```
Course-Section: IS   101  0201                 University of Maryland                                          Page 873
Title          INTRO TO COMP BASED SY           Baltimore County                                             JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:    TARI, FURKAN                      Spring 2005                                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    61
Questionnaires: 29                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	2	10	8	6	3.59	1325/1504	3.59	4.24	4.27	4.13	3.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	6	8	12	4.15	954/1503	4.15	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	10	14	4.41	642/1290	4.41	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	1	5	9	9	4.08	957/1453	4.08	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	2	1	7	6	7	3.65	1023/1421	3.65	4.08	4.00	3.91	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	4	0	5	9	6	3.54	1133/1365	3.54	4.11	4.08	3.96	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	9	15	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	691/1504	4.88	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	5	13	3	3.90	989/1483	3.90	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	2	20	4.75	420/1425	4.75	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	3	20	4.72	895/1426	4.72	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	450/1418	4.60	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	8	14	4.44	701/1416	4.44	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	177/1199	4.67	3.95	3.97	3.82	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	2	3	3	7	3.81	870/1312	3.81	4.12	4.00	3.69	3.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	2	2	2	9	4.00	910/1303	4.00	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	2	2	10	4.19	841/1299	4.19	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.19
4. Were special techniques successful	13	10	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.52	****

```
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal      28   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/   35  ****  4.43  4.49  4.65  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful        28   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/   36  ****  4.38  4.60  4.48  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful         28   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/   20  ****  5.00  4.24  4.92  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students       28   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/   16  ****  5.00  4.51  5.00  ****
```

```
Course-Section: IS   101  0201                          University of Maryland                                    Page  873
Title           INTRO TO COMP BASED SY                    Baltimore County                                      JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:     TARI, FURKAN                                Spring 2005                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     61
Questionnaires: 29                               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	29	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: IS   125  0101               University of Maryland                                    Page  874
Title       INFO SYS LOGIC/DESIGN              Baltimore County                                        JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:  VYAS, AMRISH J                    Spring 2005                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   29
Questionnaires:  21                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                           Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank   Mean Mean  Mean Mean   Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  1  6  9  5  3.86 1219/1504  3.86 4.24  4.27 4.13  3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  2  4  6  9  4.05 1027/1503  4.05 4.22  4.20 4.16  4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  2  3  9  7  4.00  937/1290  4.00 4.32  4.28 4.19  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1  0  1  5  8  6  3.95 1052/1453  3.95 4.22  4.21 4.11  3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   3  0  1  6  7  4  3.78  957/1421  3.78 4.08  4.00 3.91  3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4  0  1  5 10  1  3.65 1078/1365  3.65 4.11  4.08 3.96  3.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  1  4  6 10  4.19  830/1485  4.19 4.20  4.16 4.13  4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0 19  1  4.05 1397/1504  4.05 4.68  4.69 4.66  4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0  0  0  5  7  1  3.69 1157/1483  3.69 4.07  4.06 3.97  3.69

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  1  1  7 11  4.40  900/1425  4.40 4.41  4.41 4.36  4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  2  9  9  4.35 1222/1426  4.35 4.72  4.69 4.56  4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  1  0 10  8  4.32  790/1418  4.32 4.29  4.25 4.20  4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  1  3 11  5  4.00 1029/1416  4.00 4.34  4.26 4.21  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0  0  1  2  8  8  4.21  527/1199  4.21 3.95  3.97 3.82  4.21

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0  3  0  5  6  1  3.13 1124/1312  3.13 4.12  4.00 3.69  3.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0  0  1  1  5  8  4.33  737/1303  4.33 4.39  4.24 3.93  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  1  1  1  7  5  3.93  973/1299  3.93 4.34  4.25 3.94  3.93
4. Were special techniques successful                   6   5  1  1  6  1  1  3.00  680/ 758  3.00 4.05  4.01 3.80  3.00

                Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0 0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 244  **** 4.12  4.09 4.07  ****

                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  76  **** 4.60  4.61 4.64  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     19  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/  76  **** 4.41  4.44 4.51  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 19  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  73  **** 4.17  4.17 3.83  ****

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  19  0  1  0  1  0  0  2.00 ****/  58  **** 3.98  4.43 3.63  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria   19  0  0  0  2  0  0  3.00 ****/  56  **** 4.12  4.23 4.11  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        19  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  44  **** 4.68  4.65 4.60  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    19  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  47  **** 4.32  4.29 4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  19  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  39  **** 4.61  4.44 5.00  ****

                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 20  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  40  **** 4.28  4.53 4.52  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     20  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  35  **** 4.43  4.49 4.65  ****
```

                        Frequency Distribution


