Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CYBR 620 01		Term - Spring 2012									Enrollment: 25		
Title:	Introduction to Cybersec											Questionnaires: 14		
Instructor:	Getek,Ryan C													

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	435/1542	4.41	4.10	4.33	4.39	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	297/1542	4.35	4.18	4.29	4.31	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	224/1339	4.38	4.10	4.32	4.31	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	500/1498	4.25	4.00	4.26	4.25	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	3	4	3.92	971/1428	4.00	3.94	4.12	4.13	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	405/1407	4.41	4.01	4.15	4.20	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	159/1521	4.53	4.16	4.20	4.24	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1541	4.74	4.56	4.70	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	433/1518	4.09	3.97	4.11	4.15	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	503/1472	4.44	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	484/1475	4.84	4.53	4.72	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	770/1471	4.24	4.30	4.32	4.36	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	692/1470	4.46	4.22	4.33	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	556/1310	4.34	3.94	4.06	3.99	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	430/1210	4.35	4.30	4.18	4.28	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	213/1211	4.62	4.18	4.37	4.51	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	256/1207	4.69	4.38	4.41	4.53	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	5	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/859	4.27	4.18	4.08	4.08	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CYBR 620 01			Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 25			
Title:	Introduction to Cybersec											Questionnaires: 14			
Instructor:	Getek,Ryan C														

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/210	****	3.39	4.17	4.12	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.28	4.54	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.35	4.17	4.35	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/32	****	4.07	4.20	4.06	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/35	****	4.28	4.36	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	4.11	4.59	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	4.00	4.41	4.39	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	4.02	4.27	4.36	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	4.43	4.57	4.45	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CYBR 620 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment:	25
Title:	Introduction to Cybersec		Questionnaires:	14
Instructor:	Getek,Ryan C			

