20
Instructor:	Huhn,Michael S						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/16	****	3.53	4.25	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	4	A	9	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CYBR 620 02	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 19
Title:	Introduction to Cybersec			Questionnaires: 14
Instructor:	Shariati,Behnam			

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	2	0	2	7	4.27	938/1589	4.12	4.36	4.32	4.39	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	433/1589	4.29	4.35	4.29	4.33	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	666/1391	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.40	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	588/1552	4.14	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	643/1495	4.09	4.19	4.14	4.18	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	557/1457	4.30	4.21	4.15	4.30	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	267/1572	4.57	4.40	4.21	4.29	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	1467/1589	4.31	4.66	4.66	4.79	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	596/1569	4.04	4.24	4.13	4.18	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	1016/1530	4.44	4.59	4.49	4.55	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	872/1533	4.79	4.83	4.75	4.82	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	524/1528	4.31	4.53	4.35	4.38	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	689/1529	4.38	4.50	4.36	4.38	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	315/1393	4.01	4.26	4.06	3.91	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	686/1337	4.02	4.37	4.17	4.29	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	478/1331	4.45	4.46	4.35	4.51	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	547/1333	4.63	4.66	4.40	4.51	4.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CYBR 620 02		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 19	
Title:	Introduction to Cybersec										**Questionnaires: 14**	
Instructor:	Shariati,Behnam											

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	273/1014	4.10	4.24	4.05	4.13	4.44

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CYBR 620 03		Term - Fall 2012							Enrollment: 14				
Title:	Introduction to Cybersec									Questionnaires: 13				
Instructor:	Williams,Tina C													

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1131/1589	4.12	4.36	4.32	4.39	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	790/1589	4.29	4.35	4.29	4.33	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	733/1391	4.27	4.31	4.34	4.40	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	1259/1552	4.14	4.29	4.25	4.30	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	643/1495	4.09	4.19	4.14	4.18	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	372/1457	4.30	4.21	4.15	4.30	4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	221/1572	4.57	4.40	4.21	4.29	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1231/1589	4.31	4.66	4.66	4.79	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	7	0	3.78	1193/1569	4.04	4.24	4.13	4.18	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	938/1530	4.44	4.59	4.49	4.55	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	942/1533	4.79	4.83	4.75	4.82	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	992/1528	4.31	4.53	4.35	4.38	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	956/1529	4.38	4.50	4.36	4.38	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	912/1393	4.01	4.26	4.06	3.91	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	738/1337	4.02	4.37	4.17	4.29	4.15
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	659/1331	4.45	4.46	4.35	4.51	4.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	514/1333	4.63	4.66	4.40	4.51	4.69

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CYBR 620 03	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 14
Title: Introduction to Cybersec		Questionnaires: 13
Instructor: Williams,Tina C		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	756/1014	4.10	4.24	4.05	4.13	3.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CYBR 621 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 19

Title:	Cyber Warfare			Questionnaires: 11

Instructor:	Kinney,Albert C

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	780/1589	4.45	4.36	4.32	4.39	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	975/1589	4.11	4.35	4.29	4.33	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	733/1391	4.40	4.31	4.34	4.40	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	1009/1552	4.25	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	899/1495	4.30	4.19	4.14	4.18	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	629/1457	4.40	4.21	4.15	4.30	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	113/1572	4.44	4.40	4.21	4.29	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	467/1589	4.55	4.66	4.66	4.79	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	730/1569	4.25	4.24	4.13	4.18	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	577/1530	4.40	4.59	4.49	4.55	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	872/1533	4.90	4.83	4.75	4.82	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	570/1528	4.65	4.53	4.35	4.38	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	852/1529	4.55	4.50	4.36	4.38	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	510/1393	3.60	4.26	4.06	3.91	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	400/1337	4.64	4.37	4.17	4.29	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	802/1331	4.64	4.46	4.35	4.51	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	765/1333	4.71	4.66	4.40	4.51	4.43