```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades             Reasons                     Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
```

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	20	Non-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	10	11	4.39	712/1504	4.08	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	5	12	4.22	891/1503	4.05	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	7	12	4.26	775/1290	4.07	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	5	14	4.41	594/1453	3.96	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	4	3	10	4.05	712/1421	3.55	4.08	4.00	3.90	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	441/1365	3.81	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	3	5	10	3.83	1134/1485	4.05	4.20	4.16	4.15	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	16	6	4.27	1261/1504	4.50	4.68	4.69	4.68	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	445/1483	4.16	4.07	4.06	4.02	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	618/1425	4.58	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	1073/1426	4.70	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	682/1418	4.29	4.29	4.25	4.22	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	554/1416	4.38	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	2	2	4	2	9	3.74	830/1199	3.74	3.95	3.97	3.95	3.74
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	559/1312	3.78	4.12	4.00	3.98	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	833/1303	3.89	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	2	0	1	7	4.30	768/1299	4.01	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/ 758	3.39	4.05	4.01	3.89	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	4.41	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	4.28	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	8	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: IS   202  0201              University of Maryland                            Page  876
Title       SYSTEMS ANALYSIS METHO              Baltimore County                            JUN 14, 2005
Instructor: DENENBERG, DARR                     Spring 2005                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    48
Questionnaires: 37                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                     NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean   Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0  2  4 18 13  4.14 1019/1504  4.08  4.24  4.27  4.26  4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0  2  2 18 15  4.24  859/1503  4.05  4.22  4.20  4.18  4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0  1  6 14 16  4.22  817/1290  4.07  4.32  4.28  4.27  4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   4   1  2  6 11 13  4.00 1001/1453  3.96  4.22  4.21  4.20  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 11   2  3  6  8  5  3.46 1144/1421  3.55  4.08  4.00  3.90  3.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 11 3  2  3  8  9  3.72 1025/1365  3.81  4.11  4.08  4.00  3.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   1   0  1  6 10 18  4.29  727/1485  4.05  4.20  4.16  4.15  4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled                  3   0   0  0  0 22 12  4.35 1207/1504  4.50  4.68  4.69  4.68  4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0  0  1  5 16  7  4.00  850/1483  4.16  4.07  4.06  4.02  4.00

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4   0   0  0  2  8 23  4.64  618/1425  4.58  4.41  4.41  4.40  4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   5   0   0  0  0  4 28  4.88  572/1426  4.70  4.72  4.69  4.71  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0   0  0  1 11 21  4.61  450/1418  4.29  4.29  4.25  4.22  4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4   0   1  0  0 13 19  4.48  649/1416  4.38  4.34  4.26  4.24  4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 4  2  2  5  7 12  3.89  752/1199  3.74  3.95  3.97  3.95  3.89

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0  2  3  4  8  7  3.63  966/1312  3.78  4.12  4.00  3.98  3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0  2  2  5  5 10  3.79 1035/1303  3.89  4.39  4.24  4.23  3.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 1  1  4  6 11  4.09  902/1299  4.01  4.34  4.25  4.21  4.09
4. Were special techniques successful                  14   9   2  3  0  4  5  3.50  580/ 758  3.39  4.05  4.01  3.89  3.50

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  30   5   0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 233  ****  4.07  4.09  4.30  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 33 0 2  0  0  0  2  3.00 ****/ 244  ****  4.12  4.09  4.24  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 33 3 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 227  ****  4.49  4.40  4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           33   3   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 225  ****  4.40  4.23  4.52  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 33   3   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 207  ****  4.22  4.09  4.22  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 33 2  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  76  ****  4.60  4.61  4.22  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 33 1 0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  70  ****  4.54  4.35  4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 33 2  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  67  ****  4.32  4.34  4.50  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    33   1   0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  76  ****  4.41  4.44  4.21  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                33   1   0  1  0  0  2  4.00 ****/  73  ****  4.17  4.17  4.24  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 34  0   0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  58  ****  3.98  4.43  4.41  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 34  0   0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/  56  ****  4.12  4.23  4.24  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       34   2   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  44  ****  4.68  4.65  4.51  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   34   1   0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  47  ****  4.32  4.29  4.65  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 34   1   0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/  39  ****  4.61  4.44  4.28  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 33 0  0  0  0  3  1  4.25 ****/  40  ****  4.28  4.53  4.44  ****
```

```
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       33  1  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/  35  ****  4.43  4.49  4.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         33  1  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 ****/  36  ****  4.38  4.60  4.13  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful          33  1  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 ****/  20  ****  5.00  4.24  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        33  2  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  16  ****  5.00  4.51  5.00  ****
```

Title   SYSTEMS ANALYSIS METHO   Baltimore County   JUN 14, 2005
Instructor: DENENBERG, DARR   Spring 2005   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 48
Questionnaires: 37   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   4   0.00-0.99   1   A   12   Required for Majors   0   Graduate   1   Major   0
 28-55   11   1.00-1.99   0   B   19
 56-83   8   2.00-2.99   11   C   2   General   0   Under-grad   36   Non-major   5
 84-150   1   3.00-3.49   8   D   1
 Grad.   1   3.50-4.00   3   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                              P   0   responses to be significant
                                              I   0   Other   32
                                              ?   0

Title   SYSTEMS ANALYSIS METHO   Baltimore County   JUN 14, 2005
Instructor: DENENBERG, DARR   Spring 2005   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 20   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                                   Frequencies     Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                      NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   0   4   8   8  4.20   962/1504   4.08  4.24  4.27  4.26  4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   1   7   5   7  3.90  1136/1503   4.05  4.22  4.20  4.18  3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   1   2   5   3   9  3.85  1042/1290   4.07  4.32  4.28  4.27  3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2   1   1   6   7   3  3.56  1267/1453   3.96  4.22  4.21  4.20  3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   6   3   0   3   5   3  3.36  1198/1421   3.55  4.08  4.00  3.90  3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6   2   0   4   5   3  3.50  1153/1365   3.81  4.11  4.08  4.00  3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   1   2   4   5   8  3.85  1116/1485   4.05  4.20  4.16  4.15  3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   1   1  18  4.85   743/1504   4.50  4.68  4.69  4.68  4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1   0   1   1   5   7  4.29   602/1483   4.16  4.07  4.06  4.02  4.29

