INTRO TO COMP BASED SY

Title

Instructor: EVERHART, AMY

Enrollment: 50 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1013 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst 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	2	4	11	17	7	3.56	1492/1674	3.56	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1		21	12		1077/1674		4.26	4.23	4.16	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	7	15	13		1162/1423	3.78	4.36	4.27	4.16	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	5	7	16	10		1371/1609	3.68	4.23	4.22	4.05	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	2	12	12	10	3.55	1193/1585	3.55	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	7	10	11	8	3.36	1349/1535	3.36	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	2	14	19	4.15	977/1651	4.15	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	23	17	4.43	1289/1673	4.43	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	6	26	6	3.95	1056/1656	3.95	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	8	27	4.63			4.43	4.43	4.37	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	5	10	23		1250/1585	4.47	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	10	25	4.55	578/1582		4.30	4.26	4.17	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	4	2	9	23	4.34			4.32	4.27	4.17	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	2	0	4	10	22	4.32	440/1380	4.32	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.32
Discussion						_	_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	607/1520		4.14	4.01	3.76	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	746/1515	4.41	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	798/1511	4.35	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.35
4. Were special techniques successful	24	0	1	2	2	5	7	3.88	577/ 994	3.88	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.88
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	0	0	0	1	2	3		****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	0	0	0	1	2	3		****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****
Seminar		_			_	_								
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	1	0	1	1	1	0		****/ 103	***	4.39	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	1	0	0	2	1	0		, -	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	1 1	0	0	2	1	0		****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****
 Did presentations contribute to what you learned Were criteria for grading made clear 	37 37	1	0	0	2	1 1	0		****/ 99 ****/ 97	****	4.36 3.76	4.39 4.14	4.10 3.69	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3 /	1	U	U	2	1	U	3.33	***/ 9/	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	1	0	1	0	1		,	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	1	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	2	0	0		****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52		4.21	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****

Title INTRO TO COMP BASED SY

Instructor: EVERHART, AMY

Enrollment: 50
Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1013 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	20						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	5	C	11	General	9	Under-grad	41	Non-major	7
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	1						

Course-Section: IS 101H 0101

Title

Instructor: OZOK, ANT

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1014 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		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	0	1	5	6	2	3.64	1459/1674	3.64	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	1097/1674	4.07	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	819/1423	4.29	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	4	7	1	3.62	1405/1609	3.62	4.23	4.22	4.05	3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1260/1585	3.45	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	4	3	2	3.36	1345/1535	3.36	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	988/1651	4.14	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	655/1656	4.31	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	693/1586	4.64	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	689/1585	4.86	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	903/1582	4.29	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	523/1575	4.64	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	392/1380	4.38	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	_	4.23	663/1520	4.23	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	3	1	8	4.23	914/1515	4.23	4.14	4.01	3.70	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	845/1511	4.23	4.37	4.24		4.31
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	1	1	4	0	2	3.13	868/ 994	3.13	3.97	3.94	3.73	
i. Were special recinityaes successial	_	3	_	_	-	U	2	3.13	000/ 331	3.13	3.57	3.71	3.73	3.13
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	 7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	14	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	9	-	_		
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: IS 101Y 0101