			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	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	4.39	4.29	4.42	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	5	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	9	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CYBR 620 02	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 22
Title:	Introduction to Cybersec		Questionnaires: 14
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	0	6	7	4.36	844/1542	4.41	4.10	4.33	4.39	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	726/1542	4.35	4.18	4.29	4.31	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	739/1339	4.38	4.10	4.32	4.31	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1022/1498	4.25	4.00	4.26	4.25	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	1139/1428	4.00	3.94	4.12	4.13	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	841/1407	4.41	4.01	4.15	4.20	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	485/1521	4.53	4.16	4.20	4.24	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	551/1541	4.74	4.56	4.70	4.75	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	8	3	4.00	920/1518	4.09	3.97	4.11	4.15	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	1065/1472	4.44	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	843/1475	4.84	4.53	4.72	4.76	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	977/1471	4.24	4.30	4.32	4.36	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	934/1470	4.46	4.22	4.33	4.34	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	300/1310	4.34	3.94	4.06	3.99	4.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	538/1210	4.35	4.30	4.18	4.28	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	497/1211	4.62	4.18	4.37	4.51	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	470/1207	4.69	4.38	4.41	4.53	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	1	10	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/859	4.27	4.18	4.08	4.08	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CYBR 620 02		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 22			
Title: Introduction to Cybersec										Questionnaires: 14			
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														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/210	****	3.39	4.17	4.12	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.33	4.60	4.71	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	3.84	4.50	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.28	4.54	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.35	4.17	4.35	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/32	****	4.07	4.20	4.06	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/35	****	4.28	4.36	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/25	****	4.11	4.59	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	4.00	4.41	4.39	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.02	4.27	4.36	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	4.43	4.57	4.45	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	4.39	4.29	4.42	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CYBR 620 02		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	22
Title:	Introduction to Cybersec				Questionnaires:	14
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
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	4.17	4.25	4.35	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	8	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CYBR 620 03		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 19
Title:	Introduction to Cybersec				Questionnaires: 16
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	6	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	908/1542	4.41	4.10	4.33	4.39	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1208/1542	4.35	4.18	4.29	4.31	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	3	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	982/1339	4.38	4.10	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	2	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	722/1498	4.25	4.00	4.26	4.25	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	494/1428	4.00	3.94	4.12	4.13	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	530/1407	4.41	4.01	4.15	4.20	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	658/1521	4.53	4.16	4.20	4.24	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	959/1541	4.74	4.56	4.70	4.75	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	1057/1518	4.09	3.97	4.11	4.15	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	954/1472	4.44	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1475	4.84	4.53	4.72	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1104/1471	4.24	4.30	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	813/1470	4.46	4.22	4.33	4.34	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	626/1310	4.34	3.94	4.06	3.99	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	667/1210	4.35	4.30	4.18	4.28	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	764/1211	4.62	4.18	4.37	4.51	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	630/1207	4.69	4.38	4.41	4.53	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CYBR 620 03	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment:	19
Title:	Introduction to Cybersec		Questionnaires:	16
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
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	388/859	4.27	4.18	4.08	4.08	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	4	A	7	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	6	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	10	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CYBR 620 04	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 9
Title:	Introduction to Cybersec		Questionnaires: 8
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	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	869/1542	4.41	4.10	4.33	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	833/1542	4.35	4.18	4.29	4.31	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	757/1339	4.38	4.10	4.32	4.31	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1058/1498	4.25	4.00	4.26	4.25	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	851/1428	4.00	3.94	4.12	4.13	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	252/1407	4.41	4.01	4.15	4.20	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	746/1521	4.53	4.16	4.20	4.24	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1268/1541	4.74	4.56	4.70	4.75	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	920/1518	4.09	3.97	4.11	4.15	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1022/1472	4.44	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1039/1475	4.84	4.53	4.72	4.76	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	870/1471	4.24	4.30	4.32	4.36	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	498/1470	4.46	4.22	4.33	4.34	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	495/1310	4.34	3.94	4.06	3.99	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	578/1210	4.35	4.30	4.18	4.28	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	451/1211	4.62	4.18	4.37	4.51	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	499/1207	4.69	4.38	4.41	4.53	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	315/859	4.27	4.18	4.08	4.08	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CYBR 620 04	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 9
Title:	Introduction to Cybersec			Questionnaires: 8
Instructor:	Shariati,Behnam			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.34	4.56	4.62	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.28	4.54	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.35	4.17	4.35	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	4.07	4.20	4.06	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	4.28	4.36	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/25	****	4.11	4.59	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	4.00	4.41	4.39	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/17	****	4.30	4.62	4.43	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	2	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	6	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CYBR 622 01		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 25			
Title:	Global Cyber Trends										Questionnaires: 15			
Instructor:	Kinney,Albert C													

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	1006/1542	4.21	4.10	4.33	4.39	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	1122/1542	4.00	4.18	4.29	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	2	1	2	6	3.43	1233/1339	3.43	4.10	4.32	4.31	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	2	2	4	4	3.62	1303/1498	3.62	4.00	4.26	4.25	3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	1	5	3	3.29	1309/1428	3.29	3.94	4.12	4.13	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	2	7	3.86	1013/1407	3.86	4.01	4.15	4.20	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	291/1521	4.69	4.16	4.20	4.24	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	1038/1541	4.62	4.56	4.70	4.75	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	5	3	4	3.92	1043/1518	3.92	3.97	4.11	4.15	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	303/1472	4.85	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	879/1475	4.77	4.53	4.72	4.76	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	525/1471	4.62	4.30	4.32	4.36	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	4	2	6	4.00	1108/1470	4.00	4.22	4.33	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	324/1310	4.50	3.94	4.06	3.99	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	854/1210	3.90	4.30	4.18	4.28	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	0	3	5	4.00	918/1211	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.51	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	630/1207	4.50	4.38	4.41	4.53	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	576/859	3.83	4.18	4.08	4.08	3.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CYBR 622 01		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Global Cyber Trends				Questionnaires: 15
Instructor:	Kinney,Albert C				