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0   0   0   0   5  14  4.74   456/1425   4.58  4.41  4.41  4.40  4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0   0   0   1   4  14  4.68   940/1426   4.70  4.72  4.69  4.71  4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   0   1   2   7   9  4.26   838/1418   4.29  4.29  4.25  4.22  4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0   0   1   1   2  15  4.63   485/1416   4.38  4.34  4.26  4.24  4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  3   0   1   7   2   6  3.81   790/1199   3.74  3.95  3.97  3.95  3.81

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0   1   1   5   2   5  3.64   956/1312   3.78  4.12  4.00  3.98  3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0   2   0   5   2   5  3.57  1103/1303   3.89  4.39  4.24  4.23  3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7  0   2   0   4   0   7  3.77  1050/1299   4.01  4.34  4.25  4.21  3.77
4. Were special techniques successful                   8   8   0   0   3   1   0  3.25  ****/ 758   3.39  4.05  4.01  3.89  ****

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  17   2   1   0   0   0   0  1.00  ****/ 233   ****  4.07  4.09  4.30  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50  ****/ 244   ****  4.12  4.09  4.24  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 18 1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 227   ****  4.49  4.40  4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           18   1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 225   ****  4.40  4.23  4.52  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18   1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 207   ****  4.22  4.09  4.22  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17  1   0   1   0   1   0  3.00  ****/  76   ****  4.60  4.61  4.22  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 18 0   0   1   0   1   0  3.00  ****/  70   ****  4.54  4.35  4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 18  0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50  ****/  67   ****  4.32  4.34  4.50  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    18   0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50  ****/  76   ****  4.41  4.44  4.21  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                18   0   0   1   1   0   0  2.50  ****/  73   ****  4.17  4.17  4.24  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 18   0   0   0   0   2   0  4.00  ****/  58   ****  3.98  4.43  4.41  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 19   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  56   ****  4.12  4.23  4.24  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       19   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  44   ****  4.68  4.65  4.51  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   19   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  47   ****  4.32  4.29  4.65  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 19   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00  ****/  39   ****  4.61  4.44  4.28  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18  0   0   0   2   0   0  3.00  ****/  40   ****  4.28  4.53  4.44  ****
```

```
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    19   0   0   0   1   0   0   3.00 ****/   35   ****   4.43   4.49   4.50   ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      19   0   0   0   1   0   0   3.00 ****/   36   ****   4.38   4.60   4.13   ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       19   0   0   0   1   0   0   3.00 ****/   20   ****   5.00   4.24   5.00   ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     19   0   0   1   0   0   0   2.00 ****/   16   ****   5.00   4.51   5.00   ****
```

Title   SYSTEMS ANALYSIS METHO   Baltimore County   JUN 14, 2005
Instructor: DENENBERG, DARR   Spring 2005   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 20   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   5   0.00-0.99   1   A   4   Required for Majors 0   Graduate   0   Major   0
 28-55   1   1.00-1.99   0   B   12
 56-83   2   2.00-2.99   5   C   2   General   0   Under-grad 20   Non-major   0
 84-150   2   3.00-3.49   1   D   0
 Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   1   F   0   Electives   2   #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P   0   responses to be significant
                                          I   0   Other   14
                                          ?   0

```
Course-Section: IS   202  0401               University of Maryland                                    Page  878
Title          SYSTEMS ANALYSIS METHO              Baltimore County                                    JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:    KAHL, MARGARET                       Spring 2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    26
Questionnaires: 19                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                             Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean   Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  1  6  8  3  3.58 1331/1504  4.08  4.24  4.27  4.26  3.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  0  6  6  6  3.84 1164/1503  4.05  4.22  4.20  4.18  3.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  0  4 11  3  3.94  988/1290  4.07  4.32  4.28  4.27  3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   3  0  0  5  7  3  3.87 1129/1453  3.96  4.22  4.21  4.20  3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  2  2  1  5  6  2  3.31 1217/1421  3.55  4.08  4.00  3.90  3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 5  1  0  6  2  4  3.62 1097/1365  3.81  4.11  4.08  4.00  3.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  5  4  9  4.22  795/1485  4.05  4.20  4.16  4.15  4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   1  0  0  0  8  9  4.53 1075/1504  4.50  4.68  4.69  4.68  4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0  0  3  9  2  3.93  961/1483  4.16  4.07  4.06  4.02  3.93

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  1  2  5 10  4.33  971/1425  4.58  4.41  4.41  4.40  4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  1  4 12  4.65  995/1426  4.70  4.72  4.69  4.71  4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  1  4  9  4  3.89 1106/1418  4.29  4.29  4.25  4.22  3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  0  1  5  7  4  3.82 1135/1416  4.38  4.34  4.26  4.24  3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 12 1  0  2  1  2  3.50  919/1199  3.74  3.95  3.97  3.95  3.50

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  1  1  5  5  3  3.53 1000/1312  3.78  4.12  4.00  3.98  3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  2  3  4  7  4.00  910/1303  3.89  4.39  4.24  4.23  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0  0  2  3  5  5  3.87 1012/1299  4.01  4.34  4.25  4.21  3.87
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   8  0  0  6  0  1  3.29  642/ 758  3.39  4.05  4.01  3.89  3.29