INTRO TO COMP BASED SY

Title

Instructor: EVERHART, AMY

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1015 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		Mean
~~~~~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	6	3	3.56	1492/1674	3.56	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	856/1674	4.31	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	943/1423	4.13	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	6	4	3.69	1366/1609	3.69	4.23	4.22	4.05	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	8	3	3.81	996/1585	3.81	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	3	4	3.50	1295/1535	3.50	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	8			524/1651	4.50	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	4	4.25	1420/1673	4.25	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	5	6	1	3.46	1394/1656	3.46	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	1004/1586	4.40	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	5	2	6	3.80	1524/1585	3.80	4.72	4.69	4.60	3.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	8	2	3.80	1272/1582	3.80	4.30	4.26	4.17	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	1010/1575	4.20	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	363/1380	4.43	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	4	0	4	3.78	1010/1520	3.78	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	827/1515	4.33	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	2	2	1	4	3.78	1210/1511	3.78	4.37	4.27	4.00	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	3	2	2	2	3.33	811/ 994	3.33	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	1	1	0	0	0	1	2 00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33		****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	1	0	1	1		****/ 260	****	4.43	4.19	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	1	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports creatly specified	13	1	U	_	U	1	U	3.00	/ 233		4.30	4.20	4.00	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	1	0	1	1			****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	0	1		****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	,	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	***

Course-Section: IS 101Y 0101

Title INTRO TO COMP BASED SY

Instructor:

EVERHART, AMY

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 16 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1015 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	13	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: IS 125 0101

Title INFO SYS LOGIC/DESIGN

Instructor: VYAS, AMRISH J

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 13

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1016 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	quer	ncies	3		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
x														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	891/1674	4.31	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	446/1674	4.62	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	250/1423	4.77	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	455/1609	4.54	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	539/1585	4.27	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	119/1535	4.83	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	419/1651	4.58	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	2	4.17	1484/1673	4.17	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	615/1656	4.33	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	171/1586	4.92	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	1130/1585	4.62	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	510/1582	4.62	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	453/1575	4.69	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	234/1380	4.62	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	454/1520	4.45	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	949/1515	4.18	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	696/1511	4.45	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	708/ 994	3.57	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.57
- ,														
Laboratory		_		•			_							
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	2	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	***
Seminar														
	1.0	1	0	0	0	0	2	E 00	****/ 103	****	1 20	1 11	1 22	****
<ol> <li>Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme</li> <li>Was the instructor available for individual attention</li> </ol>	10 11	1 0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****
		0	0	0	-	-	_			****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11				0	1	1		****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	U	0	U	0	U	Τ	5.00	****/ 97	^ ^ ^ ^	3.76	4.14	3.69	^ ^ ^ ^
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****
	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****			4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations		0	0	0		-	_		,	****	3.86	4.12		****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	U	U	U	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49		3.74	4.27	4.30	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	-		****/ 31	****		4.34	3.88	****
1 one of the second for the second for		9		3	-		J	5.00	, 31			1.51	3.00	

Course-Section: IS 125 0101

Title INFO SYS LOGIC/DESIGN

Instructor:

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 13

Baltimore County VYAS, AMRISH J Fall 2005

Page 1016 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	1
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	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

SYSTEMS ANALYSIS METHO

Title

Instructor: KAHL, MARGARET

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 23

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1017 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	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	0	0	6	7	10		1046/1674		4.23	4.27	4.32	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	10	7		1208/1674	4.23	4.26	4.23	4.26	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	8	11	4.22	878/1423	4.42	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	5	5	9		1029/1609	4.30	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	2	8	3	3		1400/1585	3.30	4.04	3.96	3.91	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	5	5	7	4.00	870/1535	4.21	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	3		4.45	598/1651	4.54	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	353/1673	4.98	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	U	0	3	7	8	4.28	693/1656	4.22	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	16	4.59	763/1586	4.67	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	18		1035/1585	4.72	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	8	10	4.70	967/1582	4.49	4.72	4.26	4.35	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	5	13	4.26	949/1575	4.44		4.27	4.39	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	4	0	3	3	8	3.61	992/1380	4.31	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.61
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	5	4	U	3	3	0	3.01	992/1360	4.31	3.34	3.34	4.03	3.01
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	385/1520	4.76	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	513/1515	4.82	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	626/1511	4.76	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	5	6	5	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.34	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.42	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.48	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.07	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.45	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.22	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.63	****
Field Work			•				_							
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.97	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.20	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	***	3.74	4.27	4.82	***
Galf Darad														
Self Paced	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	г оо	++++/ (1	++++	4 02	4 00	4 00	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 61 ****/ 52	****	4.03	4.09	4.23	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	-	1	5.00	, 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.53	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22 22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50 ****/ 35	****	4.23	4.44	4.42	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31	****	4.22 4.25	4.36 4.34	4.63 4.50	****
J. Were there enough procedrs for all the students	22	U	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	/ 31		1.43	1.34	4.50	

Title SYSTEMS ANALYSIS METHO

Instructor:

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 23

Baltimore County KAHL, MARGARET Fall 2005

Page 1017 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

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

#### Course-Section: IS 202 0201 University of Maryland Title SYSTEMS ANALYSIS METHO Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: KAHL, MARGARET

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 8

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1018

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		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	1	6	4.63	458/1674	4.40	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	578/1674	4.23	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	431/1423	4.42	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	490/1609	4.30	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	1282/1585	3.30	4.04	3.96	3.91	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	481/1535	4.21	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	372/1651	4.54	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	4.98	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	827/1656	4.22	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	496/1586	4.67	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	917/1585	4.72	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	313/1582	4.49	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	551/1575	4.44	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1380	4.31	3.94	3.94	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	4.76	4.14	4.01	4.03	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1515	4.82	4.37	4.24	4.28	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1511	4.76	4.37	4.27	4.28	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	4.00	3.97	3.94	3.98	****

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1019

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

0	a	The second second second	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnarie

Course-Section: IS 247J 0101

17

JAVA PROGRAMMING

Martens, Jeffre

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 6

					Frequencies				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 gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.50
	1 0	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	830/1674		4.26	4.23	4.26	4.33
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	771/1423		4.36	4.27	4.36	4.33
	-	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	312/1609		4.23	4.22	4.23	4.67
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	612/1585		4.04	3.96	3.91	4.20
				o what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1		4.80	. ,			4.08	4.03	4.80
		g system clearl			0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67			4.20	4.18	4.20	4.67
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83			4.65	4.69	4.67	4.83
	-			hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	794/1656	4.10	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.20
_		Lectur		_		_		_										
		uctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0	2		4.67	663/1586		4.43	4.43	4.48	4.67
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	0	1		4.83	737/1585		4.72	4.69	4.76	4.83
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	0	2		4.67	,		4.30	4.26	4.35	4.67
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	1	0		4.67	,			4.27	4.39	4.67
5. Did	audiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	200/1380	4.33	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.67
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class disc			what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1092/1520	3.42	4.14	4.01	4.03	3.67
				d to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	1		1024/1515		4.37	4.24	4.28	4.00
				d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1511		4.37		4.28	5.00
		echniques succe			3	2	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 994				3.98	****
				Frequ	lency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 A 4		Red	auire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors		1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2			\			)		_	or addac	-	-		-	•
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				1	Under-q	rad	6	Non-	-major	0
84-150	_	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		00.		_				_	2201		-	-1011		Ü
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enous	ηh
	-			P 0	Electives					0 #### - Means there are not enou responses to be significant			_	,				
				I O		Ot.1	her					4					-	
				? 0														
				• •														

Course-Section: IS 247J 0201 University of Maryland Title JAVA PROGRAMMING Baltimore County

Title JAVA PROGRAMMING
Instructor: BURALL, KYLE B

Enrollment: 17

Questionnaires: 8

Fall 2005

Page 1020 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		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	1	2	5	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	3		1291/1674		4.26	4.23	4.26	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	431/1423		4.36	4.27	4.36	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	4		1007/1609		4.23	4.22	4.23	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	769/1585		4.04	3.96	3.91	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	200/1535		4.08	4.08	4.03	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	372/1651		4.20	4.18	4.20	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673		4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	955/1656	4.10	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	723/1586	4.65	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	640/1585	4.85	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	1061/1582	4.40	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1289/1575	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.39	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	666/1380	4.33	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1315/1520	3.42	4.14	4.01	4.03	3.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1361/1515	3.67	4.37	4.24	4.28	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	1265/1511	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.28	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	847/ 994	3.20	3.97	3.94	3.98	3.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	257/ 265	3.00	4.06	4.23	4.34	3.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	259/ 278	3.00	4.21	4.19	4.36	3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	260/ 260	2.50	4.43	4.46	4.51	2.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	259/ 259	2.50	4.21	4.33	4.42	2.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	232/ 233	2.50	4.36	4.20	4.48	2.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.07	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.45	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.63	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.20	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.23	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.53	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.42	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.50	****

Course-Section: IS 247J 0201
Title JAVA PROGRAMMING
Instructor: BURALL, KYLE B

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1020 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	edits Earned Cum. GPA Ex			Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0 General 1		1	Under-grad	8	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	are not enough	L	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: IS 247S 0101 PROGRAMMING IN SAS Fall 2005 FORGIONNE, GUIS

Page 1021 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	9				
Questionnaires:	4	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Title

Instructor:

						Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions	3		N	R 1	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 General	. – – – – –																
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil	ls fro	m this course		0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.50
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.26	5.00
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflect	the e	xpected goals		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.36	4.27	4.36	5.00
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals		0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.23	4.22	4.23	5.00
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	f	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	769/1585	4.00	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.00
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contri	bute t	o what you learn	ned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.08	4.08	4.03	5.00
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearly	expla	ined		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.20	4.18	4.20	5.00
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled			0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	How would you grade the overall teaching effective					2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.50
		Lecture	2																
1. Were t	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.43	4.43	4.48	5.00
		ctor seem intere				1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presented	l and e	xplained clearly	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.35	5.00
		es contribute to				1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.39	5.00
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques enh	nance y	our understandir	ng	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1380	5.00	3.94	3.94	4.03	5.00
		Discuss	sion																
1. Did cl	lass discu	ussions contribu	ite to	what you learned	d	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.14	4.01	4.03	5.00
				d to participate		2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.28	5.00
		-	_	d open discussion		2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.28	5.00
		echniques succes				2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	3.97	3.94	3.98	5.00
				Fi	requen	cy I	Dist	ribu	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade:									Dos					Т.				Mojere	
creatts E	Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				.es 				кез	asons				Туј	 he			Majors 	; 
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Required for Majors 0						Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0															

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

Course-Section: IS 247V 0101
Title SELECTED TOPICS

Title SELECTED TOPICS Instructor: SMITH, DANA H

Enrollment: 23

Grandant Ga

Fall 2005

Page 1022 JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Ouestionnaires: 19 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC 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 5 10 4.32 878/1674 4.67 4.23 4.27 4.32 4.32 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 3 7 8 4.16 1035/1674 4.56 4.26 4.23 4.26 4.16 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 5 12 4.61 445/1423 4.60 4.36 4.27 4.36 4.61 0 3 8 8 4.26 839/1609 4.46 4.23 4.22 4.23 4.26 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 2 01 5 6 5 3.88 926/1585 4.09 4.04 3.96 3.91 3.88 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5 12 4 1 6 3.64 1218/1535 4.04 4.08 4.08 4.03 3.64 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 2 4 12 4.42 643/1651 4.48 4.20 4.18 4.20 4.42 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 12 7 4.37 1339/1673 4.66 4.65 4.69 4.67 4.37 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 2 4 6 4 3.75 1237/1656 4.22 4.06 4.07 4.10 3.75 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Ω Ω Ω Ω 2 9 4.37 1044/1586 4.62 4.43 4.43 4.48 4.37 8 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 3 5 10 4.26 1392/1585 4.39 4.72 4.69 4.76 4.26 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 4 6 9 4.26 924/1582 4.57 4.30 4.26 4.35 4.26 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 3 9 6 4.05 1119/1575 4.29 4.32 4.27 4.39 4.05 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0 2 2 4 10 4.22 514/1380 4.62 3.94 3.94 4.03 4.22 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 1 1 3.00 1353/1520 3.88 4.14 4.01 4.03 3.00 1 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 0 0 0 2 1 2 4.00 1024/1515 4.29 4.37 4.24 4.28 4.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.40 751/1511 4.63 4.37 4.27 4.28 4.40 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 0 0 0 3.00 ****/ 265 **** 4.06 4.23 4.34 **** 0 1 0 **** 4.21 4.19 4.36 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 278 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** / 260 **** 4.43 4.46 4.51 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 18 0 0 18 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 259 **** 4.21 4.33 4.42 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 233 **** 4.36 4.20 4.48 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 18 0 0 0 3.00 ****/ 103 **** 4.39 4.41 4.07 **** 0 1 0 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 18 0 3.00 ****/ 101 **** 4.33 4.48 4.45 **** 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 95 **** 4.15 4.31 4.33 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 99 **** 4.36 4.39 4.22 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 18 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 97 **** 3.76 4.14 4.63 **** Frequency Distribution C

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	8	•					
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	7	C	4	General	3	Under-grad	19	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are no		are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	14	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: IS 247V 0201 University of Maryland Page 1023 SELECTED TOPICS Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 SMITH, DANA H Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029 18

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 6

		Frequencies		Inst	structor Course Dep		Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	0	0	0	0	_	5.00	1 /1 67 /	4 67	4 22	4 07	1 20	F 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6 5	4.83	1/1674 191/1674	4.67 4.56	4.23 4.26	4.27 4.23	4.32	5.00 4.83
<ol> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> <li>Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals</li> </ol>	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.83	575/1423		4.26	4.23	4.26	4.83
	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	490/1609	4.46	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3 4	3 1	4.50	769/1585		4.23	3.96	3.91	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	-	1	0	0	0	4	1		737/1535		4.04	4.08	4.03	4.00
•	1 0	0	0	1	0	2	3		966/1651	4.48	4.08	4.18	4.03	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.17	832/1673		4.20	4.18	4.20	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	: 1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.83	522/1656		4.05	4.69	4.07	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	; <u> </u>	U	U	U	1	1	3	4.40	522/1050	4.22	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	Ο	1	4	4.80	389/1586	4.62	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	2		1423/1585		4.72	4.69	4.76	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	525/1582		4.30	4.26	4.35	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	3		1010/1575		4.32	4.27	4.39	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	114/1380		3.94	3.94	4.03	4.80
5. Dia addiovidual econniques ennance jour anderstanding	_	Ü	O	Ü	O	-	-	1.00	111/1500	1.02	3.71	3.71	1.05	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	397/1520	3.88	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	629/1515	4.29	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	642/1511	4.63	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	4.50	3.97	3.94	3.98	****
Freq	quency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	:			Rea	ason	9			Ty	ne			Majors	
	, 													. – – – –
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors		1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 3														
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 2 C 0		Gei	nera	l				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	major	1
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0														
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a		enoug	ſh

Other

5

responses to be significant

Ρ

I

0

0

Course-Section: IS 247V 0301 University of Maryland Title SELECTED TOPICS

Baltimore County Fall 2005

Instructor: TARI, FURKAN Enrollment: 19 Ouestionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1024 JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 9 4.69 367/1674 4.67 4.23 4.27 4.32 4.69 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 00 0 4 9 4.69 338/1674 4.56 4.26 4.23 4.26 4.69 0 0 4 9 4.69 335/1423 4.60 4.36 4.27 4.36 4.69 0 1 3 9 4.62 363/1609 4.46 4.23 4.22 4.23 4.62 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 3 2 8 4.38 432/1585 4.09 4.04 3.96 3.91 4.38 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 1 2 1 7 4.27643/1535 4.04 4.08 4.08 4.03 4.27 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 2 11 4.85 151/1651 4.48 4.20 4.18 4.20 4.85 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 3 10 4.77 944/1673 4.66 4.65 4.69 4.67 4.77 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 5 5 4.50 381/1656 4.22 4.06 4.07 4.10 4.50 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 Ω Ω 1 2 10 4.69 618/1586 4.62 4.43 4.43 4.48 4.69 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 4 9 4.69 1035/1585 4.39 4.72 4.69 4.76 4.69 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 2 11 4.85 208/1582 4.57 4.30 4.26 4.35 4.85 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 0 2 10 4.62 565/1575 4.29 4.32 4.27 4.39 4.62 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 2 11 4.85 100/1380 4.62 3.94 3.94 4.03 4.85 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 1 0 1 1 760/1520 3.88 4.14 4.01 4.03 4.13 5 4.13 788/1515 4.29 4.37 4.24 4.28 4.38 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 1 0 0 1 6 4.38 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1511 4.63 4.37 4.27 4.28 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 2 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 205/994 4.50 3.97 3.94 3.98 4.50 Laboratory 2 5.00 ****/ 265 **** 4.06 4.23 4.34 **** 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 11 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 278 **** 4.21 4.19 4.36 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0 Ω 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 260 **** 4.43 4.46 4.51 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 11 0 0 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 11 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 259 **** 4.21 4.33 4.42 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 11 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.36 4.20 4.48 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 0 1 5.00 ****/ 103 **** 4.39 4.41 4.07 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 101 **** 4.33 4.48 4.45 **** 0 1 5.00 ****/ 95 **** 4.15 4.31 4.33 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 Ω 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 99 **** 4.36 4.39 4.22 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 97 **** 3.76 4.14 4.63 ****

Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA		Zarned Cum. GPA Exp				Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6								
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General		Under-grad	13	Non-major	2		
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0								
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there ar		are not enough	ı		
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant			
				I	0	Other	11	_		-			
				2	0								

Course-Section: IS 295 0301 Title

INTRO TO APPLIC PROGRA

Instructor: NOORUDDIN, AAMI

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1025 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	equei	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	1	1	13	4.80	243/1674	4.61	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	96/1674	4.82	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	203/1423	4.75	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	242/1609	4.71	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	277/1585	4.76	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	169/1535	4.78	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	298/1651	4.64	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	1182/1673	4.36	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	207/1656	4.45	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared		0	0	0	Ο	4	11	4.73	538/1586	4.71	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	397/1585		4.72	4.69	4.76	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	106/1582	4.90	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1575		4.32	4.27	4.39	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1380		3.94	3.94	4.03	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	Λ	1	2	7	4.25	645/1520	4.24	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	384/1515	4.41	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.75	610/1511		4.37	4.27	4.28	4.75
	3	9	1	0	1	ے 0	1		****/ 994	4.13	3.97	3.94	3.98	****
4. Were special techniques successful		9	_	U	Τ.	U	1	3.00	/ JJ4	4.13	3.91	3.94	3.90	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.23	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.53	****

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2005

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	15	Non-major	2
84-150	3	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	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: IS 295 0401

Title INTRO TO APPLIC PROGRA

Instructor: NOORUDDIN, AAM

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 17

NOORUDDIN, AAMI Fall

Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Page 1026

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

		Questions		NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	4	5		tructor Rar			e Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 54		General		0	0	0	1	2	1	10	1 11	751/1	1 6 7 1	1 (1	4 22	4 07	4 20	4 41
_	_	ew insights, skills fr		0	0	0	1	3 1	1	12	4.41	751/1 325/1		4.61		4.27	4.32	4.41
		ctor make clear the e					0	0	5	13	4.71			4.82	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.71
	_	estions reflect the		0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	322/1		4.75	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.71
		uations reflect the e eadings contribute to		0	1 3	0	0	0	1	11 13	4.69 4.93	292/1 69/1		4.71 4.76	4.23	4.22	4.23 3.91	4.69 4.93
	_	signments contribute	-	0	7	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	131/1		4.78	4.04	4.08	4.03	4.80
		g system clearly expl	_	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	419/1		4.78	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.59
		was class cancelled	aineu	1	0	0	1	1	8	6		1470/1		4.36	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.19
	_	grade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	805/1		4.45	4.06			4.18
		Lecture																
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures well	prepared	1	0	1	0	0	1	14	4.69	633/1	1586	4.71	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.69
		ctor seem interested		1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	786/1		4.87	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.81
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presented and	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	180/1	1582	4.90	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.88
		es contribute to what		1	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	203/1	1575	4.94	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.88
		techniques enhance	_	2	1	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	96/1	1380	4.93	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.86
		Discussion																
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contribute to	what you learned	4	0	2	0	1	0	10	4.23	663/1	1520	4.24	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.23
2. Were a	.ll studer	nts actively encourag	ed to participate	4	0	1	1	2	1	8	4.08	1002/1	1515	4.41	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.08
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage fair a	nd open discussion	4	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	685/1	1511	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.46
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques successful		4	5	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	432/	994	4.13	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.13
		Laboratory																
		crease understanding		13	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	265	****	4.06	4.23	4.34	****
		led with adequate bac		14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/	278	****	4.21	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were n	ecessary	materials available	for lab activities	14	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/	260	****	4.43	4.46	4.51	****
		structor provide assi		14	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	259	****	4.21	4.33	4.42	****
5. Were re	equiremer	nts for lab reports c	learly specified	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	233	****	4.36	4.20	4.48	****
		Seminar																
4. Did pro	esentatio	ons contribute to wha	t you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	99	****	4.36	4.39	4.22	****
		Field Work																
1. Did fi	eld exper	rience contribute to	what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	76	****	3.36	3.98	3.97	***
2. Did you	u clearly	understand your eva	luation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	77	****	3.65	3.93	4.20	****
3. Was the	e instruc	ctor available for co	nsultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	53	****	4.19	4.45	4.50	****
		Self Paced																
	_	system contribute to tions make clear the	-	16 16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ ****/	61 52	****	4.03	4.09 4.26	4.23 4.53	****
	11117		Frequ									,						
			-	tency	DIS	LIIL	JULIO	11										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades					asons					Тур				Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 10					or Ma				Grad			0	Majo		0
28-55 56-83	1 4	1.00-1.99 0 2.00-2.99 2	B 4 C 0		Ge	nera	ıl				0	Unde	er-gi	rad :	17	Non-	-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		m.7	0 a t - 1					1		_				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0 P 0		Εl	ecti	ves				1				there a oe sign		t enoug nt	ın
			I 0		Ot:	her				1	4							

? 0

Course-Section: IS 298I 0101

Title Intro to Programming T

Instructor: Canfield, G.

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 9

Canfield, G.

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1027 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

								Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	tructo	r	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rai	nk	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			General	 I																
1. Did	d vou	gain new	insights, skil		this course	0	0	0	3	3	3	0	3.00	1628/	1674	3.54	4.23	4.27	4.32	3.00
			or make clear			0	0	2	2	3	1	1		1653/		3.54	4.26	4.23	4.26	2.67
			stions reflect			0	0	0	2	3	3	1	3.33	1316/	1423	3.71	4.36	4.27	4.36	3.33
			tions reflect			1	2	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1452/	1609	3.71	4.23	4.22	4.23	3.50
				_	what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	4	0	3.00	1440/	1585	3.50	4.04	3.96	3.91	3.00
					what you learned	0	4	2	1	2	0	0		1524/		3.25	4.08	4.08	4.03	2.00
			system clearly		2	0	0	1	2	2	1	3	3.33	1504/	1651	3.92	4.20	4.18	4.20	3.33
			as class cance	_		0	0	0	0	0	4			1169/		4.69		4.69	4.67	
	_				ning effectiveness	2	0	3	2	1	1	0		1641/					4.10	2.00
			Lecture																	
1 Max	co the	inatrua	tor's lectures		ropared	0	0	1	4	2	2	0	2 56	1571/	1506	2 60	4.43	1 12	4.48	2.56
			or seem inter			0	0	1	3	4	1	0		15/1/.		3.64	4.43	4.43	4.46	2.56
					plained clearly	0	0	2	4	2	1	-		1576/			4.72		4.76	2.22
			_			0	1	2	4	2	0			1562/			4.32			2.22
			contribute to	_							-									
5. Dio	audi	ovisual	techniques en	nance yo	our understanding	1	2	1	1	1	2	Τ	3.17	1190/.	1380	3.81	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.17
			Discus																	
					what you learned	4	0	3	2	0	0	0	1.40	1513/	1520	2.63	4.14	4.01	4.03	1.40
2. Wer	ce all	student	s actively end	couraged	l to participate	4	0	4	1	0	0	0	1.20	1512/	1515	2.74	4.37	4.24	4.28	1.20
					d open discussion	4	0	1	3	0	1	0	2.20	1491/	1511	3.35	4.37	4.27	4.28	2.20
4. Wer	re spe	cial tec	hniques succes	ssful		4	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/	994	4.00	3.97	3.94	3.98	****
			Laborat	orv																
1. Did	the	lab incr		-	the material	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	265	****	4.06	4.23	4.34	****
					round information	8	0	1	0	0	0			****/		****			4.36	****
			ructor provide			8	0	1	0	0	0			****/		****			4.42	***
			Semina	_																
2. Was	s the	instruct			vidual attention	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	101	****	4.33	4.48	4.45	***
1 Dia	1 fio1	d owneri	Field V		nat you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	Λ	1 00	****/	76	****	2 26	2 00	3.97	****
1. DIO	a riei	u experi	ence concriba	JE CO WI	iac you rearried	O	U		U	U	U	U	1.00	/	70		3.30	3.90	3.97	
					Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	utior	ı										
Credit	s Ear	ned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons					Тур	pe			Majors	;
00-27		0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Grad	duate	9	0	Majo	r	0
28-55		0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3		-		_				_	_		_	_			_
56-83		1	2.00-2.99	2	C 2		Ger	nera:	T				1	Und	er-gr	rad	9	Non-	-major	3
84-15		1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		_						_							
Grad.		0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1			Means t			_	ŗh
					P 0								_	res	ponse	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
					I 0		Oth	ner					5							
					? 0															

Course-Section: IS 298I 0201

IS 298I 0201 University of Maryland Intro to Programming T Baltimore County

Title Intro to Progr

Instructor: Noiker, R.

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 12

Fall 2005
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1028 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	1131/1674	3.54	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	721/1674		4.26	4.23	4.26	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	968/1423	3.71	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	2	5		1211/1609	3.71	4.23	4.22	4.23	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	769/1585	3.50	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	373/1535	3.25	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	524/1651	3.92	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	868/1673	4.69	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	794/1656	3.10	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	708/1586	3.60	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	981/1585	3.64	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	525/1582	3.41	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	958/1575	3.13	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	348/1380	3.81	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	955/1520	2.63	4.14	4.01	4.03	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	873/1515	2.74	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	642/1511	3.35	4.37		4.28	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.34	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.42	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.48	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.07	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.45	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.63	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.20	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.82	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.23	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.53	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.42	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.50	****

Course-Section: IS 298I 0201

Title Intro to Programming T

Instructor:

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 12

Baltimore County Noiker, R. Fall 2005

Page 1028 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	С	4	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Title MANAGEMENT INFO SYSTEM

SMITH, ROBERT A

Instructor: Enrollment: 33

Questionnaires: 17

# Fall 2005

University of Maryland Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 1029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			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
01														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	2	10	4.29	903/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	554/1674	4.35	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4		4.65	404/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	629/1609	4.22	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	326/1585	4.29	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	467/1535	4.14	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	795/1651	4.35	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	3		1470/1673		4.65	4.69	4.68	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	507/1656			4.07	4.07	
J. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	Ü	0	0	_	3	O	1.12	30771030	1.10	1.00	1.07	1.07	1.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	1034/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	917/1585	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	313/1582	4.42	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	467/1575	4.33	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	265/1380	3.96	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	3	9	4.27	635/1520	4.15	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	3		4.53	603/1515	4.09	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	618/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	148/ 994	3.74	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2 00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 278	4.25	4.21	4.19	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 260	****	4.43	4.19	4.49	****
J. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	U	_	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 200		1.13	1.10	1.10	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	4.00	4.33	4.48	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	4.00	4.15	4.31	3.91	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	4.50	4.36	4.39	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	4.80	3.76	4.14	3.48	****
Frequ	encv	Dist	ribı.	ıt.ior	า									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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	11	_			
				2	0						

#### Course-Section: IS 300 0201 University of Maryland Title MANAGEMENT INFO SYSTEM Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006

Instructor: SMITH, DANA H

Enrollment: 37 Questionnaires: 26

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1030

Job IRBR3029

								Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			Question				NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			 Genera																
1. I	Did you	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	4	9	13	4.35	841/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.35
2. I	Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	17	4.50	578/1674	4.35	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.50
3. I	Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	16	4.38	718/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.38
4. I	Did oth	ner evalı	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	1	0	5	7	13	4.19	930/1609	4.22	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.19
5. I	Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	3	0	0	5	5	12	4.32	502/1585	4.29	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.32
6. I	Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	1	1	0	2	3	5	14	4.29	619/1535	4.14	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.29
7. 7	Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	1	0	0	1	4	5	15	4.36	727/1651	4.35	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.36
8. I	How mar	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	17	8	4.32	1368/1673	4.49	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.32
9. I	How wor	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	12	7	4.24	744/1656	4.10	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.24
			Lectur	e															
1. 1	Were th	ne instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	1	1	6	16	4.54	816/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.54
			ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	1118/1585	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.63
3. 1	Was led	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	4	16	4.46	704/1582	4.42	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.46
4. I	Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	2	1	5	16	4.46	755/1575	4.33	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.46
5. I	Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	0	1	1	4	5	13	4.17	567/1380	3.96	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.17
			Discus	sion															
1. I	Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	244/1520	4.15	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.73
2. 7	Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	11	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	681/1515	4.09	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.47
3. I	Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	171/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.93
4. 7	Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		11	2	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	337/ 994	3.74	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.31
					Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Cred	dits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Pe:	ason	c c			Ту	ne			Majors	2
														ту. 					
	-27	4	0.00-0.99		A 15		Re	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	1	Majo	r	0
	-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В 4								_	TT		_			_

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	А	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	20	_			
				2	0						

MANAGEMENT INFO SYSTEM

Title PETRY, PHILIP L

Instructor:

Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 28

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1031 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

				Fre	eque:	ncie	s		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	1	0	1	1	4	11	10	4.04	1171/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.04
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	9	13	4.30	882/1674	4.35	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.30
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	13	8	4.00	1016/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.00
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	8	6	9	3.67	1377/1609	4.22	4.23	4.22	4.27	3.67
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	3	5	15	4.11	692/1585	4.29	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.11
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	8	5	10	3.81	1110/1535	4.14	4.08	4.08	4.15	3.81
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	0	5	17	4.22	901/1651	4.35	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.22
8.	How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	19	8	4.30	1390/1673	4.49	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.30
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	10	9	2	3.62	1324/1656	4.10	4.06	4.07	4.07	3.62
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	8	18	4.63	723/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.63
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	5	6	16	4.41	1309/1585	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.41
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	8	12	4.24	956/1582	4.42	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.24
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	2	10	13	4.31	915/1575	4.33	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.31
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	7	2	3	3	4	2.74	1294/1380	3.96	3.94	3.94	4.01	2.74
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	1	7	4	10	3.58	1141/1520	4.15	4.14	4.01	4.09	3.58
2.	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	8	4	8	1	6	2.74	1461/1515	4.09	4.37	4.24	4.32	2.74
3.	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	9	3	8	0	7	2.74	1467/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	2.74
4.	Were special techniques successful	1	19	1	0	4	1	2	3.38	795/ 994	3.74	3.97	3.94	3.96	3.38
	Laboratory														
	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	1	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****
	Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 278	4.25	4.21	4.19	4.24	****
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****
5.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****
_	Seminar						_	_							
	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 101	4.00	4.33	4.48	4.30	
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	1	0	1		****/ 95	4.00	4.15	4.31	3.91	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	0	2		****/ 99	4.50	4.36	4.39	4.29	****
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 97	4.80	3.76	4.14	3.48	****
	Dield West														
1	Field Work	٥٢	0	0	0	0	1	2	1 67	++++/ 76	4 50	2 26	2 00	4 02	****
	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 76	4.50		3.98	4.03	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 77	3.75	3.65	3.93	3.70	****
	Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	1	0	1	0	1		,	4.25	4.19	4.45	3.87	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 48	3.75	3.86	4.12	3.67	****
5.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 49	3.50	3.74	4.27	3.27	****
	Self Paced														
1	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	2	1 22	****/ 61	4.50	4.03	4 00	3.20	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25 26	0	0	0	0	0	2		,					****
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26 25	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33		4.00 4.60	4.21	4.26	3.50 3.82	****
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25 25	0	0	0	U T	1	2	4.33	,	4.50	4.23	4.44 4.36	3.82	****
	Were there enough proctors for all the students	25 25	0	0	0	0	2						4.34	4.29	****
э.	were there enough procedus for all the students	∠ ⊃	U	U	U	U	۷	Τ	4.33	/ 31	4.50	±.∠⊃	4.34	4.43	

Title MANAGEMENT INFO SYSTEM

Instructor:

PETRY, PHILIP L

Enrollment: 36

Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1031 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	0						

#### Course-Section: IS 300 0401 University of Maryland Page 1032 Title MANAGEMENT INFO SYSTEM Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006

Instructor: RADA, ROY

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 28

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

							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 y	you gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	1	3	7	7	10	3.79	1393/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	3.79
		ctor make clear			1	0	1	1	6	6	13	4.07	1097/1674	4.35	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.07
		uestions reflec			0	4	0	1	5	6	12	4.21	887/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.21
4. Did c	other eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	2	0	2	3	10	11	4.15	974/1609	4.22	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.15
5. Did a	assigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	8	15	4.25	557/1585	4.29	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.25
6. Did w	written as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	11	12	4.26	667/1535	4.14	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.26
7. Was t	the grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	3	2	8	15	4.25	866/1651	4.35	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.25
8. How m	many times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	1	0	1	26	4.86	796/1673	4.49	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.86
9. How w	would you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	1	0	3	7	7	7	3.75	1237/1656	4.10	4.06	4.07	4.07	3.75
		Lectur	•															
1 Womo	the insta	Lectur uctor's lecture		nwanawa d	5	0	0	1	6	8	0	4 00	1300/1586	4.53	1 12	1 12	1 12	4 00
		ctor seem inter			5	0	0	0	4	-			1374/1585				4.42	
				xplained clearly		0				8			1261/1582			4.26		3.83
		es contribute t			5	2	2	3	-	5			1355/1575					
				our understanding	5			3		-			968/1380					
J. DIG 8	audiovisua	r ceciminques en	nance y	our understanding	J	,	2	J	3	-	O	3.03	900/1300	3.90	3.94	3.91	1.01	3.03
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	class disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	17	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	924/1520	4.15	4.14	4.01	4.09	3.91
2. Were	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	17	0	0	0		2		4.64	513/1515	4.09	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.64
3. Did t	the instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	17	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	1050/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.00
4. Were	special to	echniques succe	ssful		17	5	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	****/ 994	3.74	3.97	3.94	3.96	****
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s 			Ту	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 16		Red	quire	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6						-						_		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 2		Gei	neral	L				3	Under-g	rad 2	18	Non-	major	9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her				2	1						
				? 0														

Course-Section: IS 300 0501 University of Maryland Title MANAGEMENT INFO SYSTEM

Baltimore County Fall 2005

Instructor: HOLDEN, STEPHEN 29

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1033 JAN 21, 2006 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	Ο	2	3	10	4.53	570/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	641/1674	4.35	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	623/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	408/1609	4.22	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	728/1585	4.29	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	5	5	4	3.93	991/1535	4.14	4.08	4.08	4.15	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	484/1651	4.35	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	4	4.27	1412/1673	4.49	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	381/1656	4.10	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	301/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1585	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	272/1582	4.42	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	612/1575	4.33	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	253/1380	3.96	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	330/1520	4.15	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	4	1	8	4.31	857/1515	4.09	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	553/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.62
4. Were special techniques successful	2	8	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	881/ 994	3.74	3.97	3.94	3.96	3.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	4.25	4.21	4.19	4.24	****
Qomin ou														
Seminar	1 /	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	1 20	1 11	1 10	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	U	U	U	0	U	Τ	5.00	/ 1U3		4.39	4.41	4.10	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

MANAGEMENT INFO SYSTEM

Title Instructor: SPONAUGLE, RICH

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 16

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1034 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies		\$		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions			1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
		NA 												
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	878/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	931/1674	4.35	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	6	8	4.25	845/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	743/1609	4.22	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	360/1585	4.29	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	807/1535	4.14	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	5	10	4.44	628/1651	4.35	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1673	4.49	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	894/1656	4.10	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	496/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	1328/1585	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	733/1582	4.42	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	819/1575	4.33	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	2	1	3	9	4.06	639/1380	3.96	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	4	6	3	3.79	1002/1520	4.15	4.14	4.01	4.09	3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	1	3	3	6		1158/1515	4.09	4.37	4.24	4.32	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	937/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.21
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	4	0	3	2	3.33	811/ 994	3.74	3.97	3.94	3.96	3.33
Laboratory			_	_	•	_								
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	4	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	150/ 278	4.25	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	2	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	72/ 101	4.00	4.33	4.41	4.30	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	62/ 95	4.00	4.15	4.31	3.91	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	2		49/ 99	4.50	4.15	4.31	4.29	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	29/ 97		3.76	4.14	3.48	4.80
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	11	U	U	U	U	_	4	4.00	29/ 91	4.00	3.70	4.14	3.40	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	33/ 76	4.50	3.36	3.98	4.03	4.50
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	44/ 77	3.75	3.65	3.93	3.70	3.75
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	39/ 53		4.19	4.45	3.87	4.25
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	1	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	33/ 48		3.86	4.12	3.67	3.75
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	1	0	3		3.50	40/ 49		3.74			3.50
or pro conteressed mere you early out from desiriores		_	Ū	_	ŭ		Ü	3.30	10, 15	3.30	J., 1	1.27	3.27	5.50
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	26/ 61	4.50	4.03	4.09	3.20	4.50
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	29/ 52			4.26	3.50	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	2	3		26/ 50		4.23	4.44	3.82	4.60
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	19/ 35		4.22	4.36	3.29	4.50
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50		4.50		4.34	4.29	4.50

Title MANAGEMENT INFO SYSTEM

Instructor: Questionnaires: 16

Enrollment: 23

SPONAUGLE, RICH

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1034 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	Credits Earned			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				2	1						

HUMAN FACTORS IN COMP

Title SMITH, ROBERT B

Instructor:

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 23

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1035 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies In			Inst	Instructor		Dept	t UMBC Level		Sect				
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	3	4	8	5	3.50	1511/1674	3.97	4.23	4.27	4.26	3.50
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	9	8	3.87	1298/1674	4.18	4.26	4.23	4.21	3.87
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	5	14	4.45	636/1423	4.26	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.45
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1094/1609	4.02	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.00
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	2	5	4	6	3.40	1297/1585	3.88	4.04	3.96	3.95	3.40
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	13	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	667/1535	4.32	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.25
	Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	6	2	10	3.86	1258/1651	4.18	4.20	4.18	4.16	3.86
	How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1			778/1673	4.85	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.86
	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	1	7	7	1	3.50	1377/1656			4.07	4.07	3.50
	. 3														
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	5	15	4.50	858/1586	4.63	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.50
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	1191/1585	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.55
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	5	7	9	4.05	1109/1582	4.27	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.05
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	3	5	10	4.00	1138/1575	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.00
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	1	3	2	13	4.25	489/1380	4.49	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.25
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	3	4	1	2	2.83	1421/1520	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.09	2.83
2.	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	4	1	4	1	1	2.45	1476/1515	3.75	4.37	4.24	4.32	2.45
3.	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	2	5	2	1	3.00	1420/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	3.00
4.	Were special techniques successful	12	5	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	732/ 994	4.15	3.97	3.94	3.96	3.50
	Laboratory														
1.	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****
2.	Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****
3.	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****
4.	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	***
5.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****
	Seminar														
	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****
2.	Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****
3.	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.91	****
4.	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.29	****
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.48	****
	Field Work														
	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	1	0		****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.03	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.70	****
	Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	3.87	****
4.	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	3.67	****
	- 10														
_	Self Paced			_	_		_	_							