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/69	****	4.34	4.56	4.62	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/69	****	4.33	4.60	4.71	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	3.84	4.50	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	4.28	4.54	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	4.35	4.17	4.35	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	5	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CYBR 623 02		Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment: 16				
Title:	Cyber Law and Policy									Questionnaires: 10				
Instructor:	Rasch,Mark D													

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	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	486/1542	4.63	4.10	4.33	4.39	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1122/1542	4.00	4.18	4.29	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	825/1339	4.25	4.10	4.32	4.31	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	854/1498	4.25	4.00	4.26	4.25	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	519/1428	4.38	3.94	4.12	4.13	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	405/1407	4.50	4.01	4.15	4.20	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	2	0	0	6	4.25	838/1521	4.25	4.16	4.20	4.24	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1085/1541	4.56	4.56	4.70	4.75	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	373/1518	4.50	3.97	4.11	4.15	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	1106/1472	4.22	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.53	4.72	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	821/1471	4.38	4.30	4.32	4.36	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	349/1470	4.78	4.22	4.33	4.34	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	0	0	0	4	3.67	991/1310	3.67	3.94	4.06	3.99	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	373/1210	4.60	4.30	4.18	4.28	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1211	5.00	4.18	4.37	4.51	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1207	5.00	4.38	4.41	4.53	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	315/859	4.33	4.18	4.08	4.08	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CYBR 623 02		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment: 16
Title:	Cyber Law and Policy					Questionnaires: 10
Instructor:	Rasch,Mark D					

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	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.06	4.12	4.20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/210	****	3.39	4.17	4.12	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.04	4.50	4.23	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.10	4.32	4.24	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	3.76	4.15	4.30	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.34	4.56	4.62	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.33	4.60	4.71	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	3.84	4.50	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.28	4.54	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.35	4.17	4.35	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	4.07	4.20	4.06	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	4.28	4.36	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	4.11	4.59	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	4.00	4.41	4.39	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	4.30	4.62	4.43	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.02	4.27	4.36	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	4.43	4.57	4.45	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.39	4.29	4.42	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CYBR 623 02	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 16
Title: Cyber Law and Policy		Questionnaires: 10
Instructor: Rasch,Mark D		

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	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	4.17	4.25	4.35	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	4.10	4.14	4.23	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	4	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	6	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	1	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 631 01		Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment: 25				
Title:	Applied Computer Forensi									Questionnaires: 23				
Instructor:	Leschke,Timothy													

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	169/1542	4.90	4.10	4.33	4.39	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	297/1542	4.75	4.18	4.29	4.31	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	79/1339	4.95	4.10	4.32	4.31	4.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	194/1498	4.81	4.00	4.26	4.25	4.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	7	12	4.43	473/1428	4.43	3.94	4.12	4.13	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	385/1407	4.52	4.01	4.15	4.20	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	1	17	4.62	395/1521	4.62	4.16	4.20	4.24	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	948/1541	4.71	4.56	4.70	4.75	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	615/1518	4.31	3.97	4.11	4.15	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	367/1472	4.81	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	269/1475	4.95	4.53	4.72	4.76	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	280/1471	4.81	4.30	4.32	4.36	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	361/1470	4.76	4.22	4.33	4.34	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	201/1310	4.67	3.94	4.06	3.99	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	145/1210	4.89	4.30	4.18	4.28	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	327/1211	4.78	4.18	4.37	4.51	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	256/1207	4.89	4.38	4.41	4.53	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	5	9	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	478/859	4.00	4.18	4.08	4.08	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CYBR 631 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Applied Computer Forensi			Questionnaires: 23
Instructor:	Leschke,Timothy			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/207	****	4.06	4.12	4.20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/210	****	3.39	4.17	4.12	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.04	4.50	4.23	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.10	4.32	4.24	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/199	****	3.76	4.15	4.30	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.34	4.56	4.62	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.33	4.60	4.71	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	3.84	4.50	4.55	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	9	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	12	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						