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  76  ****  4.60  4.61  4.22  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 18 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  70  ****  4.54  4.35  4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 18 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  67  ****  4.32  4.34  4.50  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    18   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  76  ****  4.41  4.44  4.21  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                18   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  73  ****  4.17  4.17  4.24  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17  0  1  0  1  0  0  2.00 ****/  58  ****  3.98  4.43  4.41  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  56  ****  4.12  4.23  4.24  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       18   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  44  ****  4.68  4.65  4.51  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   18   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  47  ****  4.32  4.29  4.65  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 18  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  39  ****  4.61  4.44  4.28  ****
```

                            Frequency Distribution

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

```
P    2                                              responses to be significant
I    0              Other              10
?    0
```

```
Course-Section: IS   247J 0101            University of Maryland                              Page  879
Title      JAVA PROGRAMMING                    Baltimore County                               JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:   MATHEWS, MIJI A                     Spring 2005                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires: 11                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

	Frequencies							Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	495/1504	4.42	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	2	4.18	919/1503	4.27	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	766/1290	4.40	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	8	1	4.00	1001/1453	3.97	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	879/1421	3.84	4.08	4.00	3.90	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	922/1365	3.91	4.11	4.08	4.00	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	5	2	3.82	1140/1485	3.78	4.20	4.16	4.15	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	1200/1504	4.68	4.68	4.69	4.68	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	635/1483	4.36	4.07	4.06	4.02	4.25
Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	971/1425	4.46	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	967/1426	4.83	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	772/1418	4.28	4.29	4.25	4.22	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	701/1416	4.43	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	636/1199	3.75	3.95	3.97	3.95	4.00
Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	947/1312	3.98	4.12	4.00	3.98	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1076/1303	4.03	4.39	4.24	4.23	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	741/1299	4.62	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 758	4.38	4.05	4.01	3.89	****

```
                                        Frequency Distribution
```

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		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	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: IS   247J 0201              University of Maryland                              Page  880
Title          JAVA PROGRAMMING              Baltimore County                                  JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:    EMURIAN, HENRY                  Spring 2005                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    24
Questionnaires: 17                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  2  8  7  4.29  838/1504  4.42  4.24  4.27  4.26  4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  2  7  8  4.35  722/1503  4.27  4.22  4.20  4.18  4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  3  2 12  4.53  488/1290  4.40  4.32  4.28  4.27  4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  1  5  5  6  3.94 1062/1453  3.97  4.22  4.21  4.20  3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  3  1  2  1  5  5  3.79  952/1421  3.84  4.08  4.00  3.90  3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1  4  6  5  3.94  866/1365  3.91  4.11  4.08  4.00  3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   1  1  3  2  3  7  3.75 1176/1485  3.78  4.20  4.16  4.15  3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0 17  5.00    1/1504  4.68  4.68  4.69  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 0 0 2  4  9  4.47  385/1483  4.36  4.07  4.06  4.02  4.47


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  2  3 12  4.59  688/1425  4.46  4.41  4.41  4.40  4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  0 17  5.00    1/1426  4.83  4.72  4.69  4.71  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  1 11  5  4.24  867/1418  4.28  4.29  4.25  4.22  4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  3  4 10  4.41  740/1416  4.43  4.34  4.26  4.24  4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 2 1  4  2  5  3.50  919/1199  3.75  3.95  3.97  3.95  3.50


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0  2  3  5  4.30  559/1312  3.98  4.12  4.00  3.98  4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 1 0  0  2  7  4.40  675/1303  4.03  4.39  4.24  4.23  4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0  1  9  4.90  203/1299  4.62  4.34  4.25  4.21  4.90
4. Were special techniques successful                  7   2  0  0  2  1  5  4.38  255/ 758  4.38  4.05  4.01  3.89  4.38
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	17	Non-major	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: IS   247V 0101                University of Maryland                                Page 881
Title       SELECTED TOPICS                    Baltimore County                                     JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:   SMITH, DANA H                         Spring 2005                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   19
Questionnaires: 14                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	763/1504	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	495/1503	4.29	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	615/1290	4.11	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	578/1453	4.36	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	2	7	3.86	903/1421	3.82	4.08	4.00	3.90	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	370/1365	4.23	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	2	10	4.36	648/1485	4.18	4.20	4.16	4.15	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	1207/1504	4.44	4.68	4.69	4.68	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	8	3	4.00	850/1483	4.13	4.07	4.06	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	603/1425	4.61	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	0	3	9	4.36	1222/1426	4.50	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	1	10	4.36	754/1418	4.33	4.29	4.25	4.22	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	2	8	4.14	961/1416	4.23	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	3	1	9	4.21	527/1199	4.31	3.95	3.97	3.95	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	1149/1312	3.46	4.12	4.00	3.98	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	1195/1303	3.48	4.39	4.24	4.23	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	922/1299	3.86	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	4.75	4.05	4.01	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: IS   247V 0201            University of Maryland                              Page  882
Title      SELECTED TOPICS                Baltimore County                                  JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:   SMITH, DANA H               Spring 2005                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   20
Questionnaires: 17                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	1	5	9	4.12	1038/1504	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	5	9	4.18	928/1503	4.29	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	5	8	4.00	937/1290	4.11	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	9	6	4.18	867/1453	4.36	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	4	4	6	3.81	935/1421	3.82	4.08	4.00	3.90	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	878/1365	4.23	4.11	4.08	4.00	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	2	4	8	3.88	1098/1485	4.18	4.20	4.16	4.15	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	10	5	4.25	1274/1504	4.44	4.68	4.69	4.68	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	989/1483	4.13	4.07	4.06	4.02	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	420/1425	4.61	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	738/1426	4.50	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	539/1418	4.33	4.29	4.25	4.22	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	821/1416	4.23	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	149/1199	4.31	3.95	3.97	3.95	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1059/1312	3.46	4.12	4.00	3.98	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1162/1303	3.48	4.39	4.24	4.23	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	0	1	4	1	3.25	1166/1299	3.86	4.34	4.25	4.21	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 758	4.75	4.05	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.44	****

```
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     16   0   0   0   0   1   0   4.00 ****/  35  ****  4.43  4.49  4.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      16   0   0   0   0   1   0   4.00 ****/  36  ****  4.38  4.60  4.13  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       16   0   0   0   0   1   0   4.00 ****/  20  ****  5.00  4.24  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     16   0   0   0   0   1   0   4.00 ****/  16  ****  5.00  4.51  5.00  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