	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.20	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	****
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	3.82	****
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.29	****
5.	Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	***	4.25	4.34	4.29	****

Title HUMAN FACTORS IN COMP

Instructor: SMITH, ROBERT B

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1035 JAN 21, 2006 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	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	7	Under-grad	23	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

HUMAN FACTORS IN COMP

Title SMITH, ROBERT B

Instructor:

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 20

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1036 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	^	0	4	0	4	7	_	2 45	1500/1674	2 07	4 00	4 07	1 26	2 45
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	0 1	4 4	7 8	5 4		1528/1674 1519/1674		4.23 4.26	4.27 4.23	4.26 4.21	3.45 3.45
<ol> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> <li>Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals</li> </ol>	0	0	1	2	2	6	9		1016/1423	4.18	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	2	1	1	4		1431/1609	4.02	4.23	4.27	4.27	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	2	4	2	6		1376/1585	3.88	4.23	3.96	3.95	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	1	0	1	0	3		1110/1535	4.32	4.04	4.08	4.15	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	1	3	4	5	4		1454/1651	4.18	4.20	4.18	4.16	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	4			915/1673		4.65	4.69		4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	2	2	3	6			1513/1656				4.07	
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	3		4.50	858/1586	4.63	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	4	1	5	10		1463/1585	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.05
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	4	5			1244/1582	4.27	4.30	4.26	4.26	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	6	7		1289/1575	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.25	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	1	2	14	4.56	272/1380	4.49	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.56
Discussion			_		_									
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	2	3		955/1520	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.09	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	2	1	1	3		1233/1515	3.75	4.37	4.24	4.32	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	2	0	1	4		1050/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27		4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	390/ 994	4.15	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****
Seminar		•					_							***
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19 19	0	0	0	0	0	1 1		****/ 95 ****/ 99	****	4.15 4.36	4.31	3.91 4.29	****
<ol> <li>Did presentations contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Were criteria for grading made clear</li> </ol>	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	3.76	4.39 4.14	3.48	****
• •	12	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00			3.70	4.14	3.40	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.03	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.70	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	3.87	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	***	3.86	4.12	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	3.27	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.20	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 50	****	4.23		3.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.29	****

Title HUMAN FACTORS IN COMP

Instructor: SMITH, ROBERT B

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1036 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	rned Cum. GPA			Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	20	Non-major	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: IS 303 0301 University of Maryland Title HUMAN FACTORS IN COMP Baltimore County

Instructor: CAMPBELL, JEFFR Enrollment: 28

Questionnaires: 20

JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Page 1037

		Frequencies

						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	3	4	11	4.26	941/1674	3.97	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	519/1674	4.18	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	6	10	4.26	836/1423	4.26	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	9	9	4.37	701/1609	4.02	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	2	8	7	4.11	692/1585	3.88	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	5	3	9	4.24	691/1535	4.32	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	0	4	2	11	4.41	658/1651	4.18	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	424/1673	4.85	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	955/1656	3.86	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	858/1586	4.63	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	1	16	4.72	981/1585	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	850/1582	4.27	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	669/1575	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	325/1380	4.49	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	673/1520	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	2	1	5		1024/1515	3.75	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	507/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	346/ 994	4.15	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.29
1. Hore Special Colmitator Successivi		_	9	3	_	5	,		310, 331	1.13	2.27	2.71	2.20	1.20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	А	5 5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	7	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	19	Non-major	2
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

HUMAN FACTORS IN COMP

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

8 Questionnaires: 6

DeVreis, Esther

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1038 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fr	_	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	406/1674	3.97	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	191/1674	4.18	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	771/1423	4.26	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	963/1609	4.02	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	136/1585	3.88	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1535	4.32	4.08	4.08	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1651	4.18	4.20	4.18	4.16	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	887/1673	4.85	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	149/1656	3.86	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1586	4.63	4.43	4.43	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1585	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	217/1582	4.27	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	495/1575	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	200/1380	4.49	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.67
Discussion		_			_		_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	173/1520	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	289/1515	3.75	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27		5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	167/ 994	4.15	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	***	3.76	4.14	3.48	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.03	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.70	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	3.87	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	***	3.74	4.27	3.27	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.20	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	3.82	****
1 10 concacos nien one imperatore neipiai	-	•	•	Ü	Ŭ	•	_	3.00	, 30		1.23		3.02	

Title HUMAN FACTORS IN COMP

Instructor: DeVreis, Esther

Enrollment: 8
Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1038 JAN 21, 2006 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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	6	Non-major	1
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	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: IS 304 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County

ETHICAL ISSUES IN IS

Title Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 18

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1039 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	471/1674	4.51	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	446/1674	4.46	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	2	14	4.50	575/1423	4.45	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	312/1609	4.68	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	2	11	4.38	442/1585	4.54	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	4	11	4.22	703/1535	4.51	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	1	1	3	9		1377/1651	4.13	4.20	4.18	4.16	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	11	6		1405/1673	4.64	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.28
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	7	7	4.27	706/1656			4.07	4.07	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	989/1586	4.66	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	14		1024/1585	4.75	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	762/1582	4.51	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	669/1575	4.51	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	770/1380	4.30	3.94	3.94	4.01	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	338/1520	4.68	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	325/1515	4.78	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	358/1511	4.78	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	157/ 994	4.82	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.64
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.91	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.48	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.03	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.70	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	3.87	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	3.27	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.20	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	3.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.29	****

Title ETHICAL ISSUES IN IS

Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1039 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	12	Under-grad	18	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: IS 304 0201 University of Maryland Title ETHICAL ISSUES IN IS

Baltimore County Fall 2005

Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD Enrollment: 21

Questionnaires: 11

Page	1040
JAN 21,	2006
Job IRBI	R3029

Student Course Eval	ation Questionnaire
---------------------	---------------------

			Fre	eque:	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	768/1674	4.51	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.40
_	_	ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	870/1674	4.46	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.30
		uestions reflec			1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	697/1423	4.45	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.40
	_	uations reflect		_	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	282/1609	4.68	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.70
				what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	2	5	4.70		4.54	4.23	3.96	3.95	4.70
	_	-		_		0	0	0	0	2								
		-		to what you learned	1			0			8	4.80	131/1535	4.51	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.80
	-	g system clearl		ainea	1	0	0	-	1	2	7	4.60		4.13	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.60
		was class cand			2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1673	4.64	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	331/1656	4.42	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.57
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	214/1586	4.66	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.90
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	811/1585	4.75	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.80
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	525/1582	4.51	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.60
		es contribute t			1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50			4.32	4.27		4.50
				our understanding	1	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67						
5. Did au	idiovisua.	ı techniques en	nance y	your understanding	Τ	1	U	U	U	3	О	4.67	200/1380	4.30	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.67
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	229/1520	4.68	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.75
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	384/1515	4.78	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.75
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	414/1511	4.78	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.75
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	-	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 994	4.82	3.97	3.94	3.96	5.00
		Labora	torv															
1 Did th	e lah ind	crease understa	-	of the material	10	0	0	1	0	0	Λ	2 00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****
				ground information	10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****
					10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 260	****	4.43			****
				for lab activities							-		,			4.46	4.49	****
		structor provid			10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	
5. Were r	equiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	learly specified	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****
		Semina	r															
1. Were a	ssigned t	topics relevant	to the	e announced theme	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utio:	n									
					_													
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons				Ту:	pe 			Majors 	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Rec	quire	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 5														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С 0		Ger	nera:	1				7	Under-g	rad 1	1	Non-	-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0													5 2	_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		El-	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means +	here =	are not	enous	rh
Ji aa.	J	3.30-4.00	J	P 0		11.1.6	-CC1'	v CB				J	respons				_	1+4
				I 0		Otł	2020					1	respons	CB CO D	c argi	ııııdı	10	
				= *		ULI	1CT					т						
				? 0														

Course-Section: IS 310 0101 University of Maryland Title SOFTWARE/HARDWARE CNCP Baltimore County

Instructor: REDDING, TATE

Enrollment: 63 Questionnaires: 29

# Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1041

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque	ncie	es		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	2	12	15	4.45	703/1674	4.03	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	270/1674	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	188/1423	4.19	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	12	13	4.31	771/1609	4.06	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	9	17	4.45	378/1585	4.01	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	. 0	0	0	3	8	8	10	3.86	1057/1535	3.73	4.08	4.08	4.15	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	186/1651	4.12	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1673	4.64	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	13	13	4.50	381/1656	3.87	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	86/1586	4.59	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1585	4.56	4.72	4.69	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	366/1582	4.35	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	423/1575	4.35	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	200/1380	4.27	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1520	3.77	4.14	4.01	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1515	4.04	4.37	4.24	4.32	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	****
4. Were special techniques successful	26	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 994	3.54	3.97	3.94	3.96	****
Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 9		 Re	auir	ed f	 or N	 Ia ior	 `s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Maio	 r	0

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	11	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	29	Non-major	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
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	28				
				?	1						

#### Course-Section: IS 310 0201 University of Maryland Title SOFTWARE/HARDWARE CNCP Baltimore County Fall 2005

Instructor: GREEN, FRANK E.

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1042

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	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	3	0	1	3	5	3	3	3.27	1581/1674	4.03	4.23	4.27	4.26	3.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	3	3	3	3			1637/1674			4.23		2.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	4	3	3	3	3.21	1340/1423	4.19	4.36	4.27	4.27	3.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	3	3	7	2	3.53	1439/1609	4.06	4.23	4.22	4.27	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	1	3	4	5	3.79	1023/1585	4.01	4.04	3.96	3.95	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	6	0	3	1	3	2	3.44	1317/1535	3.73	4.08	4.08	4.15	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	6	4	2	3	3.13	1549/1651	4.12	4.20	4.18	4.16	3.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	494/1673	4.64	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	1	7	0	0	2.88	1584/1656	3.87	4.06	4.07	4.07	2.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	1224/1586	4.59	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	4	2			1513/1585		4.72			3.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	1	4			1348/1582		4.30			3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	4	1	7		1299/1575		4.32	4.27		3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	2	4	3	5	3.79	880/1380	4.27	3.94	3.94	4.01	3.79
Discussion	_		_			_	_		4005/4500					
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	4	2	1	3		1335/1520			4.01	4.09	3.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	3	3			1137/1515		4.37	4.24		
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	2	4	1			1278/1511		4.37	4.27	4.34	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	3	2	0	0	2	2.43	972/ 994	3.54	3.97	3.94	3.96	2.43
Frequ	iency	Dist	crib	ution	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: IS 310 0301 Title

SOFTWARE/HARDWARE CNCP

Instructor: COMITZ, PAUL H.

Enrollment: 37 Questionnaires: 32 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1043 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestions				Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,skil	ls fro	m this course	0	0	0	3	2	11	16	4.25	954/1674	4.03	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.25
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	2	11	18	4.44	689/1674	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.44
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflect	the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	2	2	9	18	4.39	718/1423	4.19	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.39
		uations reflect			1	0	1	3	4	8	15	4.06	1055/1609	4.06	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.06
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contribu	te to	what you learned	1	0	2	1	10	8	10	3.74	1058/1585	4.01	4.04	3.96	3.95	3.74
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contri	bute t	o what you learned	0	0	3	3	7	9	10	3.63	1229/1535	3.73	4.08	4.08	4.15	3.63
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearly	expla	ined	1	0	0	2	3	10	16	4.29	820/1651	4.12	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.29
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	lled		0	0	0	0	0	18	14	4.44	1278/1673	4.64	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.44
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overal	l teac	hing effectiveness	6	0	1	0	5	9	11	4.12	882/1656	3.87	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.12
		Lecture	:															
		uctor's lectures			2	0	0	0	0	6	24	4.80	389/1586	4.59	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.80
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem intere	sted i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	397/1585	4.56	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.94
				xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	8	21	4.67	438/1582	4.35	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.67
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute to	what	you learned	1	0	1	0	3	4	23	4.55	646/1575	4.35	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.55
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enh	ance y	our understanding	2	0	3	1	1	9	16	4.13	594/1380	4.27	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.13
		Discuss	ion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribu	te to	what you learned	17	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	751/1520	3.77	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.13
				d to participate	16	0	1	1	0	4	10	4.31	847/1515	4.04	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.31
				d open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	594/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.56
4. Were s	special t	echniques succes	sful		16	5	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	396/ 994	3.54	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.18
		Laborat																
		crease understan			31	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 265		4.06	4.23	4.26	****
				ground information	31	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 278		4.21	4.19	4.24	****
				or lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 260		4.43	4.46	4.49	****
4. Did th	ne lab in	structor provide	assis	tance	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****
		Field W																
1. Did fi	.eld expe	rience contribut	e to w	hat you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.03	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 15		Re	 quir	ed f	or M	 lajor	:	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В 8			_			-								
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	5	C 1		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 3	32	Non-	-major	13
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D 0													-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Ot]	her				2	12	_					
				? 0														

Title SOFTWARE/HARDWARE CNCP

Instructor: CHIANG, CHIYUNK

Emailment: 10

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 12

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1044 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			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	0	1	3	1	7	4.17	1056/1674	4.03	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	6		1026/1674		4.26	4.23	4.21	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	771/1423	4.19	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	743/1609	4.06	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	715/1585	4.01	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	1	6	4.00	870/1535	3.73	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	866/1651	4.12	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	1470/1673	4.64	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	955/1656	3.87	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	931/1586	4.59	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	1267/1585	4.56	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	819/1582		4.30	4.26	4.26	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	819/1575	4.35	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	303/1380	4.27	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	777/1520	3.77	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	5	1	4	3.90	1137/1515	4.04	4.37	4.24	4.32	3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	845/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	474/ 994	3.54	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.00
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.91	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.48	****
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	3.87	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	3.27	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	4.03	4.09	3.20	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	3.82	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	utio	n									

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

Course-Section: IS 325 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO MANAGEMENT SC Baltimore County Fall 2005

Instructor: FORGIONNE, GUIS

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1045

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	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	1	1	3	4.40	768/1674	4.25	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	460/1674	4.48	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	203/1423	4.58	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1094/1609	4.17	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	413/1585	4.20	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1535	4.22	4.08	4.08	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	393/1651	4.60	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	887/1673	4.54	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1297/1656	3.94	4.06	4.07	4.07	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.50	858/1586	4.70	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585		4.43	4.43	4.44	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1582	4.65	4.72	4.09	4.06	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1575		4.32	4.27	4.25	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	303/1380		3.94	3.94	4.25	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	U	U	U	Т	U	3	4.50	303/1360	4.55	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1520	****	4.14	4.01	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1515	****	4.37	4.24	4.32	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1511	****	4.37	4.27	4.34	***
Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	ıtioı	n									

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

Course-Section: IS 325 0201

INTRO TO MANAGEMENT SC

Title

Instructor: ROBINSON, RANDA

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 11

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1046 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	7	3	4 00	1123/1674	4.25	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	3 6	4.09	790/1674		4.23	4.27	4.26	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	739/1423	4.40	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	743/1609	4.17	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	769/1585	4.20	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	1	_	4.22	703/1535	4.22	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4		4.60	393/1651	4.60	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	3		1405/1673		4.65	4.69	4.68	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	757/1656			4.07	4.07	
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	214/1586	4.70	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	811/1585	4.90	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	882/1582	4.65	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	819/1575	4.70	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	241/1380	4.55	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.60
Discussion			_			_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1520	****	4.14	4.01	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1515	****	4.37	4.24	4.32	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1511	****	4.37	4.27	4.34	****
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.96	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****
Seminar						•								
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 103	***	4.39	4.41	4.10	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10 10	0	0	0	0 1	1	0	4.00	****/ 95 ****/ 99	****	4.15	4.31	3.91 4.29	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.36 3.76	4.39 4.14	3.48	****
		· ·	ŭ	Ü	_	ŭ	Ü	3.00	, , ,		3.70		5.10	
Field Work	1.0	0	0	_	1	0	^	2 00	****/ <b>7</b> C		2 26	2 00	4 02	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.03	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.70	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10 10	0	0	0	1 1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53 ****/ 48	****	4.19 3.86	4.45 4.12	3.87 3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 49	****	3.74	4.12	3.07	****
	10	O	U	U	U	1	U	1.00	/ 40		3.74	1.2/	3.27	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.20	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	3.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35 ****/ 31	****	4.22	4.36	3.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	U	U	U	1	U	0	3.00	· · · · / 31	^^^	4.25	4.34	4.29	- ^ ^ ^

Course-Section: IS 325 0201

Title INTRO TO MANAGEMENT SC

Instructor: ROBINSON, RANDA

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1046 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

#### Course-Section: IS 350 0101 University of Maryland Title BUSINESS COMM SYSTEMS Baltimore County

Instructor: GLAZER, DINA

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 12

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1047

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equer	ncies	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 yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	854/1674	4.31	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.33
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	419/1674	4.60	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.64
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	575/1423	4.61	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.50
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	963/1609	4.23	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.17
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	452/1585	4.32	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.36
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	1	0	2	1	4	3	3.80	1110/1535	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.15	3.80
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	471/1651	4.63	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.55
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	1203/1673	4.46	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.50
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	655/1656	4.32	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.30
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	214/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.91
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	981/1585	4.78	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.73
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	236/1582	4.74	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.82
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	279/1575	4.73	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.80
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	1	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	447/1380	3.90	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.30
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	572/1520	4.67	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.33
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	483/1515	4.58	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.67
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	642/1511	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.50
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful		6	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.96	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	 รบว่า	ed fo	 or Ma			0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6		1100	2411	-u 1	J_ 1'1C	בטנ ג	5	J	Graduat	_	0	ra J	, <u>.</u>	J
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C 1		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		001	a.	_				-	011401 9	1	_	1.011		-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enouc	rh
	-	2.22 2.00	_	P 0								-	respons					,

Other

I 0

?

0

University of Maryland Baltimore County

BUSINESS COMM SYSTEMS

Instructor: Martens, Jeffre

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 7

Title

Fall 2005

Page 1048 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eauei	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General					_		_							
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	916/1674		4.23	4.27	4.26	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	495/1674	4.60	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	,	4.61		4.27	4.27	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1		4.29	812/1609		4.23	4.22	4.27	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	530/1585	4.32	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1 0	2		4.43	481/1535	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4			276/1651 1289/1673		4.20	4.18	4.16 4.68	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0 1	0	0	0	1	4	3		615/1656		4.65 4.06	4.69 4.07		4.43 4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	Т	U	U	U	Τ	2	3	4.33	013/1030	4.34	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	1224/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	737/1585	4.78	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	438/1582	4.74	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	495/1575	4.73	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1036/1380	3.90	3.94	3.94	4.01	3.50
Plananta														
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	_	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	4.67	4.14	4.01	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5 5	0	0	0	0	1		4.50	629/1515	4.58	4.14	4.01	4.32	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	642/1511	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 994	****	3.97		3.96	****
1. Wele special techniques successful	O	O	O	O	U	_	O	1.00	, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		3.57	3.71	3.70	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.91	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.48	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.03	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.70	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	3.87	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	3.27	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.20	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	3.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.29	***
2 1														

Title BUSINESS COMM SYSTEMS

Instructor: Martens, Jeffre

Enrollment: 9
Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1048 JAN 21, 2006 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	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

#### Course-Section: IS 387 0101 University of Maryland Title WEB CONTENT DEVELOPMEN Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006

Instructor: KOMLODI, ANITA

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 12

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1049

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque:	ncies	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 yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	- lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	1056/1674	4.17	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.17
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	931/1674	4.25	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.25
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	845/1423	4.25	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.25
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	852/1609	4.25	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.25
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	3	4	3.67	1121/1585	3.67	4.04	3.96	3.95	3.67
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.00
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	1	0	0	6	5	4.17	966/1651	4.17	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.17
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1072/1673	4.67	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.67
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	1	0	3	7	1	3.58	1339/1656	3.58	4.06	4.07	4.07	3.58
		T a a b	_															
1 Wome +1	ho inatro	Lectur uctor's lecture		boxonoxod	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	931/1586	4.45	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.45
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.45	786/1585	4.45	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.45
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	589/1582	4.55	4.72	4.26	4.26	4.55
		es contribute t			1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	755/1575	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.35
				our understanding	1	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.45	472/1380	4.45	3.94	3.94	4.25	4.45
5. Did au	aiovisua.	ı techniques en	nance y	our understanding	1	U	U	1	1	3	О	4.2/	4/2/1380	4.27	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.27
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	397/1520	4.50	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.50
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.50
				d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	507/1511	4.67	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.67
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		6	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	322/ 994	4.33	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.33
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio:	n									
								_					_					
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	:
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 6														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				7	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	major	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh
				P 1									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her					4						
				. 1														

1

#### Course-Section: IS 403 0101 University of Maryland Title USER INTERFACE DESIGN Baltimore County Fall 2005

Instructor: GOODALL, JOHN R

Enrollment: 18

Questionnaires: 13 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					<b>.</b>	377		_	ncies		-		ructor		Dept			
		Question	IS 		NR	NA		2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	671/1674	4.46	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.46
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	338/1674		4.26	4.23	4.31	4.69
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	718/1423		4.36	4.27	4.34	
	_	uations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	455/1609	4.54	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.54
				what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	482/1585	4.33	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.33
	_	_		to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	578/1535	4.33	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.33
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	889/1651	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.23
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	565/1673	4.92	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.92
	-			ching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.50
		Lectur	re															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	618/1586	4.69	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.69
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested :	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	896/1585	4.77	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.77
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presente	ed and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	599/1582	4.54	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.54
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	915/1575	4.31	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.31
				your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	253/1380	4.58	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.58
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	726/1520	4.17	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.17
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.50
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair an	nd open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	816/1511	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.33
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	essful		7	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	4.19	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	7	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00 07												1						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5 B 6		ке	quir	ea I	or Ma	a Jor	S	Т	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r.	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6 С 1		<b>a</b>	nera	1				4	TTrades		.3	Mar		1
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1			Ge	nera.	Т				4	Under-g	rau l	. 3	NOU-	major	1
84-150	7 0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	6 2	D 0 F 0		ר יו	ecti [.]					0	#### - 1	Moona +	homo -	nc+	020011	-h
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	۷	F 0		E.I.	ecr1.	ves				U	respons				_	ìII
				I 0		O+1	her					7	respons	es co l	e sign	ıııcaı	L	
				Ι 0		UL.	ner.					/						

Page 1050

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

University of Maryland INTRO TO DATABASE DESI

Title Instructor: MCGINNIS, JOSEP

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 24 Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1051 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	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	2	7	15	4.54	558/1674	4.39	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	13	4.38	776/1674	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	376/1423	4.39	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	2	1	6	12	4.33	743/1609	4.22	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	1	4	13	4.40	413/1585	3.95	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	1	1	4	9	4.19	747/1535	4.27	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	3	15	4.33	768/1651	4.28	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	353/1673	4.91	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	11	7	4.32	641/1656	4.05	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	3	18	4.73	560/1586	4.59	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	960/1585	4.61	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	5	16	4.57	567/1582	4.19	4.30		4.31	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	7	15	4.57	624/1575	4.24	4.32	4.27		4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	1	0	5	12	4.37	406/1380	4.15	3.94	3.94		4.37
Discussion	11	0	1	0	2	4	_	2 00	001/1500	2 04	4 1 4	4 01	4 10	2 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	901/1520	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.18	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2 1	4	7	4.38	778/1515	4.38	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11 11	7	0	0	2	3 1	9	4.62	553/1511	4.35	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.62
4. Were special techniques successful	ΤŢ	/	U	U	2	Τ	3	4.17	408/ 994	4.11	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.17
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 97	****	3.76		4.46	****
-1.11 1														
Field Work	0.1	0	^	0	1	-	1	4 00	****/ DC		2 26	2 00	1 00	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.07	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	2	0	0	0		****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	1 1	1	0	1		****/ 48 ****/ 49	****	3.86		4.13	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	U	Τ	U	1	0	3.00	****/ 49	^ ^ ^ ^	3.74	4.27	4.48	^ ^ ^ ^
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	1.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.07	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	1	1	0	1		****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	5.00	****

Title INTRO TO DATABASE DESI

Instructor: MCGINNIS, JOSEP

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1051 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	С	2	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Title INTRO TO DATABASE DESI

YOON, VICTORIA

Instructor:

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 26

# Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1052 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	0	0	2	1 /	1.0	4.31	891/1674	4.39	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.31
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	14 13	10 9		1001/1674		4.23	4.27	4.42	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	13 7	11		1016/1423	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	7	9	8		1146/1609	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.34	3.96
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	1	4	9 7	9	3.87	946/1585		4.23	3.96	4.30	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	757/1535	4.27	4.04	4.08	4.18	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	5	6	11		1097/1651	4.28	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	1	0	23	4.76	944/1673	4.91	4.65	4.69	4.23	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	6	10	3		1169/1656		4.05	4.09		3.84
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	U	_	U	U	U	10	J	3.01	1109/1030	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.10	3.01
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	11	14	4.46	916/1586	4.59	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	811/1585	4.61	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	11	11	4.27	924/1582	4.19	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	7	13	4.23	975/1575	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	385/1380	4.15	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.39
Discussion			_				_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	0	4	5	4.00	810/1520	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	857/1515	4.38	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	955/1511	4.35	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	346/ 994	4.11	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.29
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	1	1	0	1		****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	1	0	1	0	1		****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	1	1	0	1		****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.24	****
		0	0		0	0	•	2.00	,	****				****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25 25	0	0	1 1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48 ****/ 49	****	3.86	4.12	4.13	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	∠5	U	U	Т	U	U	U	∠.00	/ 49		3.74	4.27	4.48	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	5.00	****

Title INTRO TO DATABASE DESI

Instructor: YOON, VICTORIA

Enrollment: 33
Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1052 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	12
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	0						

Title INTRO TO DATABASE DESI

Chen, Zhiyaun Instructor:

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Page 1053 Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	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	7	4.33	854/1674	4.39	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	830/1674		4.26	4.23	4.31	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	575/1423	4.39	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	701/1609	4.22	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	2	5		1175/1585	3.95	4.04	3.96	4.01	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	440/1535	4.27	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	524/1651	4.28	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	4.91	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	955/1656	4.05	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.00
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	a	4.58	774/1586	4.59	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	5		1387/1585	4.61	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	2	4		1320/1582	4.19	4.72	4.26	4.70	3.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	2	5		1216/1575		4.32	4.27	4.35	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	2	2	4				3.94		4.04	
J. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding	۷	U	1		2	2	1	3.70	230/1300	4.13	3.94	3.94	1.01	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	936/1520	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.18	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	707/1515	4.38	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	927/1511	4.35	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	581/ 994	4.11	3.97	3.94	4.19	3.88
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	Ο	1	5 00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 99		4.36	4.39	4.57	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97		3.76	4.14	4.46	****
Self Paced		0	0	0	•	•	-	F 00		als als als als	4 00	4 00	F 00	***
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11 11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35 ****/ 31	****	4.22	4.36	5.00 5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	ΤŢ	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	/ 31		4.25	4.34	5.00	
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	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	9	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: IS 413 0101 Title

GUI SYSTEMS USING JAVA

Instructor: EMURIAN, HENRY

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 14

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1054 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque	ncies	;		Inst	ructor	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	gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	342/1674	4.71	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.71
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	314/1674		4.26	4.23	4.31	4.71
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	105/1423		4.36	4.27	4.34	4.93
	_	ations reflect			0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	715/1609	4.36	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.36
				what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	482/1585		4.04	3.96	4.01	4.33
	_	-		o what you learned	0	0	3	0	5	2	4		1374/1535	3.29	4.08	4.08	4.18	3.29
		g system clearly			0	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	832/1651	4.29	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.29
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	565/1673		4.65	4.69	4.67	4.93
	-			hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	131/1656		4.06	4.07	4.19	4.85
		T = ======	_															
1 Wome +h	o inat	Lectur		nwanawad	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	1 70	121/1506	4 70	1 12	1 12	1 10	1 70
		actor's lecture: ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	3 0	11 14	4.79 5.00	431/1586		4.43 4.72	4.43	4.46 4.76	4.79 5.00
					0			0	1				1/1585					
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.64	467/1582		4.30	4.26	4.31	4.64
		es contribute to			0	0	0			2	12	4.86	225/1575		4.32	4.27	4.35	4.86
5. Did aud	iovisual	techniques en	nance y	our understanding	0	0	U	1	1	1	11	4.57	259/1380	4.57	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.57
		Discus																
				what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	259/1520	4.71	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.71
		_	_	d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	242/1515	4.88	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.88
				d open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	458/1511		4.37	4.27	4.45	4.71
4. Were sp	ecial te	echniques succe	ssful		7	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	408/ 994	4.17	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.17
		Labora	tory															
1. Did the	lab inc	rease understa	nding o	f the material	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****
2. Were you	u provid	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****
3. Were ne	cessary	materials avai	lable f	or lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****
4. Did the	lab ins	structor provid	e assis	tance	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****
5. Were re	quiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****
		Semina	r															
1. Were as	signed t	copics relevant	to the	announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
	_			_	-													
Credits Ea	rned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	; 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	; 
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Rec	quire	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 4														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	7	C 1		Ger	nera:	1				6	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		$El\epsilon$	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1				_	βh
				P 0									respons	es to k	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ıer					8						
				? 0														

Course-Section: IS 420 0101 University of Maryland Title

DATABASE APPL DEVELOP Baltimore County Instructor: KARABATIS, GEOR Fall 2005

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 31

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1055

JAN 21, 2006

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	1	0	0	0	1	3	26	4.83	214/1674	4.39	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	24	4.73	292/1674	4.47	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	22	4.70	335/1423	4.53	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	25	4.83	157/1609	4.42	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	9	18	4.52	319/1585	4.30	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	3	6	17	4.54	346/1535	4.40	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	5	24	4.73	254/1651	4.24	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	11	16	4.54	359/1656	4.13	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.54
<u> </u>														
Lecture	-	•	0	0	-	_	0.17	4 05	004/1506	4 60	4 42	4 40	1 16	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	27	4.87	284/1586	4.62	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	Τ	4	25	4.80	811/1585	4.57	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	8	22	4.73	339/1582	4.47	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	6	21	4.60	579/1575	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	Τ	U	0	1	3	4	22	4.57	265/1380	4.20	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	8	20	4.66	302/1520	4.30	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.66
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	9	20	4.69	463/1515	4.23	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	4	7	18	4.48	663/1511	4.20	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.48
4. Were special techniques successful	2	11	1	0	1	3	13	4.50	205/ 994	4.13	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.50

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	31	Non-major	7
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	25	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: IS 420 0201 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County

Page 1056 JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

DATABASE APPL DEVELOP Instructor: BANDARU, PRAKAS Fall 2005

Enrollment: 24

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Ouestionnaires: 18 Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 3 7 3.83 1366/1674 4.39 4.23 4.27 4.42 3.83 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 5 10 4.33 830/1674 4.47 4.26 4.23 4.31 4.33 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 5 10 4.33 830/16/4 4.47 4.26 4.23 4.31 4.33 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 6 10 4.39 718/1423 4.53 4.36 4.27 4.34 4.39 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 2 0 1 2 5 8 4.25 852/1609 4.42 4.23 4.22 4.30 4.25 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 2 2 1 3 6 4 3.56 1187/1585 4.30 4.04 3.96 4.01 3.56 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 00 2 6 7 4.33 578/1535 4.40 4.08 4.08 4.18 4.33 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 2 5 10 4.33 768/1651 4.24 4.20 4.18 4.23 4.33 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 18 5.00 1/1673 5.00 4.65 4.69 4.67 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 4 7 2 3.85 1169/1656 4.13 4.06 4.07 4.19 3.85 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 Ω Ω 0 6 12 4.67 663/1586 4.62 4.43 4.43 4.46 4.67 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 3 1 13 4.59 1158/1585 4.57 4.72 4.69 4.76 4.59 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 2 5 11 4.50 632/1582 4.47 4.30 4.26 4.31 4.50 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 3 5 8 4.12 1090/1575 4.29 4.32 4.27 4.35 4.12 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 1 3 4 8 4.19 549/1380 4.20 3.94 3.94 4.04 4.19 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 1 1 3 2 3.50 1169/1520 4.30 4.14 4.01 4.18 3.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 2 1 2 3 3.75 1209/1515 4.23 4.37 4.24 4.40 3.75 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 2 1 1 4 3.88 1155/1511 4.20 4.37 4.27 4.45 3.88 4. Were special techniques successful 9 6 0 2 0 1 3.67 ****/ 994 4.13 3.97 3.94 4.19 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 16 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 265 **** 4.06 4.23 4.53 **** 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 278 **** 4.21 4.19 4.21 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 0 Ω 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 260 **** 4.43 4.46 4.24 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 0 0 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 259 **** 4.21 4.33 4.31 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.36 4.20 4.10 ****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	3
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Į
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	15	_			
				2	0						

#### Course-Section: IS 420 8020 University of Maryland DATABASE APPL DEVELOP Baltimore County

Title Fall 2005 Instructor: BANDARU, PRAKAS

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 6

_			
C+11don+	Courac	Erraluation	Ouestionnaire
Scudenc	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Page 1057

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equei	ncies	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 yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	607/1674	4.39	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.50
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	830/1674	4.47	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.33
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	575/1423	4.53	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.50
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	963/1609	4.42	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.17
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	121/1585	4.30	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.83
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	578/1535	4.40	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.33
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1377/1651	4.24	4.20	4.18	4.23	3.67
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	955/1656	4.13	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1074/1586	4.62	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.33
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1354/1585	4.57	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.33
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1025/1582	4.47	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.17
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1040/1575	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.17
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	845/1380	4.20	3.94	3.94	4.04	3.83
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	229/1520	4.30	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.75
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	898/1515	4.23	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.25
				d open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	896/1511	4.20	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.25
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		2	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	638/ 994	4.13	3.97	3.94	4.19	3.75
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 2		Red	 quir	 -d f	 or Ma	iors		1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2		1000	2011	-u I(	J_ 11C	- ,	-	_	Gradade	_	•	11000	-	J
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	ı				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			a.	_				-	011001 9		-	2.011		_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
2	-	2.22 2.00	=	P 0								-	respons				_	•
				I O		Ot.1	her					4			– 3		-	
				2 0		0.01						-						

Title DECISION SUPPORT SYSTE

Instructor: EVERHART, AMY

Enrollment: 33
Questionnaires: 31

RHART, AMY Fall 2005

Page 1058 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
~~~~~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	1	5	14	8	3.74	1411/1674	4.39	4.23	4.27	4.42	3.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	12	13	4.16	1026/1674	4.60	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	5	6	8	12	3.87	1121/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.34	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	5	11	11	4.14	985/1609	4.47	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	5	5	7	8	3.27	1360/1585	4.14	4.04	3.96	4.01	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	2	7	7	10		1212/1535	4.32	4.08	4.08	4.18	3.66
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	3	10	13	4.03	1077/1651	4.45	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	22	4.73	987/1673	4.86	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	7	9	9	4.00	955/1656	4.25	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.00
Loghuwa														
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	3	9	14	4 22	1074/1586	4.66	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	2	3	8	14		1397/1585	4.63	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.26
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	2	2	9	13		924/1582	4.58	4.72	4.09	4.70	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	4	10			1111/1575	4.52	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	2	2	3	6			718/1380	4.49	3.94		4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	2	2	3	О	12	3.96	/18/1380	4.49	3.94	3.94	4.04	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	1	4	4	5	3.73	1043/1520	4.42	4.14	4.01	4.18	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	930/1515	4.58	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	1030/1511	4.61	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	16	4	0	3	2	1	5	3.73	652/ 994	3.89	3.97	3.94	4.19	3.73
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 233	****		4.20	4.10	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports crearry specified	30	U	U	U	U	U	Τ.	3.00	/ 233		4.30	4.20	4.10	
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.13	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.48	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	0	0	_		****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	5.00	****
5. Here there though proceeds for all the students	50	0	0	J	J	J	_	3.00	, 51		1.23	1.51	3.00	