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CYBR 621 01	Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment: 19
Title:	Cyber Warfare				Questionnaires: 11
Instructor:	Kinney,Albert C				

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	110/1014	4.54	4.24	4.05	4.13	4.80

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CYBR 621 02		Term - Fall 2012				Enrollment: 12			
Title:	Cyber Warfare						Questionnaires: 12			
Instructor:	Pickard,William									

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	646/1589	4.45	4.36	4.32	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	1151/1589	4.11	4.35	4.29	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	668/1552	4.25	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	309/1495	4.30	4.19	4.14	4.18	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	400/1457	4.40	4.21	4.15	4.30	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	1095/1572	4.44	4.40	4.21	4.29	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	1395/1589	4.55	4.66	4.66	4.79	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	658/1569	4.25	4.24	4.13	4.18	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	1281/1530	4.40	4.59	4.49	4.55	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1533	4.90	4.83	4.75	4.82	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	419/1528	4.65	4.53	4.35	4.38	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	474/1529	4.55	4.50	4.36	4.38	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	2	0	3	1	1	2.86	1341/1393	3.60	4.26	4.06	3.91	2.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	309/1337	4.64	4.37	4.17	4.29	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1331	4.64	4.46	4.35	4.51	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1333	4.71	4.66	4.40	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	375/1014	4.54	4.24	4.05	4.13	4.29
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	****	4.38	4.17	4.15	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CYBR 621 02	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 12
Title: Cyber Warfare		Questionnaires: 12
Instructor: Pickard,William		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/62	****	4.20	4.46	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	31/65	4.67	4.30	4.43	4.61	4.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	22/63	4.67	4.08	4.29	4.42	4.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	25/61	4.67	4.18	4.47	4.33	4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	32/61	4.33	4.04	4.19	4.22	4.33
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	3.83	3.85	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/40	****	3.93	3.89	4.83	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/39	****	3.93	4.00	4.10	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CYBR 622 01		Term - Fall 2012									Enrollment: 26		
Title:	Global Cyber Trends											Questionnaires: 24		
Instructor:	Waddell,William													

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	8	13	4.33	871/1589	4.33	4.36	4.32	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	467/1589	4.61	4.35	4.29	4.33	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	15	4.54	552/1391	4.54	4.31	4.34	4.40	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	3	16	4.38	706/1552	4.38	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	7	14	4.38	564/1495	4.38	4.19	4.14	4.18	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	3	18	4.61	308/1457	4.61	4.21	4.15	4.30	4.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	152/1572	4.83	4.40	4.21	4.29	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	14	4.58	1032/1589	4.58	4.66	4.66	4.79	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	10	6	4.16	816/1569	4.16	4.24	4.13	4.18	4.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	276/1530	4.88	4.59	4.49	4.55	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.83	4.75	4.82	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	259/1528	4.83	4.53	4.35	4.38	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	17	4.50	739/1529	4.50	4.50	4.36	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	3	6	14	4.33	510/1393	4.33	4.26	4.06	3.91	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	6	12	4.27	647/1337	4.27	4.37	4.17	4.29	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	591/1331	4.55	4.46	4.35	4.51	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	525/1333	4.68	4.66	4.40	4.51	4.68
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	1	0	3	3	11	4.28	382/1014	4.28	4.24	4.05	4.13	4.28

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CYBR 622 01		Term - Fall 2012							Enrollment: 26				
Title:	Global Cyber Trends									**Questionnaires: 24**				
Instructor:	Waddell,William													