```
                                                  Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                  Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
          -----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                    General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  2  4  4  4.20   962/1504  4.22  4.24  4.27  4.26  4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  1  3  5  4.20   910/1503  4.29  4.22  4.20  4.18  4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  1  1  0  4  4  3.90  1022/1290  4.11  4.32  4.28  4.27  3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2  0  0  0  4  4  4.50   440/1453  4.36  4.22  4.21  4.20  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  1  1  1  2  4  3.78   957/1421  3.82  4.08  4.00  3.90  3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0  0  2  2  5  4.33   493/1365  4.23  4.11  4.08  4.00  4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  2  3  5  4.30   705/1485  4.18  4.20  4.16  4.15  4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  1  1  8  4.70   960/1504  4.44  4.68  4.69  4.68  4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 0 0  0  2  2  4.50   338/1483  4.13  4.07  4.06  4.02  4.50


                    Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  1  3  5  4.44   853/1425  4.61  4.41  4.41  4.40  4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  1  4  4  4.33  1232/1426  4.50  4.72  4.69  4.71  4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  1  0  0  4  4  4.11   972/1418  4.33  4.29  4.25  4.22  4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  1  0  0  3  5  4.22   896/1416  4.23  4.34  4.26  4.24  4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0 1  0  0  2  3  4.00   636/1199  4.31  3.95  3.97  3.95  4.00


                    Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  1  0  0  2  3  4.00   716/1312  3.46  4.12  4.00  3.98  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  0  1  0  2  3  4.17   851/1303  3.48  4.39  4.24  4.23  4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0  1  0  1  4  4.33   741/1299  3.86  4.34  4.25  4.21  4.33
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   2  0  0  0  1  3  4.75   101/ 758  4.75  4.05  4.01  3.89  4.75


                    Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  9   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/ 233  ****  4.07  4.09  4.30  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 9 0 0 1  0  0  0  2.00  ****/ 244  ****  4.12  4.09  4.24  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9 0 0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/ 227  ****  4.49  4.40  4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           9   0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00  ****/ 225  ****  4.40  4.23  4.52  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 9   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/ 207  ****  4.22  4.09  4.22  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1      0.00-0.99    0        A    4      Required for Majors   0     Graduate      0      Major       0
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0        B    2
 56-83      0      2.00-2.99    1        C    1      General               0     Under-grad   10      Non-major   3
 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
                                         P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other                 6
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: IS   295  0101                University of Maryland                                    Page  884
Title          INTRO TO APPLIC PROGRA              Baltimore County                                    JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:    EVERHART, AMY                       Spring 2005                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires: 16                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level   Sect
                Questions                   NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0   0   2   2  12  4.63  396/1504  4.33  4.24  4.27  4.26  4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   0   1   3  12  4.69  290/1503  4.62  4.22  4.20  4.18  4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   0   0   1   3  12  4.69  322/1290  4.58  4.32  4.28  4.27  4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   1   0   0   1   1  13  4.80  158/1453  4.59  4.22  4.21  4.20  4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  6   0   1   2   3   3  3.89  879/1421  3.98  4.08  4.00  3.90  3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 7  0   0   1   2   5  4.50  297/1365  4.09  4.11  4.08  4.00  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0   0   0   3   3   9  4.40  591/1485  4.49  4.20  4.16  4.15  4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0   0   0   1   3  11  4.67  983/1504  4.58  4.68  4.69  4.68  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0   0   3   6   5  4.14  751/1483  4.20  4.07  4.06  4.02  4.14

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0   0   0   1   2  12  4.73  456/1425  4.69  4.41  4.41  4.40  4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0   0   0   1   1  13  4.80  738/1426  4.66  4.72  4.69  4.71  4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  0   0   2   2  11  4.60  450/1418  4.57  4.29  4.25  4.22  4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0   0   0   1   2  12  4.73  352/1416  4.52  4.34  4.26  4.24  4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 1  0   0   0   1  12  4.92   61/1199  4.50  3.95  3.97  3.95  4.92

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0  0   0   0   0   2  5.00  ****/1312  3.51  4.12  4.00  3.98  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 0  0   0   0   0   2  5.00  ****/1303  3.89  4.39  4.24  4.23  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0  0   0   1   0   2  4.33  ****/1299  3.49  4.34  4.25  4.21  ****

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 15  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/ 233  ****  4.07  4.09  4.30  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15 0 0  0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/ 244  ****  4.12  4.09  4.24  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 15 0  0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/ 227  ****  4.49  4.40  4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          15  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/ 225  ****  4.40  4.23  4.52  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 15  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/ 207  ****  4.22  4.09  4.22  ****