Title DECISION SUPPORT SYSTE

Instructor: EVERHART, AMY

Enrollment: 33
Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1058 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	19						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	12	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	3
84-150	20	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	2						

Course-Section: IS 425 0201 University of Maryland Title DECISION SUPPORT SYSTE Baltimore County

Fall 2005 Instructor: ZHANG, DONGSONG

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1059

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

					Freq				ncies	5		Inst	ructor	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	l vou gain	new insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	485/1674	4.39	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.60
	1 0	uctor make clear			1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	406/1674		4.26	4.23	4.31	4.64
		questions reflec			1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	310/1423		4.36	4.27	4.34	4.71
		luations reflect			1	0	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	614/1609		4.23	4.22	4.30	4.43
				what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	1	8	4.31	512/1585		4.04	3.96	4.01	4.31
				o what you learned	1	1	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	608/1535		4.08	4.08	4.18	4.31
		ng system clearl		-	1	0	1	0	0			4.64			4.20	4.18	4.23	4.64
	_	s was class cand			1	1	0	0	0	0			1/1673			4.69	4.67	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	7	_	0	0	2	4	2		955/1656		4.06		4.19	
J. 110W	would you	grade the overa	II ccac	ning criccerveness	,	Ü	Ü	Ü		-	-	1.00	JJJ, 1030	1.25	1.00	1.07	1.17	1.00
		Lectur	6															
1. Wer	e the inst	ructor's lecture		prepared	1	0	0	1	1	0	12	4.64	693/1586	4.66	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.64
		n the subject	1	0	0	0	2	•	11		1094/1585		4.72	4.69	4.76	4.64		
		•	2	0	0		1	2	9	4.46	690/1582		4.30	4.26	4.31	4.46		
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearl Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	2	3	9	4.50	692/1575		4.32	4.27		4.50
				our understanding	1	0	0	0	2	2	-	4.50	303/1380					4.50
J. DIC	audiovisu	ar techniques en	nance y	our understanding		2	U	U	2	2	O	1.50	303/1300	1.10	3.94	3.94	1.01	4.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	d class dis	cussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	379/1520	4.42	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.54
				d to participate	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	603/1515	4.58	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.54
				d open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	402/1511	4.61	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.77
		techniques succe		a open arreassion	2	5	1	1	0	3	3		638/ 994		3.97			3.75
i. Wei	c bpcciai	cccimitques bucce	DDIGI		_	3	_	_	Ü	3	3	3.75	030, 331	3.03	3.77	3.71	1.17	3.73
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credit	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	ре			Majors	5
00-27	7 0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	 quir	ed fo	or Ma	ior		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	5 0	1.00-1.99	0	в 6			-			_						J -		
56-83		2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	-major	2
84-15		3.00-3.49	5	D 0									5				3	
Grad.		3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0					0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ah		
	-		-	P 0	Electives						respons				_	•		
				I 0	Other				.3					-				
				? 1		0.01					_	-						

Course-Section: IS 425 8020 University of Maryland Title DECISION SUPPORT SYSTE Baltimore County Fall 2005

Ρ

I

0

0

Instructor: DeVreis, Esther

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1060

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

					Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil	_	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	214/1674	4.39	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.83
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1674	4.60	4.26	4.23	4.31	5.00
		estions reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	575/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27		4.50
	_	uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1609	4.47	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.83
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	121/1585	4.14	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.83
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contri	bute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1535	4.32	4.08	4.08	4.18	5.00
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly	expla	ained	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	330/1651	4.45	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.67
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	832/1673	4.86	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.83
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overal	l tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	185/1656	4.25	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.75
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	he instru	uctor's lectures	well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1586	4.66	4.43	4.43	4.46	5.00
2. Did th	e instruc	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1585	4.63	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00		
3. Was le	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Was lecture material presented and explained clearly							0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1582	4.58	4.30	4.26	4.31	5.00
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to	what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1575	4.52	4.32	4.27	4.35	5.00
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques enh	nance y	your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1380	4.49	3.94	3.94	4.04	5.00
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	4.42	4.14	4.01	4.18	5.00
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively end	courage	ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1515	4.58	4.37	4.24	4.40	5.00
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage f	air a	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1511	4.61	4.37	4.27	4.45	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succes	sful		0	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	390/ 994	3.89	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.20
				Frequ	ency	7 Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe.			Majors	:
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Major						S	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2 C 0	Gamana 1							0	TT		_	Mari		1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General							0	Under-g	rau	6	Non-	major	1
84-150	2 0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0 F 0	Electives							0	инии з	Moona +	homo -	n-+		-h
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	2	ų u		₽T€	SCLI	ves				U	#### - 1	means t	mere a	re not	. enoug	ÌII

Other

Title INFO SYSTEMS & SECURIT

DIAMOND, ROBERT

Instructor:

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1061 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

				equer		5			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	2	7	6	4.27	941/1674	4.27	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	1	10	4.43	705/1674		4.26	4.23	4.31	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	878/1423		4.36	4.27	4.34	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	7		1094/1609		4.23	4.22	4.30	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	307/1585		4.04	3.96	4.01	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	2	2	2	4	3.55	1273/1535	3.55	4.08	4.08	4.18	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	832/1651	4.29	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	494/1673	4.93	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	1124/1656	3.91	4.06	4.07	4.19	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	974/1586	4.43	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	811/1585		4.72	4.69	4.76	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	2	11		599/1582		4.30	4.26	4.31	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	2	9	4.21	992/1575		4.32	4.27	4.35	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	2	5	6	3.87	824/1380	3.87	3.94	3.94	4.04	3.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	0	0	5	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	148/ 994	4.67	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.67
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.13	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.48	****
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	8	Under-grad	15	Non-major	1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	5				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: IS 436 0201 University of Maryland STRUCT SYST ANALY/DESI

3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 19 0

4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance

5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified

Baltimore County Fall 2005

Title Instructor: NORCIO, ANTHONY

Enrollment: 31 Ouestionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1062 JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 260 **** 4.43 4.46 4.24 ****

0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.36 4.20 4.10 ****

19 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 259 **** 4.21 4.33 4.31 ****

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 7 4 3.67 1449/1674 3.83 4.23 4.27 4.42 3.67 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 2 6 4 9 3.95 1208/1674 3.75 4.26 4.23 4.31 3.95 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 3 7 10 4.24 861/1423 4.22 4.36 4.27 4.34 4.24 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 2 0 1 4 9 5 3.95 1172/1609 3.90 4.23 4.22 4.30 3.95 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 3 4 8 4 3.43 1282/1585 3.34 4.04 3.96 4.01 3.43 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 1 5 7 6 3.95 961/1535 3.91 4.08 4.08 4.18 3.95 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 9 12 4.57 432/1651 4.23 4.20 4.18 4.23 4.57 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 1 13 7 4.29 1397/1673 4.53 4.65 4.69 4.67 4.29 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 7 6 7 4.00 955/1656 3.70 4.06 4.07 4.19 4.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 1 3 7 4.11 1250/1586 4.05 4.43 4.43 4.46 4.11 8 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 8 11 4.58 1166/1585 4.46 4.72 4.69 4.76 4.58 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 2 4 6 7 3.95 1181/1582 3.92 4.30 4.26 4.31 3.95 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 4 1 7 7 3.89 1220/1575 3.61 4.32 4.27 4.35 3.89 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 4 2 5 2 2 4 3.07 1211/1380 3.46 3.94 3.94 4.04 3.07 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 1 4 8 4.20 700/1520 3.48 4.14 4.01 4.18 4.20 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 0 0 4 11 4.73 408/1515 4.24 4.37 4.24 4.40 4.73 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 2 3 10 4.53 618/1511 4.02 4.37 4.27 4.45 4.53 4. Were special techniques successful 6 9 0 0 2 3 1 3.83 600/994 3.83 3.97 3.94 4.19 3.83 Laboratory 0 2 5.00 ****/ 265 **** 4.06 4.23 4.53 **** 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 19 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 278 **** 4.21 4.19 4.21 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0 0 Ω