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/180	****	4.19	4.20	4.40	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/194	****	4.38	4.17	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/178	****	4.09	4.47	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/181	****	4.10	4.40	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/165	****	4.28	4.12	4.43	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	46/62	4.33	4.20	4.46	4.44	4.33
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/65	5.00	4.30	4.43	4.61	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	38/63	4.33	4.08	4.29	4.42	4.33
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	34/61	4.50	4.18	4.47	4.33	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	18/61	4.50	4.04	4.19	4.22	4.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/40	****	3.83	3.85	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/40	****	3.93	3.89	4.83	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/32	****	4.04	4.30	4.67	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/29	****	3.83	4.15	4.17	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/21	****	3.93	4.32	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/39	****	3.93	4.00	4.10	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/22	****	4.03	4.12	4.54	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/33	****	3.93	4.42	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CYBR 622 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 26
Title:	Global Cyber Trends		Questionnaires: 24
Instructor:	Waddell,William		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/19	****	3.63	4.44	4.06	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/16	****	3.53	4.25	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	19	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	6	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CYBR 623 01		Term - Fall 2012							Enrollment: 25			
Title:	Cyber Law and Policy									Questionnaires: 22			
Instructor:	Owen,Cathleen R												

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	646/1589	4.50	4.36	4.32	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	10	4.27	922/1589	4.27	4.35	4.29	4.33	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	971/1391	4.14	4.31	4.34	4.40	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	394/1552	4.62	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	9	11	4.41	531/1495	4.41	4.19	4.14	4.18	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	9	11	4.41	509/1457	4.41	4.21	4.15	4.30	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	4	16	4.50	495/1572	4.50	4.40	4.21	4.29	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	703/1589	4.82	4.66	4.66	4.79	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	4	9	6	4.00	957/1569	4.00	4.24	4.13	4.18	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	3	7	11	4.23	1193/1530	4.23	4.59	4.49	4.55	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	4	17	4.68	1073/1533	4.68	4.83	4.75	4.82	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	4	6	10	4.05	1147/1528	4.05	4.53	4.35	4.38	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	9	10	4.27	984/1529	4.27	4.50	4.36	4.38	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	6	1	2	4	4	2.94	1325/1393	2.94	4.26	4.06	3.91	2.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	4	5	10	4.15	738/1337	4.15	4.37	4.17	4.29	4.15
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	2	8	8	4.16	909/1331	4.16	4.46	4.35	4.51	4.16
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	741/1333	4.45	4.66	4.40	4.51	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	2	14	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	672/1014	3.83	4.24	4.05	4.13	3.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CYBR 623 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 25
Title:	Cyber Law and Policy		Questionnaires: 22
Instructor:	Owen,Cathleen R		

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/180	****	4.19	4.20	4.40	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/194	****	4.38	4.17	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	4.09	4.47	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.10	4.40	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	4.28	4.12	4.43	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/62	****	4.20	4.46	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	4.30	4.43	4.61	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.08	4.29	4.42	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/61	****	4.18	4.47	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	4.04	4.19	4.22	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/40	****	3.83	3.85	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/40	****	3.93	3.89	4.83	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	4.04	4.30	4.67	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.83	4.15	4.17	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	3.93	4.32	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/39	****	3.93	4.00	4.10	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	4.03	4.12	4.54	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	3.93	4.42	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CYBR 623 01		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment: 25
Title:	Cyber Law and Policy					Questionnaires: 22
Instructor:	Owen,Cathleen R					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	3.63	4.44	4.06	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	3.53	4.25	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	9	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CYBR 624 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 8
Title:	Cybersecurity Project			Questionnaires: 7
Instructor:	Forno,Richard			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.36	4.32	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1151/1589	4.00	4.35	4.29	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	509/1552	4.50	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1495	****	4.19	4.14	4.18	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1457	5.00	4.21	4.15	4.30	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.40	4.21	4.29	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.66	4.66	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1569	****	4.24	4.13	4.18	****
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1530	5.00	4.59	4.49	4.55	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.83	4.75	4.82	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.53	4.35	4.38	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1529	5.00	4.50	4.36	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1393	****	4.26	4.06	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	823/1337	4.00	4.37	4.17	4.29	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	623/1331	4.50	4.46	4.35	4.51	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	702/1333	4.50	4.66	4.40	4.51	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1014	****	4.24	4.05	4.13	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	3.93	4.00	4.10	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CYBR 624 01		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment: 8
Title:	Cybersecurity Project					Questionnaires: 7
Instructor:	Forno,Richard					

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/33	****	3.93	4.42	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

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