                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15 0  0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  76  ****  4.60  4.61  4.22  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15 0  0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  70  ****  4.54  4.35  4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15 0  0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  67  ****  4.32  4.34  4.50  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   15  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  76  ****  4.41  4.44  4.21  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               15  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  73  ****  4.17  4.17  4.24  ****

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  58  ****  3.98  4.43  4.41  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  56  ****  4.12  4.23  4.24  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      15  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  44  ****  4.68  4.65  4.51  ****

                          Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27       0        0.00-0.99    0          A    8        Required for Majors   0     Graduate      0      Major       0
```

```
28-55      2      1.00-1.99    0      B    7
56-83      5      2.00-2.99    5      C    0      General        2      Under-grad  16      Non-major   0
84-150     2      3.00-3.49    2      D    0
Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    3      F    0      Electives      0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                      I    0      Other         11
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: IS   295  0201            University of Maryland                                    Page 885
Title       INTRO TO APPLIC PROGRA             Baltimore County                                     JUN 14, 2005
Instructor: EVERHART, AMY                        Spring 2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    22
Questionnaires: 17                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level   Sect
              Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean   Mean
         ------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  2  3 12  4.59  442/1504   4.33  4.24  4.27  4.26  4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  2 14  4.76  209/1503   4.62  4.22  4.20  4.18  4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  0  4 12  4.59  431/1290   4.58  4.32  4.28  4.27  4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2  0  0  1  1 13  4.80  158/1453   4.59  4.22  4.21  4.20  4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  7  0  3  3  1  3  3.40 1175/1421   3.98  4.08  4.00  3.90  3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5 1 1 0 3 7  4.17  672/1365   4.09  4.11  4.08  4.00  4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  1  6 10  4.53  433/1485   4.49  4.20  4.16  4.15  4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  7  9  4.56 1052/1504   4.58  4.68  4.69  4.68  4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 1 8 7  4.38  493/1483   4.20  4.07  4.06  4.02  4.38


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  3 13  4.81  315/1425   4.69  4.41  4.41  4.40  4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  5 11  4.69  940/1426   4.66  4.72  4.69  4.71  4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  1  2 13  4.75  261/1418   4.57  4.29  4.25  4.22  4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  1  2 13  4.75  324/1416   4.52  4.34  4.26  4.24  4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 1 5 10 4.56  236/1199   4.50  3.95  3.97  3.95  4.56


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 0 3  4.50 ****/1312   3.51  4.12  4.00  3.98  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 0 0 1 3  4.75 ****/1303   3.89  4.39  4.24  4.23  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 ****/1299   3.49  4.34  4.25  4.21  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  13   2  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/ 758   4.50  4.05  4.01  3.89  ****

                                        Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons                  Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0        A   6        Required for Majors   2      Graduate      0      Major       0
28-55      2      1.00-1.99   0        B   7                                                          
56-83      7      2.00-2.99   7        C   4        General               0      Under-grad   17      Non-major   0
84-150     5      3.00-3.49   2        D   0                                                          
Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   2        F   0        Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0                                    responses to be significant
                                       I   0        Other                14
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: IS   295  0301              University of Maryland                              Page 886
Title          INTRO TO APPLIC PROGRA          Baltimore County                               JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:    NOORUDDIN, AAMI                  Spring 2005                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    15
Questionnaires: 13                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                               Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level   Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean   Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0   0  1  1  2  8  4.42  684/1504  4.33  4.24  4.27  4.26  4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0  0  2  1  9  4.58  403/1503  4.62  4.22  4.20  4.18  4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0   1  0  0  2  9  4.50  507/1290  4.58  4.32  4.28  4.27  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0   1  0  0  3  8  4.42  578/1453  4.59  4.22  4.21  4.20  4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  4   0  0  0  2  6  4.75  158/1421  3.98  4.08  4.00  3.90  4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 3  2  0  1  0  6  3.89  915/1365  4.09  4.11  4.08  4.00  3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   1   0  0  0  2  9  4.82  144/1485  4.49  4.20  4.16  4.15  4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0  0  2  2  8  4.50 1087/1504  4.58  4.68  4.69  4.68  4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  0  1  2  7  4.60  258/1483  4.20  4.07  4.06  4.02  4.60

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0  1  1  0 11  4.62  649/1425  4.69  4.41  4.41  4.40  4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   1  0  0  1 11  4.62 1036/1426  4.66  4.72  4.69  4.71  4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0  1  0  2 10  4.62  438/1418  4.57  4.29  4.25  4.22  4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   1  0  0  2 10  4.54  593/1416  4.52  4.34  4.26  4.24  4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1  0  0  1  2  9  4.67  177/1199  4.50  3.95  3.97  3.95  4.67

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0   1  0  0  2  5  4.25  592/1312  3.51  4.12  4.00  3.98  4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0   1  0  1  2  4  4.00  910/1303  3.89  4.39  4.24  4.23  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0  1  0  2  1  4  3.88 1008/1299  3.49  4.34  4.25  4.21  3.88
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   4   0  0  1  0  3  4.50  185/ 758  4.50  4.05  4.01  3.89  4.50