19 1 0 Frequency Distribution

0

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	 6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	6
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Į
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	18	-			
				2	0						

STRUCT SYST ANALY/DESI

Title

Instructor: KORU, GUNES A

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1063

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies Ins			Inst	tructor	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	3	3	3		1196/1674		4.23	4.27	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	2	2		1475/1674		4.26	4.23	4.31	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	894/1423		4.36	4.27	4.34	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	1	2	3		1254/1609		4.23	4.22	4.30	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	2	1		1364/1585		4.04	3.96	4.01	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	3	2		1048/1535		4.08	4.08	4.18	3.88
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	0	0	0	2	2	0	5		1240/1651		4.20	4.18	4.23	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7		929/1673		4.65	4.69	4.67	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1421/1656	3.70	4.06	4.07	4.19	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1300/1586	4.05	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	5		1354/1585		4.72	4.69	4.76	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	2		1228/1582		4.30	4.26	4.31	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	3	1		1423/1575		4.32	4.27	4.35	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	2	1	_		831/1380					
J. Did addiovisual techniques emhance your understanding			U		2	1	J	3.00	031/1300	3.40	3.74	3.94	1.01	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1434/1520	3.48	4.14	4.01	4.18	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1209/1515	4.24	4.37	4.24	4.40	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1308/1511	4.02	4.37	4.27	4.45	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	3.83	3.97	3.94	4.19	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports crearry specified	0	U	U	U	U	U		5.00	/ 233		4.30	4.20	4.10	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53		4.19	4.45	4.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.13	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.48	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out fred activities	0	U	J	J	J	U	Т	5.00	/ 49		J. /4	7.4/	7.40	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52		4.21	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	5.00	****

Title STRUCT SYST ANALY/DESI

Instructor:

Baltimore County KORU, GUNES A Fall 2005

JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 1063

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General 1		Under-grad	9	Non-major	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: IS 438 0101 University of Maryland Title PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Baltimore County Fall 2005

Instructor: RICHBURG, TASHA

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 13

Page 1064 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		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	0	3	8	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	830/1674	4.33	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	575/1423	4.50	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	743/1609	4.33	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	404/1585	4.42	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	667/1535	4.25	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	419/1651	4.58	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	757/1656	4.22	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	663/1586	4.67	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	510/1585		4.72	4.69	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	886/1575	4.33	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	1	2	7	4.17	567/1380	4.17	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	259/1520	4.71	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	266/1515		4.37	4.24	4.40	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	301/1511		4.37	4.27	4.45	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	131/ 994			3.94		4.71
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 101	****	4.33	4.41	4.42	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 95	****	4.15	4.40	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 97		3.76	4.14	4.46	****
J. Here directia for grading made crear	14	U	U	U	U	_	U	1.00	, 51		3.70	1.11	1.10	
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	utior	n									

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

INTEG TECH BUS PROC

Title

Instructor: LEWIS, CLARENCE

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 12

Baltimore County Fall 2005

University of Maryland

Page 1065 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equen 2	cies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	3	3	2		1618/1674		4.23	4.27	4.42	3.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	3	3		1535/1674	3.99	4.26	4.23	4.31	3.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	1	2	4	1		1401/1423	2.75	4.36	4.27	4.34	2.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	4	1		1552/1609	3.97	4.23	4.22	4.30	3.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	4	4	0		1517/1585	3.75	4.04	3.96	4.01	2.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1 1	2	3	0 2	2	4 3	0		1490/1535	3.82	4.08	4.08 4.18	4.18 4.23	2.78 2.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	9		1608/1651 868/1673	3.42 4.77	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	5	1	_		1494/1656	3.68	4.05	4.09	4.19	3.20
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	U	Τ.		5	_	2	3.20	1494/1030	3.00	1.00	1.07	4.19	3.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	0	6	2	3.70	1430/1586	4.35	4.43	4.43	4.46	3.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	1535/1585	4.35	4.72	4.69	4.76	3.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	1	2	3	3.30	1464/1582	4.15	4.30	4.26	4.31	3.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	1	2	3	3.10	1474/1575	4.05	4.32	4.27	4.35	3.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	4	1	0	1	2.25	1347/1380	3.63	3.94	3.94	4.04	2.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	726/1520	4.58	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	629/1515	4.75	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	642/1511	4.75	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	2	1	0	0	2						4.19	2.80
1. Hold Special decimiques successful	ŭ	_	_	_	ŭ	Ü	_	2.00	33., 331	2.00	3.,,	3.71	,	2.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1			****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	5.00	4.39	4.41	4.42	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	5.00	4.33	4.48	4.65	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	5.00	4.15	4.31	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	5.00	4.36	4.39	4.57	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	5.00	3.76	4.14	4.46	****
ni da wada														
Field Work	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	****/ 76	****	2 26	2 00	1 00	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 76 ****/ 77	****	3.36	3.98 3.93	4.86	****
 Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria Was the instructor available for consultation 	11 11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 53	****	3.65 4.19	4.45	4.24	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.13	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 49	****	3.74		4.13	****
J. Did conferences help you carry out freid activities	11	U	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	/ 40		3.71	1.2/	1.10	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		,	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	5.00	***

Course-Section: IS 440 0101

Title INTEG TECH BUS PROC

Instructor: LEWIS, CLARENCE

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1065 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: IS 440 0201 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1066 JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Title INTEG TECH BUS PROC Instructor: EMURIAN, HENRY Fall 2005

Enrollment: 11 Ouestionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 5 4.71 342/1674 3.90 4.23 4.27 4.42 4.71 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 5 4.57 495/1674 3.99 4.26 4.23 4.31 4.57 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 6 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1423 2.75 4.36 4.27 4.34 **** 0 1 6 4.86 147/1609 3.97 4.23 4.22 4.30 4.86 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 3 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 167/1585 3.75 4.04 3.96 4.01 4.75 0 0 1 6 4.86 112/1535 3.82 4.08 4.08 4.18 4.86 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 832/1651 3.42 4.20 4.18 4.23 4.29 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 1015/1673 4.77 4.65 4.69 4.67 4.71 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 1 3 2 4.17 827/1656 3.68 4.06 4.07 4.19 4.17 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 Ω Ω Ω Ω 0 3 5.00 1/1586 4.35 4.43 4.43 4.46 5.00 0 0 4 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 1/1585 4.35 4.72 4.69 4.76 5.00 0 0 3 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 1/1582 4.15 4.30 4.26 4.31 5.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1575 4.05 4.32 4.27 4.35 5.00 0 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1380 3.63 3.94 3.94 4.04 5.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1520 4.58 4.14 4.01 4.18 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1515 4.75 4.37 4.24 4.40 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1511 4.75 4.37 4.27 4.45 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 6 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 994 2.80 3.97 3.94 4.19 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 265 **** 4.06 4.23 4.53 **** 1 5.00 ****/ 278 **** 4.21 4.19 4.21 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0 Ω Ω Ω Ω 0 1 5.00 ****/ 260 **** 4.43 4.46 4.24 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6 0 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 259 **** 4.21 4.33 4.31 **** 6 0 0 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.36 4.20 4.10 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 0 2 5.00 1/ 103 5.00 4.39 4.41 4.42 5.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 5 Ω 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 101 5.00 4.33 4.48 4.65 5.00 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 5 Ω 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 95 5.00 4.15 4.31 4.60 5.00 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 99 5.00 4.36 4.39 4.57 5.00 0 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 5 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 97 5.00 3.76 4.14 4.46 5.00 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 3.36 3.98 4.86 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 1 5.00 ****/ 77 **** 3.65 3.93 4.24 **** 6 0 0 0 0 0 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 0 1 5.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.19 4.45 4.86 **** 6 0 0 0 0 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 3.86 4.12 4.13 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 49 **** 3.74 4.27 4.48 ****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 7 .

Course-Section: IS 448 0101 Title

MARKUP & SCRIPTING LAN

Instructor: CANFIELD, GERAL

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 5 Fall 2005

Baltimore County

Page 1067

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

								_	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
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1026/1674	4.20	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.20
		tor make clear			0	0	1	0	3	1	0		1642/1674		4.26	4.23	4.31	2.80
3. Did the	e exam que	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	1413/1423	2.40	4.36	4.27	4.34	2.40
4. Did otl	her evalua	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1603/1609	2.50	4.23	4.22	4.30	2.50
5. Did as	signed rea	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1297/1585	3.40	4.04	3.96	4.01	3.40
		_		o what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1499/1535	2.67	4.08	4.08	4.18	2.67
		system clearl		ined	0	0	0	1	2	2	0		1537/1651		4.20	4.18	4.23	3.20
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	1			887/1673		4.65	4.69	4.67	4.80
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	1592/1656	2.80	4.06	4.07	4.19	2.80
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	prepared	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1528/1586	3.20	4.43	4.43	4.46	3.20	
2. Did the	e instruct	tor seem inter	n the subject	0	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1559/1585	3.40	4.72	4.69	4.76	3.40	
3. Was le	cture mate	erial presente	xplained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	1504/1582	3.00	4.30	4.26	4.31	3.00	
4. Did the	e lecture:	you learned	0	0	1	2	1	0	1	2.60	1543/1575	2.60	4.32	4.27	4.35	2.60		
5. Did aud	diovisual	our understanding	0	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	1311/1380	2.60	3.94	3.94	4.04	2.60		
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1488/1520	2.33	4.14	4.01	4.18	2.33
2. Were a	ll student	ts actively en	courage	d to participate	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	1507/1515	1.67	4.37	4.24	4.40	1.67
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	1510/1511	1.33	4.37	4.27	4.45	1.33
		Labora	torv															
1. Did the	e lab inc		-	f the material	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****
				ground information	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****
				or lab activities	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****
4. Did the	e lab ins	tructor provid	e assis	tance	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****
5. Were re	equirement	ts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	ribu	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	:			Ту	ne			Majors	
										- – – –								
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors		2	Graduat	е	1	Majo	r	0
28-55 56-83	0	1.00-1.99	0 0	B 1 C 1		Cox	neral					1	Under-g	rad	4	Mon	maion	2
84-150	1	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	1	D 0		Gen	ıcıdı	L				т	onder-9	ı au	4	MOI1-	major	۷
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		r1-	ectiv	760				0	#### -	Meane +	here a	re not	enoud	h
Grau.	1	3.30-4.00	_	P 0		11 T C	-CL1\	GD,				U	respons					11
				P 0		0+1						1	T CPFOIIP	CD LO L	c argii	ıııcan		

Other

1

I 0

?

Course-Section: IS 450 0101 University of Maryland Title DATA COMM & NETWORKS Baltimore County Instructor: MEISE, JOHN D

40

Page 1068 JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 21 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	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	vou gain r	new insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	3	10	8	4.24	979/1674	4.07	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.24
		actor make clear			0	0	0	1	4	8	8		1083/1674		4.26	4.23	4.31	4.10
		questions reflec			1	0	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	750/1423		4.36	4.27	4.34	4.35
		luations reflect			1	1	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	771/1609	4.03	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.32
				what you learned	1	2	1	2	8	3	4		1306/1585		4.04	3.96	4.01	3.39
				what you learned	1	3	0	1	6	5	5	3.82	1092/1535	3.65	4.08	4.08	4.18	3.82
		ng system clearl		-	1	0	0	0	5	5	10	4.25	866/1651	4.07	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.25
	_	s was class canc			1	0	1	0	1	0	18	4.70	1040/1673	4.85	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.70
9. How	would you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	1	5	5	6	3.94	1056/1656	3.93	4.06	4.07	4.19	3.94
	-			_														
		Lectur	е															
1. Wer	e the inst	ructor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	1	0	7	6	5	3.74	1421/1586	3.89	4.43	4.43	4.46	3.74
2. Did	the instru	actor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	713/1585	4.70	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.84
3. Was	lecture ma	aterial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	2	0	1	0	9	4	5	3.63	1359/1582	3.69	4.30	4.26	4.31	3.63
4. Did	the lectur	res contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	793/1575	4.09	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.42
5. Did	audiovisua	al techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	7	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	666/1380	3.50	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.00
		Discus																
				what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	645/1520		4.14	4.01	4.18	4.25
				d to participate	13	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	523/1515		4.37	4.24	4.40	4.63
3. Did	the instru	uctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	544/1511	4.31	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.63
4. Wer	e special t	techniques succe	ssful		13	5	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 994	3.00	3.97	3.94	4.19	****
				Frequ	ıency	7 Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credit	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Red	quir	 ed fo	 วะ M	 aior		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo		0
28-55		1.00-1.99	0	B 8		100	-1 0.1.1	-a -t	O. 1.1	<u>ـ ۲</u>	~	•	Gradac	_	•	1100	-	J
56-83		2.00-2.99	3	C 1		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	21	Non-	major	2
84-15		3.00-3.49	3	D 0			a.	_				-	011401 9	2	_	2.021		-
Grad.		3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives						0	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enous	ιh	
3244.	ŭ	2.20 2.00	-	P 0								-	respons				_	,
				I 0		O+1	her				1	.8			3-		-	
				? 0							_	-						

Course-Section: IS 450 0201

Title DATA COMM & NETWORKS

Instructor: Martens, Jeffre

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 20

Baltimore County Fall 2005

University of Maryland

Page 1069 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque:	ncies	3		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	1	5	9	5		1322/1674			4.27	4.42	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	5	7	3.80	1340/1674	3.95	4.26	4.23	4.31	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	4	4	7	3.68	1203/1423	4.02	4.36	4.27	4.34	3.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	4	7	3.75	1320/1609	4.03	4.23	4.22	4.30	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	6	6	5	3.65	1128/1585	3.52	4.04	3.96	4.01	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	11	4	3	3.47	1306/1535	3.65	4.08	4.08	4.18	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	7	7	3.90	1228/1651	4.07	4.20	4.18	4.23	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1673	4.85	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	1090/1656	3.93	4.06	4.07	4.19	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	5	6	8		1275/1586	3.89	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	5	13		1183/1585	4.70	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	6	7	5		1302/1582	3.69	4.30	4.26	4.31	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	3	7			1289/1575	4.09		4.27	4.35	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	3	3	7	3	3	3.00	1217/1380	3.50	3.94	3.94	4.04	3.00
_,														
Discussion	11	0	0	_	0	_	_	4 00	010/1500	4 12	4 1 4	4 01	4 10	4 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	810/1520	4.13	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	2	3	3		1197/1515	4.20	4.37	4.24	4.40	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	2	2	4		1050/1511	4.31	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	3	1	1	1	3.00	881/ 994	3.00	3.97	3.94	4.19	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	1	1	0		,	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 260	****	4.43	4.19	4.21	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 259	****	4.21		4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 233	****	4.36	4.33	4.10	****
5. Were requirements for tab reports creatry specified	13	U	U	U		U	U	3.00	/ 233		4.30	4.20	4.10	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00		****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****
g g														
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.13	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.48	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 61	****		4.09	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	5.00	***

Course-Section: IS 450 0201

Title DATA COMM & NETWORKS

Instructor: Martens, Jeffre

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1069 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General		Under-grad	20	Non-major	2
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: IS 451 0101

Title NETWORK DESIGN & MGMT

Instructor: GLAZER, DINA

THE CLUCKOL. CENTER.

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2005

Page 1070 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	auer	cies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	751/1674		4.23	4.27	4.42	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	7	4		1401/1674		4.26	4.23	4.31	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	7	3		1226/1423	4.14	4.36	4.27	4.34	3.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	4	4			1313/1609	4.26	4.23	4.22	4.30	3.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	2		4.25	557/1585	4.63	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	1	0	1	0	2		****/1535	5.00	4.08	4.08	4.18	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	5		4.19	945/1651		4.20	4.18	4.23	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0			4.75	958/1673	4.88	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	5	5	2	3.75	1237/1656	4.13	4.06	4.07	4.19	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	1054/1586	4.68	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	4	9		1166/1585	4.79	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	6	4		1199/1582	4.46	4.30	4.26	4.31	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	4	2			1274/1575	4.39		4.27	4.35	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	4	6			845/1380				4.04	3.83
1														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	1	1	3		1210/1520	4.11	4.14	4.01	4.18	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	2	3	0			1374/1515	3.84	4.37	4.24	4.40	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	3	2			1166/1511	4.33		4.27	4.45	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	4.19	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.13	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.48	****
		-	-	-	-	-	_		,					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	5.00	****

Course-Section: IS 451 0101

Title NETWORK DESIGN & MGMT

Instructor: GLAZER, DINA

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1070 JAN 21, 2006 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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7	1					
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: IS 451 0201 University of Maryland Title NETWORK DESIGN & MGMT Baltimore County

Instructor: GLAZER, DINA

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 8

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1071

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	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	1	1	6	4.63	458/1674	4.52	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	433/1674	4.17	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	431/1423	4.14	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	222/1609	4.26	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1585	4.63	4.04	3.96	4.01	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.08	4.08	4.18	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1651	4.59	4.20	4.18	4.23	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	4.88	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	381/1656	4.13	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1586	4.68	4.43	4.43	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1585	4.79	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1582	4.46	4.30	4.26	4.31	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1575	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.35	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	89/1380	4.35	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	191/1520	4.11	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	759/1515	3.84	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	358/1511	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	4.19	****
Eream		Dia	- m i bı	.+ : 0.	-									

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

Course-Section: IS 451M 0201

Title LAN MGT USING MICROSOF

Instructor: SHUJA, HUSSAN

Enrollment: 22

Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1072 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		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	3	13	4.71	354/1674		4.23	4.27	4.42	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	325/1674	4.71	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	505/1423	4.56	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	2	0	1	2	4		1377/1609	3.67	4.23		4.30	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	3	1	9	4.21	593/1585	4.21	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2			351/1651	4.65	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13			1434/1673	4.24	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.24
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	1	7	5	4.07	912/1656	4.07	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.07
Lecture	1	0	0	^	1	1	1 1	4 01	271 /1506	4 01	4 42	4 42	1 10	4 01
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2		4.81	371/1586	4.81	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	-	-	-	-	_	14	4.88	640/1585	4.88	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4		4.75	313/1582	4.75	4.30	4.26		4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2		4.75	359/1575	4.75	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	U	2	2	10	4.57	259/1380	4.57	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.5/
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	295/1520	4.67	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	523/1515	4.63	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	544/1511	4.63	4.37	4.24	4.45	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	614/ 994	3.80	3.97	3.94	4.45	3.80
4. Wele special techniques successful	9	3	U	U	3	U	۷	3.00	014/ 994	3.00	3.31	3.34	4.13	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	2	2	4 50	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	1	3		****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	3		****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	1	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	4		****/ 233	****	4.36		4.10	****
J. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specifica		Ü	O	Ü	J	Ü	-	3.00	, 233		1.50	1.20	1.10	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76		4.46	****
-														
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.13	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.48	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	5.00	****

Course-Section: IS 451M 0201

Title LAN MGT USING MICROSOF

Instructor: SHUJA, HUSSAN

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1072 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General		Under-grad	16	Non-major	3
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: IS 451U 0101

LAN MGNT USING UNIX

Title PELKEY, KEVIN Instructor:

Enrollment:

15 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1073 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

	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	1	2	1	1	4 00	1196/1674	4 00	4.23	4.27	1 12	4 00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4 5	4 6	4.55	530/1674	4.55	4.25	4.27	4.42 4.31	4.00 4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	417/1423	4.64	4.36	4.23	4.34	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	2	1		743/1609	4.33	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	4	0	2	1	0		1572/1585	2.00	4.04	3.96	4.01	2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	1	5		119/1535	4.83	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	471/1651	4.55	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	1001/1673	4.73	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	8	1	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	5		1225/1585	4.50	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	525/1582	4.60	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	453/1575	4.70	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	463/1380	4.29		3.94		4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	2	2		1092/1520	3.67	4.14	4.01	4.18	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	827/1515	4.33	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	3		816/1511	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	4.19	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 77	****		3.93	4.24	****
2000 020020		-	-	-	-	-	_		, , ,					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	***	4.21	4.26	5.00	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ition	ı									

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

Course-Section: IS 452C 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County Instructor: SHUJA, HUSSAN Fall 2005

Enrollment:

19

niversity of Maryland Page 1074
Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 14 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	Questionnaires:	14	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
--	-----------------	----	----------------	------------	---------------

					Fr	eanei	ncies	:		Inst	ructor	Course	. Dept.	UMBC:	Level	Sect		
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	Mean
1 Did 110	aain na	Genera w insights,ski		om this source	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.50
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21		4.21	4.26	4.27	4.42	
		estions reflec			0	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	750/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.36
		ations reflect			0	4	0	2	3	1	4		1355/1609	3.70	4.23	4.22	4.30	3.70
				what you learned	0	3	2	0	1	2	6	3.91	907/1585	3.91	4.04	3.96	4.01	3.91
				to what you learned	0	5	1	1	2	2	3		1267/1535	3.56	4.08	4.08	4.18	3.56
		system clearl			0	0	0	2	2	2	8		988/1651	4.14	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.14
		was class cand		211100	1	0	0	0	2	8	3		1537/1673	4.08	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.08
	-			ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	,		4.06		4.19	4.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture		prepared	1	0	0	0	4	1	8	4.31	1104/1586	4.31	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.31
2. Did th	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested :	in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	1035/1585	4.69	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.69
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	798/1582	4.38	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.38
		s contribute t		1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	742/1575	4.46	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.46	
		your understanding	1	0	1	1	1	2	8	4.15	576/1380	4.15	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.15		
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	1	1	1	0	5	3.88	942/1520	3.88	4.14	4.01	4.18	3.88
2. Were a	ll studen	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	6	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.50
3. Did th	e instruc	tor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	278/1511	4.88	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.88
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		6	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	4.19	****
		Labora	tory															
1. Did th	e lab inc	rease understa	nding o	of the material	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****
2. Were y	ou provid	led with adequa	te bacl	kground information	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****
				for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****
		structor provid			12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****
5. Were r	equiremen	its for lab rep	orts c	learly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****
			Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n										
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	\$		
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 10							ed fo	or Ma	ior	 s	1	Graduat	 e	4	Majo	 or	0
28-55							-1 ~ -1 .		10	-)	_	_	or adda c	-	-		-	ŭ
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				8	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	-major	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	8	D 0									5				3	-
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	_i h
P 0													respons				_	
I 0						Otl	ner					4	_		5			

Baltimore County

Fall 2005

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1075

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: IS 474 8020 University of Maryland Title LEGAL ASPECTS OF IS Instructor: SPONAUGLE, RICH

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

8

4. Were special techniques successful

~		~												
	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	2	6	4.75	298/1674	4.75	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	270/1674	4.75	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	431/1423	4.63	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	101/1585	4.88	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	481/1535	4.43	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	231/1651	4.75	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	257/1656	4.67	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.43	4.43	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.31	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.35	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	96/1380	4.86	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	Λ	7	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.14	4.01	4.18	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.40	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.45	5.00
J. Did the instructor encourage rair and open discussion		U	U	J	U	J	1	5.00	1/1311	5.00	T.3/	7.4/	7.43	5.00

Frequency Distribution

1 1 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 205/994 4.50 3.97 3.94 4.19 4.50

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	8	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: IS 498A 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County Acctg Info Systems Fall 2005

? 1

Instructor: Eisenman S.

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1076

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

						Frequencies					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 yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	991/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.22
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	519/1674	4.56	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.56
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	146/1423	4.89	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.89
	_	uations reflect		_	0	1	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1007/1609	4.13	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.13
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	326/1585	4.50	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.50
				o what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	0	4	3.88	1048/1535	3.88	4.08	4.08	4.18	3.88
		g system clearl			0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1020/1651	4.11	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.11
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1072/1673	4.67	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.67
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	561/1656	4.38	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.38
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	1034/1586	4.38	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.38
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	640/1585	4.88	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.88
		3	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	808/1582	4.38	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.38		
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearl . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned							1	1	2	4	4.13	1080/1575	4.13	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.13
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	143/1380	4.75	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.75
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.00
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.40	5.00
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.45	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	_	5	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	4.19	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	:
														- 				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General						1	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	-major	4	
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives						2	#### - 1				_	βh	
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					5						

Course-Section: IS 498B 0101

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Program for Biomed Inf

Instructor: Liu, H. Enrollment: 40

Questionnaires: 13

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2005

Page 1077 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questions			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	1	1	1	4	6	4 00	1196/1674	4.00	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	1	8		1146/1674		4.25	4.27	4.42	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	517/1423	4.56	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	0	2	8	4.33	743/1609	4.33	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	452/1585	4.36	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	1	2	7	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	0	1	9		1050/1651	4.08	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	944/1673	4.77	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	3	1	4	2		1377/1656	3.50	4.06	4.07	4.19	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	2	1	8		1265/1586	4.08	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	1374/1585	4.31	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	1	2	6		1367/1582	3.62	4.30	4.26	4.31	3.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	1	1	7		1284/1575	3.77	4.32	4.27	4.35	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	1	1	7	4.09	626/1380	4.09	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	700/1520	4.20	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	944/1515	4.20	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	955/1511	4.20	4.37		4.45	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 233	***	4.36	4.20	4.10	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.13	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.48	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	5.00	****

Course-Section: IS 498B 0101

Title Program for Biomed Inf

Instructor: Liu, H.

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1077 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: IS 600 0101

Title IS IMPLEMENTATION Instructor: KORU, GUNES A

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 9 Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1078 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean			Sect Mean
General	^	0	0	2	2	4	1	2 44	1521/1674	2 44	4 02	4 07	1 11	2 44
 Did you gain new insights, skills from this course Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 	0	0	0	2 1	2	4 4	1		1531/1674 1475/1674	3.44	4.23	4.27 4.23	4.44 4.34	3.44 3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	3	2	1		1326/1423	3.29	4.36	4.27	4.28	3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	2		1377/1609	3.67	4.23	4.22	4.34	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	2		1267/1585	3.44	4.04	3.96	4.23	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.08	4.08	4.27	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1020/1651	4.11	4.20	4.18	4.32	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	929/1673	4.78	4.65	4.69	4.78	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.06	4.07	4.15	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	0	6		1168/1586	4.22		4.43	4.50	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	4		1354/1585	4.33	4.72	4.69	4.79	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	4	2		1348/1582	3.67	4.30	4.26	4.33	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	2	2		1452/1575	3.22	4.32	4.27	4.30	3.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	810/1380	3.89	3.94	3.94	3.85	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	2	1		1284/1520	3.25	4.14	4.01	4.19	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	2	2	1	3		1267/1515	3.63	4.37	4.24	4.47	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	3	1			1004/1511	4.13	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	1	2	1	Τ	3.40	784/ 994	3.40	3.97	3.94	4.07	3.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	132/ 265	4.33	4.06	4.23	4.51	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	130/ 278	4.33	4.21	4.19	4.42	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	175/ 260	4.33	4.43	4.46	4.67	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.66	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	108/ 233	4.33	4.36	4.20	4.53	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	1	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.56	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	69/ 101	4.33	4.33	4.48	4.62	4.33
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	62/ 95	4.00	4.15	4.31	4.43	4.00
 Did presentations contribute to what you learned Were criteria for grading made clear 	6 6	1	0	0	1 1	1 1	0 1	4.00	****/ 99 50/ 97	4.00	4.36 3.76	4.39 4.14	4.54 4.26	4.00
5. Were Criteria for grading made Crear	O	U	U	U	Τ.	1	1	4.00	50/ 97	4.00	3.70	4.14	4.20	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	46/ 77	3.67	3.65	3.93	4.31	3.67
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	35/ 53	4.33	4.19	4.45	4.64	4.33
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	1	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.35	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.46	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.46	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	29/ 52	4.00	4.21	4.26	4.59	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	1	0	2		32/ 50	4.33	4.23	4.44	4.64	4.33
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	21/ 35	4.33	4.22	4.36	4.84	4.33
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	18/ 31	4.33	4.25	4.34	4.64	4.33

Course-Section: IS 600 0101

Title IS IMPLEMENTATION

Instructor: KORU, GUNES A

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1078 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: IS 601 0101 Title

FOUNDATIONS OF IS

Instructor: GUO, ZHILING

Enrollment: 31 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1079 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	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	2	1	8	6	5	3.50	1511/1674	3.50	4.23	4.27	4.44	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	9	8	4.05	1118/1674	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1016/1423	4.00	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	6	7	3.73	1341/1609	3.73	4.23	4.22	4.34	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	5	7	4		1306/1585	3.38	4.04	3.96	4.23	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2		12	4		1140/1535	3.76	4.08	4.08	4.27	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	6	2	6	4		1562/1651	3.00	4.20	4.18	4.32	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	1			887/1673	4.81	4.65	4.69	4.78	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	4	7	4			1490/1656			4.07		3.21
y. Now would you grade one everall bedoming ellectiveness	_	_	_	•	•	-		3.21	11507 1050	3.21	1.00	1.07	1115	3.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	5	6	10	4.14	1230/1586	4.14	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	11	9		1367/1585	4.32	4.72	4.69	4.79	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	4	5	7	3		1453/1582		4.30	4.26	4.33	3.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	6	5	5		1429/1575		4.32	4.27	4.30	3.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	2	4	9	-		930/1380		3.94			3.71
J. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding	U	1	_	2	-	2	J	3.71	930/1300	3.71	3.71	J. J.	3.03	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	7	4	7	3.89	930/1520	3.89	4.14	4.01	4.19	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	5	3	11	4.32	847/1515	4.32	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.32
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	886/1511	4.26	4.37		4.49	4.26
4. Were special techniques successful	3	9	1	2	4	2	1	3.00	881/ 994	3.00	3.97		4.07	3.00
4. Were special techniques successium	3	9		4	4	4		3.00	001/ 994	3.00	3.91	3.94	4.07	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.51	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 259	****	4.21	4.19	4.66	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 233	****		4.33	4.53	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	****/ 233		4.36	4.20	4.53	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.56	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.41	4.62	****
	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 95	****				****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned						-	_		,	****	4.15	4.31	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	U	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	^ ^ ^ ^	3.76	4.14	4.26	* * * * *
Field Work														
	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 76	****	2 26	2 00	4 20	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21					0	1		,	****	3.36	3.98	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 77		3.65	3.93	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.64	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.35	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.46	****
0.15 7 1														
Self Paced	0.1	0	•	•	•	0	-	F 00		ale ale ale al	4 00	4 00	4 46	de de de de
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.46	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.59	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.64	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	4.84	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.64	****

Course-Section: IS 601 0101 Title

FOUNDATIONS OF IS GUO, ZHILING

Instructor: Enrollment:

31 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1079 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Tarned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	5	А	18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	12	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there a	re not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sign:	ificant	
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	1						

Course-Section: IS 603 0101 University of Maryland Title DECISION MAKING SUPPOR Baltimore County Fall 2005

Ρ

I

?

0

0

1

Instructor: ZHANG, DONGSONG

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 18

a. 1 .	~		
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Page 1080

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

								equer		s			ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did vo	nı gain nev	w insights,skil		om this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	432/1674	4.65	4.23	4.27	4.44	4.65
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	379/1674	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.67
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	445/1423	4.61	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.61
	_	ations reflect		_	1	0	0	0	1	10	6	4.29	799/1609	4.29	4.23	4.22	4.34	4.29
				what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	622/1585	4.19	4.04	3.96	4.23	4.19
				to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	528/1535	4.39	4.08	4.08	4.27	4.39
7. Was th	e grading	system clearly	expla	ained	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	382/1651	4.61	4.20	4.18	4.32	4.61
8. How ma	ny times v	was class cance	lled		0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.78	5.00
9. How wo	ould you gr	rade the overal	l tead	ching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	207/1656	4.73	4.06	4.07	4.15	4.73
		Lecture																
1 Wara t	ho inatru	ctor's lectures		propared	Λ	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	336/1586	4.83	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.83
		tor seem intere		1 1	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	615/1585	4.89	4.72	4.69	4.79	4.89
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	510/1582	4.61	4.30	4.26	4.33	4.61
		s contribute to			0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	495/1575	4.67	4.32	4.27	4.30	4.67
				your understanding	1	0	0	0	3	9	5	4.12	612/1380		3.94			4.12
		1											,					
		Discuss	ion															
1. Did cl	ass discus	ssions contribu	te to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	529/1520	4.39	4.14	4.01	4.19	4.39
				ed to participate	0	0	0	0	2	5	11		629/1515	4.50	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.50
		_		nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	707/1511		4.37	4.27	4.49	4.44
4. Were s	special ted	chniques succes	sful		1	8	3	2	4	0	0	2.11	976/ 994	2.11	3.97	3.94	4.07	2.11
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	1									
Credits E	arnod	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Pos	son	a			Ту	20			Majors	
	.arneu 	Cuiii. GPA		Expected Grades						5 							Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 10		Rec	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	1	Graduat	e 1	4	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0											_			
Grad.	14	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a		enoug	jh

Other

15

Course-Section: IS 620 0101

Title ADV DATABASE PROJECTS

Chen, Zhiyaun

Instructor:

Enrollment: 31 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1081 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	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	1	3	9		4.28	916/1674		4.23	4.27	4.44	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	10	9		1060/1674	4.12	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	13	4.36	739/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	3	4	14	4.30	786/1609	4.30	4.23		4.34	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	5	0	3	6	7		1245/1585	3.48	4.04	3.96	4.23	3.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	215/1535	4.70	4.08	4.08	4.27	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	5	16	4.50	524/1651	4.50	4.20	4.18	4.32	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.78	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	2	4	8	3	3.56	1353/1656	3.56	4.06	4.07	4.15	3.56
Lecture	0	0	1	1	4	4	1 -	4 04	1160/1506	4 0 4	4 42	4 42	4 50	4 04
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	4	4 5	15 15		1160/1586	4.24	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	-	2	3	9			1361/1585	4.32	4.72	4.69	4.79	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1 2	2	3		8		1208/1582		4.30	4.26	4.33	3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2 1		2	2 5	0	6	13 7		1070/1575	4.13	4.32	4.27		4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	5	1	5	/	3.50	1036/1380	3.50	3.94	3.94	3.85	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	5	4	8	3.95	878/1520	3.95	4.14	4.01	4.19	3.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	1	7	9	4.16	966/1515	4.16	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.16
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	4	6	7		1144/1511	3.89	4.37	4.27	4.49	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	6	8	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	3.97	3.94		4.00
1. Were special ecciniques successivi	O	O	U	_	2	-	1	1.00	1/1/ 551	1.00	3.57	3.71	1.07	1.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.51	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.42	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.67	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.66	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 233	****	4.36		4.53	****
									,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.56	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.62	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.26	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.64	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.35	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.46	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.46	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.59	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.64	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	4.84	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.64	****

Course-Section: IS 620 0101

Title ADV DATABASE PROJECTS

Instructor: Chen, Zhiyaun

Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1081 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	 16	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	9	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: IS 636 0101

Title STRUC SYS ANALY & DES

20

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 17

Enrollment:

NORCIO, ANTHONY

Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1082 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	equer	ncie	q		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	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	2	1	5	9	4.24	979/1674	4.24	4.23	4.27	4.44	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	956/1674	4.24	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1016/1423	4.00	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	4	2	7	3.81	1278/1609	3.81	4.23	4.22	4.34	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	575/1585	4.24	4.04	3.96	4.23	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	528/1535	4.38	4.08	4.08	4.27	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	4	3	7	3.94	1188/1651	3.94	4.20	4.18	4.32	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	5	4.29	1390/1673	4.29	4.65	4.69	4.78	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	655/1656	4.31	4.06	4.07	4.15	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	1160/1586	4.24	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	1	13	4.59	1158/1585	4.59	4.72	4.69	4.79	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	892/1582	4.29	4.30	4.26	4.33	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3			1030/1575	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.30	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	2	0	1	1	1		1280/1380	2.80	3.94	3.94	3.85	2.80
Discussion	2	0	0	0	2	2	1.0	4 52	270/1520	4 52	1 1 1	4 01	1 10	4 52
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2 2	0	0	0	2	3 3	10 12	4.53	379/1520	4.53	4.14	4.01	4.19	4.53 4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.80	325/1515 289/1511	4.80 4.87	4.37	4.24 4.27	4.47 4.49	4.80
	2	8	2	0	1	1			773/ 994					3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	2	8	2	U	1	Т	3	3.43	113/ 994	3.43	3.97	3.94	4.07	3.43
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.51	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.42	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.67	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.66	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	***	4.36	4.20	4.53	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.56	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.62	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.26	* * * *
Field Work														
	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	****/ 76	****	2 26	2 00	4 00	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16						1			****	3.36	3.98	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, , ,	****	3.65	3.93	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53		4.19	4.45	4.64	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.35	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	* * * *	3.74	4.27	4.46	^ ^ ^ ^
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.46	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.59	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.64	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	4.84	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.64	****

Course-Section: IS 636 0101

Title STRUC SYS ANALY & DES

Instructor:

STRUC SYS ANALY & DES NORCIO, ANTHONY

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 1082 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: IS 650 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2005

Title DATA COMM & NETWORKS Instructor: LIU, HONGFANG

Enrollment: 9

Questionnaires: 9

JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 1083

					Fre	equei	ncies	;		Inst	tructor		Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Ran	ık		_		Mean	Mean
	General																
1. Did vou o	gain new insights,skills from	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	854/1	674	4.33	4.23	4.27	4.44	4.33
	instructor make clear the ex		0	0	0	1	1	4	3		1146/1			4.26	4.23	4.34	4.00
	exam questions reflect the ex		0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	771/1		4.33	4.36			4.33
	r evaluations reflect the exp	_	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43			4.43	4.23	4.22	4.34	
	gned readings contribute to		0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44		585	4.44	4.04	3.96	4.23	4.44
_	ten assignments contribute to	_	0	0	0	0	1	0	8			535	4.78	4.08	4.08	4.27	4.78
7. Was the	grading system clearly explain	ined	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	458/1	651	4.56	4.20	4.18	4.32	4.56
8. How many	times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1	673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.78	5.00
9. How would	d you grade the overall teach	ning effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	381/1	656	4.50	4.06	4.07	4.15	4.50
	Lecture																
1. Were the	instructor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	805/1	586	4.56	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.56
2. Did the i	instructor seem interested in	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1071/1	585	4.67	4.72	4.69	4.79	4.67
3. Was lecti	ure material presented and ex	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	438/1	582	4.67	4.30	4.26	4.33	4.67
4. Did the 1	lectures contribute to what	you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	327/1	575	4.78	4.32	4.27	4.30	4.78
5. Did audio	ovisual techniques enhance y	our understanding	1	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	817/1	380	3.88	3.94	3.94	3.85	3.88
	Discussion																
1. Did class	s discussions contribute to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	810/1	520	4.00	4.14	4.01	4.19	4.00
2. Were all	students actively encouraged	d to participate	3	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	960/1	515	4.17	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.17
3. Did the i	instructor encourage fair and	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	816/1	511	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.33
4. Were spec	cial techniques successful		3	2	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	977/	994	2.00	3.97	3.94	4.07	2.00
	Laboratory																
1. Did the 1	lab increase understanding of	f the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	265	****	4.06	4.23	4.51	****
2. Were you	provided with adequate back	ground information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	278	****	4.21	4.19	4.42	****
3. Were nece	essary materials available f	or lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	260	****	4.43	4.46	4.67	****
4. Did the 1	lab instructor provide assis	tance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	259	****	4.21	4.33	4.66	****
5. Were requ	uirements for lab reports cl	early specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	233	****	4.36	4.20	4.53	****
	Seminar																
1. Were assi	igned topics relevant to the	announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	103	****	4.39	4.41	4.56	****
2. Was the i	instructor available for ind	ividual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	101	****	4.33	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did prese	entations contribute to what	you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	99	****	4.36	4.39	4.54	****
5. Were crit	teria for grading made clear		8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	97	****	3.76	4.14	4.26	****
	Field Work																
 Did field 	d experience contribute to w	nat you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	76	****	3.36	3.98	4.20	****
	degree could you discuss you:		8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	48	****	3.86	4.12	4.35	****
5. Did confe	erences help you carry out f	ield activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	49	****	3.74	4.27	4.46	****
	Self Paced																
2. Did study	y questions make clear the ex	xpected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	52	****	4.21	4.26	4.59	****
		Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n										
Credits Earr	ned Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;				Тур	pe			Majors	;
00-27	2 0.00-0.99 1	 A 6					or Ma	idoro		0	 Grad			4	Majo		0
28-55	0.00-0.99 1	B 1		кес	4urr,	=u I	OT MG	LJOTE	•	U	Grad	uatt	=	T	мајс) <u> </u>	U
56-83	0 2.00-2.99 0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Unde	יר-מי	rad	5	Non-	-major	0
84-150	0 3.00-3.49 1	D 0		061	c. a.	-				0	onae	9ı	Luu	5	14011		U
Grad.	4 3.50-4.00 2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	####	- I	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 8 ? 0

Course-Section: IS 706 0101 University of Maryland Title INFO. VISUALIZATION

Baltimore County Fall 2005

Instructor: KOMLODI, ANITA

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 14 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1084

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	;		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	1	1	2	8	2	3.64	1459/1674	3.64	4.23	4.27	4.44	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	1043/1674	4.14	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	750/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	879/1609	4.23	4.23	4.22	4.34	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	2	5	4	3.50	1223/1585	3.50	4.04	3.96	4.23	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	0	8	2	3.75	1147/1535	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.27	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	8	5	4.14	988/1651	4.14	4.20	4.18	4.32	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	1093/1673	4.64	4.65	4.69	4.78	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	827/1656	4.17	4.06	4.07	4.15	4.17
T a whoma														
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	6	1 26	1054/1586	4.36	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	853/1585	4.36	4.43	4.43	4.79	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	8	4		1043/1582	4.79	4.72	4.09	4.79	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	- 4		1043/1562	4.14	4.30	4.20	4.33	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	259/1380	4.57	3.94	3.94	3.85	4.57
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	U	U	U	2	2	10	4.57	259/1300	4.57	3.94	3.94	3.03	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.14	4.01	4.19	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	543/1515	4.60	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	642/1511	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	346/ 994	4.29	3.97	3.94	4.07	4.29
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.56	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.62	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.26	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	6	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	8	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: IS 707 0101 University of Maryland Title INTELLIGENT TECHNOLOGI Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006