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10   1   0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 233  ****  4.07  4.09  4.30  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 244  ****  4.12  4.09  4.24  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 11 0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 227  ****  4.49  4.40  4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          11   0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 225  ****  4.40  4.23  4.52  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 11  0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 207  ****  4.22  4.09  4.22  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  76  ****  4.60  4.61  4.22  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 12 0 0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  70  ****  4.54  4.35  4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 12 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  67  ****  4.32  4.34  4.50  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    12  0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  76  ****  4.41  4.44  4.21  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                12  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  73  ****  4.17  4.17  4.24  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 12  0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  58  ****  3.98  4.43  4.41  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 12  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  56  ****  4.12  4.23  4.24  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       12  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  44  ****  4.68  4.65  4.51  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   12  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  47  ****  4.32  4.29  4.65  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 12  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  4.61  4.44  4.28  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 12 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  40  ****  4.28  4.53  4.44  ****
```

```
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal      12   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  35  ****  4.43  4.49  4.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful        12   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  36  ****  4.38  4.60  4.13  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful         12   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  20  ****  5.00  4.24  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students       12   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  16  ****  5.00  4.51  5.00  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	13	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: IS   295  0401          University of Maryland                        Page  887
Title      INTRO TO APPLIC PROGRA             Baltimore County                        JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:    WANG, YE D                     Spring 2005                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires: 13                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  2  0  3  3  5 3.69 1293/1504  4.33  4.24  4.27  4.26  3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  1  0  4  8 4.46  556/1503  4.62  4.22  4.20  4.18  4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  0  6  7 4.54  478/1290  4.58  4.32  4.28  4.27  4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   1  0  1  1  3  7 4.33  680/1453  4.59  4.22  4.21  4.20  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 5  1  0  1  3  3 3.88  887/1421  3.98  4.08  4.00  3.90  3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 1 0 2 5 3 3.82  960/1365  4.09  4.11  4.08  4.00  3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  1  8  4 4.23  784/1485  4.49  4.20  4.16  4.15  4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   1  1  0  0  1 10 4.58 1041/1504  4.58  4.68  4.69  4.68  4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 0 0 4 5 1 3.70 1153/1483  4.20  4.07  4.06  4.02  3.70

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  2  1 10 4.62  649/1425  4.69  4.41  4.41  4.40  4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  1  4  8 4.54 1104/1426  4.66  4.72  4.69  4.71  4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 2 0 3 8 4.31  799/1418  4.57  4.29  4.25  4.22  4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  1  1  2  1  8 4.08 1004/1416  4.52  4.34  4.26  4.24  4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 2 2 0 1 8 3.85  776/1199  4.50  3.95  3.97  3.95  3.85

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 4 0 2 0 3 2.78 1205/1312  3.51  4.12  4.00  3.98  2.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 2 0 1 1 5 3.78 1041/1303  3.89  4.39  4.24  4.23  3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 3 0 2 1 3 3.11 1189/1299  3.49  4.34  4.25  4.21  3.11
4. Were special techniques successful                 4   6  0  1  0  1  1 3.67 ****/ 758  4.50  4.05  4.01  3.89  ****

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 11  0  0  0  1  0  1 4.00 ****/ 233  ****  4.07  4.09  4.30  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 244  ****  4.12  4.09  4.24  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 11 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 227  ****  4.49  4.40  4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          11  0  0  1  0  0  1 3.50 ****/ 225  ****  4.40  4.23  4.52  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 11 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 ****/ 207  ****  4.22  4.09  4.22  ****

                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 11 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/  76  ****  4.60  4.61  4.22  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 11 0 1 0 0 1 0 2.50 ****/  70  ****  4.54  4.35  4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 11 1 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/  67  ****  4.32  4.34  4.50  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   11  0  0  1  0  0  1 3.50 ****/  76  ****  4.41  4.44  4.21  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               11  0  1  0  0  0  1 3.00 ****/  73  ****  4.17  4.17  4.24  ****

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/  58  ****  3.98  4.43  4.41  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 12 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/  56  ****  4.12  4.23  4.24  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      11  0  1  0  0  1  0 2.50 ****/  44  ****  4.68  4.65  4.51  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  11  1  0  1  0  0  0 2.00 ****/  47  ****  4.32  4.29  4.65  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 11 1 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/  39  ****  4.61  4.44  4.28  ****

                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/  40  ****  4.28  4.53  4.44  ****
```

```
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    11   1   0   1   0   0   0   2.00 ****/   35   ****   4.43   4.49   4.50   ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      11   0   0   1   0   1   0   3.00 ****/   36   ****   4.38   4.60   4.13   ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     11   1   1   0   0   0   0   1.00 ****/   16   ****   5.00   4.51   5.00   ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: IS   298I 0101               University of Maryland                              Page  888
Title          INTO TO PROG TECHNIQUE         Baltimore County                                  JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:    SEARS, ANDREW                  Spring 2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires:  9                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies       Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                    Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                    General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   4   3   2  3.78 1257/1504  3.78  4.24  4.27  4.26  3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   1   5   2  3.89 1145/1503  3.89  4.22  4.20  4.18  3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   1   2   3   3  3.89 1030/1290  3.89  4.32  4.28  4.27  3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   1   0   2   1   4   0  3.29 1359/1453  3.29  4.22  4.21  4.20  3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   1   0   4   4   0  3.22 1249/1421  3.22  4.08  4.00  3.90  3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  1   0   1   3   3  3.88  922/1365  3.88  4.11  4.08  4.00  3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   1   2   3   3  3.89 1098/1485  3.89  4.20  4.16  4.15  3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   5   4  4.44 1138/1504  4.44  4.68  4.69  4.68  4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 0  0   1   4   0  3.80 1093/1483  3.80  4.07  4.06  4.02  3.80