Instructor: ZHOU, LINA

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 13

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1085

Job IRBR3029

General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 2 1 3 7 4.15 1066/1674 4.15 4.23 4.27 4.44 4. 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 0 1 3 8 4.31 870/1674 4.31 4.26 4.23 4.34 4. 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 1 1 3 7 4.08 974/1423 4.08 4.36 4.27 4.28 4. 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 4 6 4.15 974/1609 4.15 4.23 4.22 4.34 4. 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 1 3 8 4.31 512/1585 4.31 4.04 3.96 4.23 4. 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 1 0 2 4 6 4.08 1050/1651 4.08 4.08 4.27 4.18 4.29 4. 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 5 0.0 1/1673 5.00 4.65 4.69 4.78 5. 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 0 0 3 5 3 4.00 955/1656 4.00 4.06 4.07 4.15 4. 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. O 1 1 4 6 4.25 645/1520 4.25 4.14 4.01 4.19 4.2 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01								Fre	eque:	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 2 1 3 7 4.15 1066/1674 4.15 4.23 4.27 4.44 4. 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 0 1 3 8 4.31 870/1674 4.31 4.26 4.23 4.34 4. 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 1 1 3 7 4.08 974/1609 4.15 4.23 4.24 4. 4. 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 4 6 4.15 974/1609 4.15 4.23 4.22 4.34 4. 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 1 3 8 4.31 512/1585 4.31 4.04 3.96 4.23 4. 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 1 6 5 4.15 777/1535 4.15 4.08 4.08 4.27 4. 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 1 0 2 4 6 4.08 1050/1651 4.08 4.20 4.18 4.32 4. 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 12 5.00 1/1673 5.00 4.65 4.69 4.78 5. 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 0 0 3 5 3 4.00 955/1656 4.00 4.06 4.07 4.15 4. 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 1 0 3 9 4.54 826/1586 4.54 4.43 4.43 4.50 4. 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 11 4.85 713/1585 4.85 4.72 4.69 4.79 4. 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 3 0 3 7 4.08 1094/1582 4.08 4.30 4.26 4.33 4. 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 1 4 7 4.23 975/1575 4.23 4.32 4.27 4.30 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 1 4 7 4.23 975/1575 4.23 4.32 4.27 4.30 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 1 4 6 4.25 645/1520 4.25 4.14 4.01 4.19 4. Discussion 1 Discussion 1 0 0 1 1 2 9 4.67 507/1511 4.67 4.37 4.27 4.49 4. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 1 2 2 9 4.67 507/1511 4.67 4.37 4.27 4.49 4. Were special techniques successful			Question	S		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 2 1 3 7 4.15 1066/1674 4.15 4.23 4.27 4.44 4. 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 0 1 3 8 4.31 870/1674 4.31 4.26 4.23 4.34 4. 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 1 1 3 7 4.08 974/1609 4.15 4.23 4.24 4. 4. 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 4 6 4.15 974/1609 4.15 4.23 4.22 4.34 4. 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 1 3 8 4.31 512/1585 4.31 4.04 3.96 4.23 4. 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 1 6 5 4.15 777/1535 4.15 4.08 4.08 4.27 4. 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 1 0 2 4 6 4.08 1050/1651 4.08 4.20 4.18 4.32 4. 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 12 5.00 1/1673 5.00 4.65 4.69 4.78 5. 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 0 0 3 5 3 4.00 955/1656 4.00 4.06 4.07 4.15 4. 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 1 0 3 9 4.54 826/1586 4.54 4.43 4.43 4.50 4. 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 11 4.85 713/1585 4.85 4.72 4.69 4.79 4. 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 3 0 3 7 4.08 1094/1582 4.08 4.30 4.26 4.33 4. 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 1 4 7 4.23 975/1575 4.23 4.32 4.27 4.30 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 1 4 7 4.23 975/1575 4.23 4.32 4.27 4.30 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 1 4 6 4.25 645/1520 4.25 4.14 4.01 4.19 4. Discussion 1 Discussion 1 0 0 1 1 2 9 4.67 507/1511 4.67 4.37 4.27 4.49 4. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 1 2 2 9 4.67 507/1511 4.67 4.37 4.27 4.49 4. Were special techniques successful			Genera	 1															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 0 1 3 8 4.31 870/1674 4.31 4.26 4.23 4.34 4. 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 1 1 3 7 4.08 974/1423 4.08 4.36 4.27 4.28 4. 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 4 6 4.15 974/1609 4.15 4.23 4.22 4.34 4. 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 1 3 8 4.31 512/1585 4.31 4.04 3.96 4.23 4. 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 1 0 1 3 8 4.31 512/1585 4.31 4.04 3.96 4.23 4. 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 1 0 2 4 6 4.08 1050/1651 4.08 4.08 4.07 4. 7 4. 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 2 4 6 4.08 1050/1651 4.08 4.02 4.18 4.32 4. 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 5.00 1/1673 5.00 4.65 4.69 4.78 5. 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 0 0 3 5 3 4.00 955/1656 4.00 4.06 4.07 4.15 4. 8. Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 1 0 3 9 4.54 826/1586 4.54 4.43 4.43 4.50 4. 8. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 11 4.85 713/1585 4.85 4.72 4.69 4.79 4. 8. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 1 4 7 4.23 975/1575 4.23 4.32 4.27 4.30 4. 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 0 1 4 7 4.23 975/1575 4.23 4.32 4.27 4.30 4. 9. Diacussion 1 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 1 0 3 8 4.50 629/1515 4.50 4.37 4.24 4.47 4. 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 507/1511 4.67 4.37 4.27 4.49 4. 9. 4. 9 4. 9 4. 9 4. 9 4. 9 4.	1 Did vo	nı dain ne		_	this course	0	0	0	2	1	3	7	4 15	1066/1674	4 15	4 23	4 27	4 44	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 1 1 1 3 7 4.08 974/1423 4.08 4.36 4.27 4.28 4. 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 4 6 6 4.15 974/1609 4.15 4.23 4.22 4.34 4. 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 1 3 8 4.31 512/1585 4.31 4.04 3.96 4.23 4. 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 6 5 4.15 777/1535 4.15 4.08 4.08 4.08 4.27 4. 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 0 1 0 2 4 6 4.08 1050/1651 4.08 4.20 4.18 4.32 4. 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 5.00 1/1673 5.00 4.65 4.69 4.78 5. 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 0 0 3 5 3 4.00 955/1656 4.00 4.06 4.07 4.15 4. 19	_	_	J ,				-	-		_	3	8							4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 4 6 4.15 974/1609 4.15 4.23 4.22 4.34 4.5 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 3 8 4.31 512/1585 4.31 4.04 3.96 4.23 4.7 4.7 Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 0 2 4 6 4.08 1050/1651 4.08 4.20 4.18 4.32 4.8 How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 5.00 1/1673 5.00 4.65 4.69 4.78 5.9 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 0 0 0 3 5 3 4.00 955/1656 4.00 4.06 4.07 4.15 4.20 4.16 4.07 4.15 4.20 4.16 4.08 4.20 4.18 4.32 4.20 4.18 4.32 4.20 4.18 4.32 4.20 4.18 4.32 4.20 4.18 4.32 4.20 4.18 4.32 4.20 4.18 4.32 4.20 4.18 4.32 4.20 4.18 4.32 4.20 4.18 4.32 4.20 4.18 4.32 4.20 4.18 4.32 4.20 4.18 4.32 4.20 4.18 4.32 4.20 4.18 4.32 4.20 4.18 4.32 4.20 4.18 4.32 4.20 4.18 4.32 4.20 4.18 4.32 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.2						0	0	1	1	1	3	7	4.08	, -					4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 1 3 8 4.31 512/1585 4.31 4.04 3.96 4.23 4.6 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 6 5 4.15 777/1535 4.15 4.08 4.08 4.27 4.7 4.8 4.08 4.27 4.8 4.8 4.08 4.27 4.8 4.8 4.08 4.27 4.8 4.8 4.08 4.27 4.8 4.8 4.08 4.27 4.8 4.8 4.08 4.27 4.8 4.8 4.08 4.27 4.8 4.8 4.08 4.27 4.8 4.8 4.08 4.27 4.9 4.8 4.08 4.27 4.9 4.9 4.9 4.9 4.9 4.9 4.9 4.9 4.9 4.9		_		_	_		0	0	1	2	4	6							4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 6 5 4.15 777/1535 4.15 4.08 4.08 4.27 4.7 Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 0 2 4 6 4.08 1050/1651 4.08 4.20 4.18 4.32 4.8 How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 12 5.00 1/1673 5.00 4.65 4.69 4.78 5.9 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 0 0 0 3 5 3 4.00 955/1656 4.00 4.06 4.07 4.15 4.8 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 1 0 3 9 4.54 826/1586 4.54 4.43 4.43 4.43 4.50 4.2 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 11 4.85 713/1585 4.85 4.72 4.69 4.79 4.3 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 3 0 3 7 4.08 1094/1582 4.08 4.30 4.26 4.33 4.4 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 1 4 7 4.23 975/1575 4.23 4.32 4.27 4.30 4.5 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 1 0 2 4 6 4.08 635/1380 4.08 3.94 3.94 3.85 4.5 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 0 1 4 7 4.23 975/1575 4.23 4.32 4.27 4.30 4.5 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 0 2 4 6 4.08 635/1380 4.08 3.94 3.94 3.85 4.5 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 507/1511 4.67 4.37 4.24 4.47 4.4 Were special techniques successful							-	-	0		_	8							4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 0 2 4 6 4.08 1050/1651 4.08 4.20 4.18 4.32 4.8 How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 12 5.00 1/1673 5.00 4.65 4.69 4.78 5.9 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 0 0 3 5 3 4.00 955/1656 4.00 4.06 4.07 4.15 4. Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 1 0 3 9 4.54 826/1586 4.54 4.43 4.43 4.50 4.2 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 11 4.85 713/1585 4.85 4.72 4.69 4.79 4.3 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 3 0 3 7 4.08 1094/1582 4.08 4.30 4.26 4.33 4.4 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 1 4 7 4.23 975/1575 4.23 4.32 4.27 4.30 4.5 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 1 0 2 4 6 4.08 635/1380 4.08 3.94 3.94 3.85 4. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 1 4 6 4.25 645/1520 4.25 4.14 4.01 4.19 4.2 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 507/1511 4.67 4.37 4.27 4.49 4.4 Were special techniques successful 1 5 0 2 1 2 2 3.57 708/994 3.57 3.97 3.94 4.07 3.							0	0	1			5							4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 12 5.00 1/1673 5.00 4.65 4.69 4.78 5. 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 0 0 0 3 5 3 4.00 955/1656 4.00 4.06 4.07 4.15 4. Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 0 3 9 4.54 826/1586 4.54 4.43 4.43 4.50 4. 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 11 4.85 713/1585 4.85 4.72 4.69 4.79 4. 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 3 0 3 7 4.08 1094/1582 4.08 4.30 4.26 4.33 4. 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 1 4 7 4.23 975/1575 4.23 4.32 4.27 4.30 4. 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 1 0 2 4 6 4.08 635/1380 4.08 3.94 3.94 3.85 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 1 4 6 4.25 645/1520 4.25 4.14 4.01 4.19 4. 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 1 0 3 8 4.50 629/1515 4.50 4.37 4.24 4.47 4. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 507/1511 4.67 4.37 4.27 4.49 4. 4. Were special techniques successful							0	1	0		4	6		,					4.08
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. O 0 1 0 2 11 4.85 713/1585 4.85 4.72 4.69 4.79 4. 2. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9. O 1 0 1 4 7 4.23 975/1575 4.23 4.32 4.27 4.30 4. 3. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. O 1 0 2 4 6 4.08 635/1380 4.08 3.94 3.94 3.85 4. Discussion 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. O 0 1 1 4 6 4.25 645/1520 4.25 4.14 4.01 4.19 4. 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1. O 0 1 2 9 4.67 507/1511 4.67 4.37 4.24 4.47 4. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did class discussions successful 1. Did class discussions successful 1. Did class discussions seem interested in the subject 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Did the lectures of the subject of the						1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.78	5.00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 1 0 3 9 4.54 826/1586 4.54 4.43 4.43 4.50 4. 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 11 4.85 713/1585 4.85 4.72 4.69 4.79 4. 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 3 0 3 7 4.08 1094/1582 4.08 4.30 4.26 4.33 4. 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 1 4 7 4.23 975/1575 4.23 4.32 4.27 4.30 4. 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 1 0 2 4 6 4.08 635/1380 4.08 3.94 3.94 3.85 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 1 4 6 4.25 645/1520 4.25 4.14 4.01 4.19 4. 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 1 0 3 8 4.50 629/1515 4.50 4.37 4.24 4.47 4. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 507/1511 4.67 4.37 4.27 4.49 4. 4. Were special techniques successful 1 5 0 2 1 2 2 3.57 708/994 3.57 3.97 3.94 4.07 3.		-			ng effectiveness	1	1	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.06	4.07	4.15	4.00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 1 0 3 9 4.54 826/1586 4.54 4.43 4.43 4.50 4. 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 11 4.85 713/1585 4.85 4.72 4.69 4.79 4. 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 3 0 3 7 4.08 1094/1582 4.08 4.30 4.26 4.33 4. 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 1 4 7 4.23 975/1575 4.23 4.32 4.27 4.30 4. 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 1 0 2 4 6 4.08 635/1380 4.08 3.94 3.94 3.85 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 1 4 6 4.25 645/1520 4.25 4.14 4.01 4.19 4. 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 1 0 3 8 4.50 629/1515 4.50 4.37 4.24 4.47 4. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 507/1511 4.67 4.37 4.27 4.49 4. 4. Were special techniques successful 1 5 0 2 1 2 2 3.57 708/994 3.57 3.97 3.94 4.07 3.																			
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 11 4.85 713/1585 4.85 4.72 4.69 4.79 4. 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 3 0 3 7 4.08 1094/1582 4.08 4.30 4.26 4.33 4. 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 1 4 7 4.23 975/1575 4.23 4.32 4.27 4.30 4. 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 1 0 2 4 6 4.08 635/1380 4.08 3.94 3.94 3.85 4. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 1 4 6 4.25 645/1520 4.25 4.14 4.01 4.19 4. 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 1 0 3 8 4.50 629/1515 4.50 4.37 4.24 4.47 4. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 507/1511 4.67 4.37 4.27 4.49 4. 4. Were special techniques successful 1 5 0 2 1 2 2 3.57 708/994 3.57 3.97 3.94 4.07 3.	1 77					_	^	0	1	^	2	_	4 54	006/1506	4 54	4 42	4 42	4 50	4 54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 3 0 3 7 4.08 1094/1582 4.08 4.30 4.26 4.33 4. 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 1 4 7 4.23 975/1575 4.23 4.32 4.27 4.30 4. 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 1 0 2 4 6 4.08 635/1380 4.08 3.94 3.94 3.85 4. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 1 4 6 4.25 645/1520 4.25 4.14 4.01 4.19 4. 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 1 0 3 8 4.50 629/1515 4.50 4.37 4.24 4.47 4. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 507/1511 4.67 4.37 4.27 4.49 4. 4. Were special techniques successful 1 5 0 2 1 2 2 3.57 708/994 3.57 3.97 3.94 4.07 3.				_	_			-			3								4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 1 4 7 4.23 975/1575 4.23 4.32 4.27 4.30 4. 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 1 0 2 4 6 4.08 635/1380 4.08 3.94 3.94 3.85 4. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 1 4 6 4.25 645/1520 4.25 4.14 4.01 4.19 4. 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 1 0 3 8 4.50 629/1515 4.50 4.37 4.24 4.47 4. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 507/1511 4.67 4.37 4.27 4.49 4. 4. Were special techniques successful 1 5 0 2 1 2 2 3.57 708/994 3.57 3.97 3.94 4.07 3.					-						2								4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 1 0 2 4 6 4.08 635/1380 4.08 3.94 3.94 3.85 4. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 1 4 6 4.25 645/1520 4.25 4.14 4.01 4.19 4. 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 1 0 3 8 4.50 629/1515 4.50 4.37 4.24 4.47 4. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 507/1511 4.67 4.37 4.27 4.49 4. 4. Were special techniques successful 1 5 0 2 1 2 2 3.57 708/994 3.57 3.97 3.94 4.07 3.			_	_	_														4.08
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful Discussion 1. O 0 1 1 4 6 4.25 645/1520 4.25 4.14 4.01 4.19 4. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. O 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 507/1511 4.67 4.37 4.27 4.49 4. 4. Were special techniques successful Discussion 1. O 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 507/1511 4.67 4.37 4.27 4.49 4. 4. Were special techniques successful				_		-	-	_	•	_	_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 1 4 6 4.25 645/1520 4.25 4.14 4.01 4.19 4. 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 1 0 3 8 4.50 629/1515 4.50 4.37 4.24 4.47 4. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 507/1511 4.67 4.37 4.27 4.49 4. 4. Were special techniques successful 1 5 0 2 1 2 2 3.57 708/994 3.57 3.97 3.94 4.07 3.	5. Did au	la I OVISUA.	r techniques en	nance you	ir understanding	U	U	1	U	2	4	О	4.08	035/1380	4.08	3.94	3.94	3.85	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 1 0 3 8 4.50 629/1515 4.50 4.37 4.24 4.47 4. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 507/1511 4.67 4.37 4.27 4.49 4. 4. Were special techniques successful 1 5 0 2 1 2 2 3.57 708/994 3.57 3.97 3.94 4.07 3.			Discus	sion															
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 507/1511 4.67 4.37 4.27 4.49 4. 4. Were special techniques successful 1 5 0 2 1 2 2 3.57 708/994 3.57 3.97 3.94 4.07 3.	1. Did cl	lass discu	ussions contrib	ute to wh	at you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	645/1520	4.25	4.14	4.01	4.19	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful 1 5 0 2 1 2 2 3.57 708/994 3.57 3.97 3.94 4.07 3.	2. Were a	all studer	nts actively en	couraged	to participate	1	0	0	1		3	8	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.50
	3. Did th	ne instruc	ctor encourage	fair and	open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	507/1511	4.67	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.67
	4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		1	5	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	708/ 994	3.57	3.97	3.94	4.07	3.57
Frequency Distribution					Frequ	encs	z Dis	trib	ıtio	n									
					11040	.01107	210	0112	x010.										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 1 A 9 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 9 Major	00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 9		Red	auire	ed f	or Ma	ior	 s	0	Graduat	 e	9	Maid	 or	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3		-										-	-		-	-) -		-
		0					Gei	nera:	1			1	.3	Under-a	rad	4	Non-	-major	1
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 2 D 0		0										_		5				3	
Grad. 9 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough		9	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	_j h
P 0 responses to be significant					P 0													_	
I 0 Other 0					I 0		Ot]	her					0	_		3			
? 1					? 1														

Course-Section: IS 731 0101

Title ELECTRONIC COMMERCE

Instructor: OZOK, ANT

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 21

Baltimore County Fall 2005

University of Maryland

Page 1086 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

	Questions				NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain now insights skills from this gourge.							0	3	7	6	5	2 62	1474/1674	2 62	4.23	4.27	4.44	3.62
	1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course							4	5	7	4		1531/1674		4.25	4.27	4.34	3.43
	. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals . Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals						1	1	4	6	2		1344/1423		4.36	4.27	4.28	3.43
	_	tions reflect			2	3 1	0	3	2	10	5		1254/1609		4.23	4.22	4.34	3.85
				what you learned	0	0	6	2	2	9	2		1465/1585		4.04	3.96	4.23	2.95
				o what you learned	0	5	1	1	8	4	2		1362/1535		4.08	4.08	4.27	3.31
		system clearl		-	0	0	1	2	6	4	8		1317/1651		4.20	4.18	4.32	3.76
		as class canc		IIIca	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	944/1673		4.65	4.69	4.78	4.76
	-			hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	6	12	0		1297/1656		4.06	4.07		3.67
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instruc	tor's lecture		prepared	2	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	1250/1586	4.11	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.11
		or seem inter			1	0	0	0	3	2	15		1142/1585		4.72	4.69	4.79	4.60
				xplained clearly	2	0	0	2	5	7			1284/1582		4.30	4.26	4.33	3.79
		contribute t			2	0	2	0	5	8	4		1339/1575		4.32	4.27	4.30	3.63
				our understanding	3	1	1	3	4	4	5		1028/1380		3.94	3.94	3.85	3.53
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al	acc dicana			what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	9	4	3.83	967/1520	3.83	4.14	4.01	4.19	3.83
				_	3	0	1	1	2	4	10	4.17	960/1515		4.14	4.24	4.47	4.17
 Were all students actively encouraged to participate Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 						0	0	0	1	5		4.61	553/1511		4.37	4.27	4.49	4.61
		hniques succe		a open arseassion	3 4	6	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	474/ 994		3.97	3.94	4.07	4.00
		1																
		Semina	r															
1. Were a	ssigned to	pics relevant	to the	announced theme	18	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.56	***
2. Was the	e instruct	or available	for ind	ividual attention	18	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.62	***
3. Did re	search pro	jects contrib	ute to	what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.43	****
4. Did pro	esentation	s contribute	to what	you learned	18	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.54	****
5. Were c	riteria fo	or grading mad	e clear		18	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.26	***
		Self	Paced															
1. Did se	lf-paced s			what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.46	****
	_	ons make clea		_	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.59	***
		ts with the i			20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.64	****
-		tutoring by		-	20	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 35		4.22	4.36	4.84	****
		gh proctors fo	_	_	20	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 31		4.25		4.64	****
				Frequ	encv	. Diet	rih	ıtior	า									
					cricy	DISC		10101	-									
Credits E	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s 			Ту	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 17		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Graduat	e 1	.4	Majo	r	0
28-55													_				_	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	neral	L			1	5	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0		_						_						
Grad.	14	3.50-4.00	8	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### -				_	jh
				P 0								4	respons	es to k	e sign	ıfican	ıt	
				I 0		Otł	ıer					4						
	? 0																	

Course-Section: IS 800G 0101 (1774)

Title Special Topics

Instructor: Yoon, Victoria

Enrollment: 0
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 1 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

General General Did you gain new insights, skills from this course O 0 0 1 1 0 0 10 1 3.69 1434/1674 **** 3.99 4.27 4.07 3.69 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals O 10 0 1 1 0 0 10 1 3.69 1434/1674 **** 3.99 4.27 4.16 3.92 Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals D 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.0 4.00 ****/1423 **** 4.51 4.27 4.16 3.92 Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals D 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.0 4.00 ****/1423 **** 4.51 4.27 4.16 3.92 Did decay and the exam questions reflect the expected goals D 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.0 5 3.07 1313/1609 **** 3.79 4.22 4.05 3.75 D 12 assigned readings contribute to what you learned D 0 0 0 1 2 2 3 4 3.46 1309/1535 **** 4.03 4.08 3.89 3.46 D 13 avritten assignments contribute to what you learned D 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			Frequencies I			Inst	ructor	r Course Dept			Level	Sect				
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 1 1 3.69 1434/1674 **** 3.99 4.27 4.07 3.69 2 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 2 7 3 3.92 1245/1674 **** 4.11 4.23 4.16 3.92 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1423 **** 4.51 4.27 4.16 **** 4.10 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 2 2 3 3 3.77 1313/1609 **** 4.51 4.27 4.16 **** 4.10 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 2 2 3 3 5 3.69 1100/1859 **** 3.97 4.22 4.05 3.77 5.01 dassigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 1 3 2 3 4 3.46 1309/1535 **** 4.03 4.08 3.89 3.46 5.00 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 3 2 2 3 5 3.09 1100/1855 **** 4.03 4.08 3.89 3.46 5.00 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 5.00 11/1673 **** 4.58 4.69 4.67 5.00 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Questions				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 1 1 1 0 1 1 3.69 1434/1674 **** 3.99 4.27 4.07 3.69 2 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 2 7 3 3.92 1245/1674 **** 4.11 4.23 4.16 3.92 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1423 **** 4.51 4.27 4.16 **** 4.10 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 2 2 3 3 3.77 1313/1609 **** 4.51 4.27 4.16 **** 4.10 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 2 2 3 3 5 3.69 1100/1859 **** 3.97 4.22 4.05 3.77 5.01 dassigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 1 3 2 3 4 3.46 1309/1535 **** 4.03 4.08 3.89 3.46 5.00 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 3 2 2 3 5 3.09 1100/1855 **** 4.03 4.08 3.89 3.46 5.00 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 5.00 11/1673 **** 4.58 4.69 4.67 5.00 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0																
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals					1	1	Λ	10	1	2 60	1/2//167/	****	2 00	4 27	4 07	2 60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals		:	-	•	U T	1	U	7	3							
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals O 0 0 1 4 5 3 3.77 1313/1609 **** 3.97 4.22 4.05 3.77 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned O 0 1 2 2 3 5 3.69 1100/1585 **** 4.08 4.08 3.69 Awa the grading system clearly explained I 0 1 0 4 1 6 3.92 1214/1651 **** 3.77 4.18 4.10 3.92 B. How many times was class cancelled O 0 0 0 0 0 3 5 6 0 3.67 1297/1656 **** 4.07 4.07 3.96 3.67 Lecture Lecture Nere the instructor's lectures well prepared O 0 0 0 0 2 2 8 1 3.62 1457/1586 **** 4.34 4.43 4.37 3.62 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Did the lectures contribute to what you learned O 0 0 0 0 1 4 6 2 3.69 1336/1582 **** 4.07 4.07 3.96 3.67 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussion Laboratory Leberture Leberture Leberture Discussion Laboratory Were you provided with adequate background information Laboratory Were segical techniques successful Awas the instructor available for individual attention Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution Discussion Sunday Awas the segion of the single of the		:	-		•	_	_	1	0							
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 2 2 3 3 5 3.69 1100/1585 **** 3.78 3.96 3.88 3.69 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 3 2 2 3 3 4 3.46 1309/1535 **** 4.03 4.08 3.89 3.46 7.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00	-							5	3		, -	****				3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 6 3.92 1214/1651 **** 4.08 3.89 3.46 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 0 1 0 0 1 3 5.00 1/1673 **** 4.18 4.10 3.92 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 5.00 1/1673 **** 4.58 4.69 4.67 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 3 0 0 0 3 6 0 3.67 1297/1656 **** 4.07 4.07 3.96 3.67 1297/1656 **** 4.07 4.07 3.07 3.67 1297/1656 **** 4.07 4.07 3.07 3.67 1297/1656 **** 4.07 4.07 3.07 3.67 1297/1656 **** 4.07 4.07 3.07 3.67 1297/1656 **** 4.07 4.07 3.07 3.67 1297/1656 **** 4.07 4.07 3.07 3.67 1297/1656 **** 4.07 4.07 3.07 3.67 1297/1656 **** 4.07 4.07 3.07 3.67 1297/1656 **** 4.07 4.07 3.07 3.67 1297/1656 **** 4.07 4.07 3.07 3.67 1297/1656 **** 4.07 4.07 3.07 3.67 1297/1656 **** 4.07 4.07 3.07 3.67 1297/1656 **** 4.07 4.07 3.07 3.67 1297/1656 **** 4.07 4.07 3.07 3.67 1297/1656 **** 4.07 4.07 3.07 3.67 1297/1656 **** 4.07 4.07 3.07 3.07 3.07 3.07 3.07 3.07 3.07 3	<u> </u>	ned		0	1	2	2		5		,	****				
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 0 4 1 6 3.92 1214/1651 **** 3.77 4.18 4.10 3.92 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 13 5.00 1/1673 **** 4.58 4.69 4.67 5.00 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 3 0 0 0 3 6 0 3.67 1297/1656 **** 4.07 4.07 3.96 3.67 1297/1656 **** 4.07 4.07 3.96 3.67 1297/1656 **** 4.07 4.07 3.96 3.67 1297/1656 **** 4.07 4.07 3.96 3.67 1297/1656 **** 4.07 4.07 3.96 3.67 1297/1656 **** 4.07 4.07 3.96 3.67 1297/1656 **** 4.07 4.07 3.96 3.67 1297/1656 **** 4.07 4.07 3.96 3.67 1297/1656 **** 4.07 4.07 3.96 3.67 1297/1656 **** 4.07 4.07 3.96 3.67 1297/1656 **** 4.07 4.08 4.37 3.62 1457/1586 **** 4.34 4.43 4.37 3.62 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.0	3 3		0	0	1	3	2	3	4			****	4.03	4.08	3.89	3.46
Lecture Lect			1	0	1	0	4	1	6			****	3.77	4.18	4.10	3.92
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1673	****	4.58	4.69	4.67	5.00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 2 2 8 8 1 3.62 1457/1586 **** 4.34 4.43 4.37 3.62 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 0 4 8 4.46 1258/1585 **** 4.73 4.69 4.60 4.46 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 4 6 2 3.69 1336/1582 **** 4.17 4.26 4.17 3.69 4.00 4.46 1.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effective	reness	1	3	0	0	3	6	0	3.67	1297/1656	****	4.07	4.07	3.96	3.67
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 2 2 8 8 1 3.62 1457/1586 **** 4.34 4.43 4.37 3.62 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 0 4 8 4.46 1258/1585 **** 4.73 4.69 4.60 4.46 1258/1585 **** 4.73 4.69 4.60 4.46 1258/1585 **** 4.73 4.69 4.60 4.46 1258/1585 **** 4.73 4.69 4.60 4.46 1258/1585 **** 4.73 4.69 4.60 4.46 1258/1585 **** 4.73 4.69 4.60 4.46 1258/1585 **** 4.73 4.69 4.60 4.46 1258/1585 **** 4.73 4.69 4.60 4.46 1258/1585 **** 4.73 4.69 4.60 4.46 1258/1585 **** 4.77 4.26 4.17 4.2	Lecture															
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 1 0 4 8 4.46 1258/1585 **** 4.73 4.69 4.60 4.46 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 4 6 2 3.69 1336/1582 **** 4.17 4.26 4.17 3.69 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 0 2 8 1 3.69 1336/1582 **** 4.17 4.26 4.17 3.66 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5 1 0 0 0 5 1 3.71 930/1380 **** 4.17 3.94 3.78 3.71 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 2 4 6 4.15 734/1520 **** 3.57 4.01 3.76 4.15 4.16 4.16 4.16 4.16 4.16 4.16 4.16 4.16			0	0	0	2	2	8	1	3.62	1457/1586	****	4.34	4.43	4.37	3.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 4 6 2 3.69 1336/1582 **** 4.17 4.26 4.17 3.69 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 0 2 8 1 3.46 1381/1575 **** 4.09 4.27 4.17 3.46 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5 1 0 0 5 1 3.71 930/1380 **** 4.17 3.94 3.78 3.71 Discussion 1. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 2 4 6 4.15 734/1520 **** 3.57 4.01 3.76 4.15 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 1 2 0 10 4.46 681/1515 **** 3.72 4.24 3.97 4.46 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1 0 4 8 4.46 685/1511 **** 3.92 4.27 4.00 4.46 4. Were special techniques successful 0 7 0 1 1 4 8 3.46 685/1511 **** 3.92 4.27 4.00 4.46 4. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 278 **** 4.19 3.97 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6 0 0 1 1 0 0 5 1 3.71 90/101 **** 4.19 3.97 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 0 1 0 0 5 1 3.71 90/101 **** 3.71 4.48 4.18 3.71 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 6 0 2 0 0 1 2 2 3.29 92/99 **** 3.29 4.39 4.10 3.29 4.20 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 6 0 1 1 2 2 3 3.43 81/97 *** 3.29 4.39 4.30 3.43 4.31 3.99 3.43 4.31		;	0	0	0		0	4	8		- ,	****	4.73		4.60	
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 2 4 6 4.15 734/1520 **** 3.57 4.01 3.76 4.15 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 1 2 0 10 4.46 681/1515 **** 3.72 4.24 3.97 4.46 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1 0 4 8 4.46 685/1511 **** 3.92 4.27 4.00 4.46 4. Were special techniques successful 0 7 0 1 1 4 0 3.50 732/994 **** 3.96 3.94 3.73 3.50 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 278 **** **** 4.19 3.97 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6 0 0 1 1 2 3 4.00 74/103 **** 4.00 4.41 4.33 4.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 0 1 0 0 5 1 3.71 90/101 **** 3.71 4.48 4.18 3.71 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 6 0 2 0 0 3 2 3.43 82/95 **** 3.43 4.31 3.99 3.43 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 6 0 2 0 1 2 2 3.29 92/99 **** 3.29 4.39 4.10 3.99 3.43 Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution			0	0	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	1336/1582	****	4.17	4.26	4.17	3.69
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 2 4 6 4.15 734/1520 **** 3.57 4.01 3.76 4.15 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 1 2 0 10 4.46 681/1515 **** 3.72 4.24 3.97 4.46 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1 0 4 8 4.46 685/1511 **** 3.92 4.27 4.00 4.46 4. Were special techniques successful 0 7 0 1 1 4 0 3.50 732/994 **** 3.96 3.94 3.73 3.50 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 278 **** **** 4.19 3.97 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6 0 0 1 1 2 3 4.00 74/103 **** 4.00 4.41 4.33 4.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 0 1 0 0 5 1 3.71 90/101 **** 3.71 4.48 4.18 3.71 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 6 0 2 0 0 3 2 3.43 82/95 **** 3.43 4.31 3.99 3.43 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 6 0 2 0 1 2 2 3.29 92/99 **** 3.29 4.39 4.10 3.29 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 6 0 1 1 2 2 0 3 3.43 81/97 **** 3.43 4.14 3.69 3.43	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	-	0	0	2	0	2	8	1	3.46	1381/1575	****	4.09	4.27	4.17	3.46
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 2 4 6 4.15 734/1520 **** 3.57 4.01 3.76 4.15 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 1 2 0 10 4.46 681/1515 **** 3.72 4.24 3.97 4.46 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1 0 4 8 4.46 685/1511 **** 3.92 4.27 4.00 4.46 4. Were special techniques successful 0 7 0 1 1 4 0 3.50 732/994 **** 3.96 3.94 3.73 3.50 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 278 **** **** 4.19 3.97 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6 0 0 1 1 2 2 3 4.00 74/103 **** 4.00 4.41 4.33 4.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 0 1 0 0 5 1 3.71 90/101 **** 3.71 4.48 4.18 3.71 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 6 0 2 0 1 2 2 3.43 82/95 **** 3.43 4.31 3.99 3.43 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 6 0 2 0 1 2 2 3.29 92/99 **** 3.43 4.31 3.99 3.43 Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understan	nding	1	5	1	0	0	5	1	3.71	930/1380	****	4.17	3.94	3.78	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 1 2 0 10 4.46 681/1515 **** 3.72 4.24 3.97 4.46 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1 0 4 8 4.46 685/1511 **** 3.92 4.27 4.00 4.46 4. Were special techniques successful 0 7 0 1 1 4 0 3.50 732/994 **** 3.96 3.94 3.73 3.50 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 278 **** **** 4.19 3.97 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6 0 0 1 1 2 3 4.00 74/103 **** 4.00 4.41 4.33 4.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 0 1 0 0 5 1 3.71 90/101 **** 3.71 4.48 4.18 3.71 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 6 0 2 0 0 3 2 3.43 82/95 **** 3.43 4.31 3.99 3.43 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 6 0 1 1 2 0 3 3.43 81/97 **** 3.43 4.14 3.69 3.43 Frequency Distribution	Discussion															
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 1 2 0 10 4.46 681/1515 **** 3.72 4.24 3.97 4.46 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1 0 4 8 4.46 685/1511 **** 3.92 4.27 4.00 4.46 4. Were special techniques successful 0 7 0 1 1 4 0 3.50 732/994 **** 3.96 3.94 3.73 3.50 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 278 **** 4.19 3.97 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6 0 0 1 1 2 3 4.00 74/103 **** 4.00 4.41 4.33 4.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 0 1 0 0 5 1 3.71 90/101 **** 3.71 4.48 4.18 3.71 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 6 0 2 0 1 2 2 3.43 82/95 **** 3.43 4.31 3.99 3.43 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 6 0 1 1 2 0 3 3.43 81/97 **** 3.43 4.14 3.69 3.43 Frequency Distribution		ned	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	734/1520	****	3.57	4.01	3.76	4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1 0 4 8 4.46 685/1511 **** 3.92 4.27 4.00 4.46 4. Were special techniques successful 0 7 0 1 1 4 0 3.50 732/994 **** 3.96 3.94 3.73 3.50 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 278 **** **** 4.19 3.97 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6 0 0 1 1 2 3 4.00 74/103 **** 4.00 4.41 4.33 4.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 0 1 0 0 5 1 3.71 90/101 **** 3.71 4.48 4.18 3.71 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 6 0 2 0 0 3 2 3.43 82/95 **** 3.43 4.31 3.99 3.43 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 6 0 2 0 1 2 2 3.29 92/99 **** 3.29 4.39 4.10 3.29 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 6 0 1 1 2 0 3 3.43 81/97 **** 3.43 4.14 3.69 3.43 Frequency Distribution			0	0	0	1	2	0	10	4.46	681/1515	****	3.72	4.24	3.97	4.46
Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 278 **** **** 4.19 3.97 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6 0 0 1 1 2 3 4.00 74/ 103 **** 4.00 4.41 4.33 4.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 0 1 0 0 5 1 3.71 90/ 101 **** 3.71 4.48 4.18 3.71 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 6 0 2 0 0 3 2 3.43 82/ 95 **** 3.43 4.31 3.99 3.43 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 6 0 2 0 1 2 2 3.29 92/ 99 **** 3.29 4.39 4.10 3.29 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 6 0 1 1 2 0 3 3.43 81/ 97 **** 3.43 4.14 3.69 3.43			0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	685/1511	****	3.92	4.27	4.00	4.46
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6 0 0 1 1 2 3 4.00 74/103 **** 4.00 4.41 4.33 4.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 0 1 0 0 5 1 3.71 90/101 **** 3.71 4.48 4.18 3.71 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 6 0 2 0 0 3 2 3.43 82/95 **** 3.43 4.31 3.99 3.43 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 6 0 2 0 1 2 2 3.29 92/99 **** 3.29 4.39 4.10 3.29 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 6 0 1 1 2 0 3 3.43 81/97 **** 3.43 4.14 3.69 3.43 Frequency Distribution	4. Were special techniques successful		0	7	0	1	1	4	0	3.50	732/ 994	****	3.96	3.94	3.73	3.50
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6 0 0 1 0 0 0 5 1 3.71 90/101 **** 4.00 4.41 4.33 4.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 0 1 0 0 5 1 3.71 90/101 **** 3.71 4.48 4.18 3.71 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 6 0 2 0 0 3 2 3.43 82/ 95 **** 3.43 4.31 3.99 3.43 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 6 0 2 0 1 2 2 3.29 92/ 99 **** 3.29 4.39 4.10 3.29 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 6 0 1 1 2 0 3 3.43 81/ 97 **** 3.43 4.14 3.69 3.43 Frequency Distribution	Laboratory															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6 0 0 1 1 2 3 4.00 74/103 **** 4.00 4.41 4.33 4.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 0 1 0 0 5 1 3.71 90/101 **** 3.71 4.48 4.18 3.71 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 6 0 2 0 0 3 2 3.43 82/95 **** 3.43 4.31 3.99 3.43 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 6 0 2 0 1 2 2 3.29 92/99 **** 3.29 4.39 4.10 3.29 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 6 0 1 1 2 0 3 3.43 81/97 **** 3.43 4.14 3.69 3.43 Frequency Distribution	<u>.</u>	nation 1	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 0 1 0 0 5 1 3.71 90/101 **** 3.71 4.48 4.18 3.71 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 6 0 2 0 0 3 2 3.43 82/95 **** 3.43 4.31 3.99 3.43 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 6 0 2 0 1 2 2 3.29 92/99 **** 3.29 4.39 4.10 3.29 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 6 0 1 1 2 0 3 3.43 81/97 **** 3.43 4.14 3.69 3.43 Frequency Distribution	Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 0 1 0 0 5 1 3.71 90/101 **** 3.71 4.48 4.18 3.71 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 6 0 2 0 0 3 2 3.43 82/95 **** 3.43 4.31 3.99 3.43 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 6 0 2 0 1 2 2 3.29 92/99 **** 3.29 4.39 4.10 3.29 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 6 0 1 1 2 0 3 3.43 81/97 **** 3.43 4.14 3.69 3.43 Frequency Distribution	1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced th	ieme	6	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	74/ 103	****	4.00	4.41	4.33	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 6 0 2 0 1 2 2 3.29 92/ 99 **** 3.29 4.39 4.10 3.29 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 6 0 1 1 2 0 3 3.43 81/ 97 **** 3.43 4.14 3.69 3.43 Frequency Distribution			6	0	1	0	0	5	1	3.71	90/ 101	****	3.71	4.48	4.18	3.71
5. Were criteria for grading made clear 6 0 1 1 2 0 3 3.43 81/ 97 **** 3.43 4.14 3.69 3.43 Frequency Distribution	3. Did research projects contribute to what you lear	ned	6	0	2	0	0	3	2	3.43	82/ 95	****	3.43	4.31	3.99	3.43
Frequency Distribution					2	0	1	2	2	3.29	92/ 99	****	3.29	4.39	4.10	3.29
				0	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	81/ 97	****	3.43	4.14	3.69	3.43
Credits Farned Cum GDA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors		Frequer	псу	Dist	ribu	ıtior	ı									
CICALED BAINCA CAM, CIN EMPECECA GRACE READOND 1906 1906 PA CONTRA CADOND	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected G	rades				Rea	son	S			Tvi	pe		Majors		

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	Major	0	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	13	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	0 #### - Means there		e are not enough		
				P	0			responses to	responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	11	_				
				?	1							

Course-Section: IS 805 0101 (1799)

Title Adv Field Res Mthds

Instructor: Luttes, Wayne

Enrollment: 0 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 2 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NTD	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect
Questions	NR	NA				- 1		Mean	Ralik	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	768/1674	****	3.99	4.27	4.07	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	542/1674	****	4.11	4.23	4.16	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	1	12	4.53	540/1423	****	4.51	4.27	4.16	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	6	6	4.07	1055/1609	****	3.97	4.22	4.05	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	722/1585	****	3.78	3.96	3.88	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	7	6	4.29	631/1535	****	4.03	4.08	3.89	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	643/1651	****	3.77	4.18	4.10	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1673	****	4.58	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	827/1656	****	4.07	4.07	3.96	4.17
Lecture	•		_		_	_								
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	Τ	3	12	4.69	633/1586	****	4.34	4.43	4.37	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	640/1585	****	4.73	4.69	4.60	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1 1	0 1	4	11	4.56	567/1582	****	4.17	4.26	4.17	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	U T	2	5 7	9	4.38	847/1575	****	4.09	4.27	4.17	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	2	U	U	2	/	5	4.21	522/1380		4.17	3.94	3.78	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	397/1520	****	3.57	4.01	3.76	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	313/1515	****	3.72	4.24	3.97	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	414/1511	****	3.92	4.27	4.00	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	287/ 994	****	3.96	3.94	3.73	4.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 103	****	4.00	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 101	****	3.71	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 95	****	3.43	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 99	****	3.29	4.39	4.10	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.43	4.14	3.69	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	38/ 76	****	4.20	3.98	3.32	4.20
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	1	1	2	6	5	3.87	42/ 77	****	3.87	3.93	3.42	3.87
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	2	0	2	0	4	7	4.23	39/ 53	****	4.23	4.45	4.34	4.23
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	2	0	2	2	6	3	3.77	33/ 48	****	3.77	4.12	4.00	3.77
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	4	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	31/ 49	****	4.18	4.27	4.30	4.18
			-	-	-	-	-	. •	- ,					

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_			
				2	1						