                    Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   2   2   5  4.33  971/1425  4.33  4.41  4.41  4.40  4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   1   2   6  4.56 1089/1426  4.56  4.72  4.69  4.71  4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   4   5   0  3.56 1237/1418  3.56  4.29  4.25  4.22  3.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   2   2   2   3  3.67 1199/1416  3.67  4.34  4.26  4.24  3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0  0   1   1   3   3  4.00  636/1199  4.00  3.95  3.97  3.95  4.00

                    Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0   0   1   3   1   0  3.00 1149/1312  3.00  4.12  4.00  3.98  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0   0   1   1   2   1  3.60 1096/1303  3.60  4.39  4.24  4.23  3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0  0   0   1   4   0  3.80 1038/1299  3.80  4.34  4.25  4.21  3.80
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   3   1   1   0   0   0  1.50 ****/ 758  ****  4.05  4.01  3.89  ****

                    Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  7   1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 233  ****  4.07  4.09  4.30  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0  0  0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 244  ****  4.12  4.09  4.24  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 227  ****  4.49  4.40  4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           8   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 225  ****  4.40  4.23  4.52  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 207  ****  4.22  4.09  4.22  ****

                    Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 8  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  76  ****  4.60  4.61  4.22  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 8 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  70  ****  4.54  4.35  4.30  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    8   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  76  ****  4.41  4.44  4.21  ****

                    Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  58  ****  3.98  4.43  4.41  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 8   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  56  ****  4.12  4.23  4.24  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       8   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  44  ****  4.68  4.65  4.51  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   8   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  47  ****  4.32  4.29  4.65  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 8   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  39  ****  4.61  4.44  4.28  ****

                    Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  40  ****  4.28  4.53  4.44  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    8   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  35  ****  4.43  4.49  4.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      8   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  36  ****  4.38  4.60  4.13  ****
```

```
Course-Section: IS   298I 0101              University of Maryland                        Page  888
Title          INTO TO PROG TECHNIQUE          Baltimore County                          JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:    SEARS, ANDREW                    Spring 2005                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires: 9                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

                                       Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: IS  300  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 889
Title       MANAGEMENT INFO SYSTEM            Baltimore County                              JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:    SMITH, ROBERT A                  Spring 2005                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    40
Questionnaires: 17                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level   Sect
            Questions               NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0   0   0   1   5  10  4.56   469/1504  4.11  4.24  4.27  4.27  4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0   0   0   0   4  12  4.75   219/1503  4.38  4.22  4.20  4.22  4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0   0   0   0   1  15  4.94    92/1290  4.37  4.32  4.28  4.31  4.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0   0   1   4  12  4.65   290/1453  4.23  4.22  4.21  4.23  4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   1   3  13  4.71   189/1421  4.30  4.08  4.00  4.01  4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   3   6   8  4.29   536/1365  4.02  4.11  4.08  4.08  4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   0   2   5  10  4.47   495/1485  4.35  4.20  4.16  4.17  4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   1   0   0  15   1  3.88  1455/1504  4.32  4.68  4.69  4.65  3.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0   0   0   0   5  10  4.67   211/1483  4.06  4.07  4.06  4.08  4.67


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   1   3  13  4.71   510/1425  4.74  4.41  4.41  4.43  4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   0   0  17  5.00     1/1426  4.61  4.72  4.69  4.71  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   0   1   4  12  4.65   402/1418  4.56  4.29  4.25  4.26  4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0   0   1   3  13  4.71   394/1416  4.66  4.34  4.26  4.27  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0   0   0   2   3  12  4.59   224/1199  4.12  3.95  3.97  4.02  4.59


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5   0   0   0   1   3   8  4.58   310/1312  4.00  4.12  4.00  4.09  4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5   0   0   0   0   3   9  4.75   356/1303  3.95  4.39  4.24  4.27  4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0   0   0   1   3   8  4.58   517/1299  3.99  4.34  4.25  4.30  4.58
4. Were special techniques successful                   5   0   1   0   0   3   8  4.42   237/ 758  3.91  4.05  4.01  4.00  4.42


                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   16  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 233  ****  4.07  4.09  4.12  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 244  ****  4.12  4.09  4.20  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 227  ****  4.49  4.40  4.46  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            16  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 225  ****  4.40  4.23  4.29  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  16  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 207  ****  4.22  4.09  4.14  ****


                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  76  ****  4.60  4.61  4.84  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  70  ****  4.54  4.35  4.24  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  67  ****  4.32  4.34  3.98  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     16  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  76  ****  4.41  4.44  4.51  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 16  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  73  ****  4.17  4.17  4.25  ****


                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  16  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  58  ****  3.98  4.43  4.52  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  16  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  56  ****  4.12  4.23  4.13  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        16  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  44  ****  4.68  4.65  4.77  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    16  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  47  ****  4.32  4.29  4.14  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  16  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  39  ****  4.61  4.44  4.47  ****


                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  40  ****  4.28  4.53  4.74  ****
```

```
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     16   0   0   0   0   1   0   4.00 ****/  35   ****  4.43  4.49  4.36  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       16   0   0   0   0   0   1   5.00 ****/  36   ****  4.38  4.60  4.63  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        16   0   0   0   0   0   1   5.00 ****/  20   ****  5.00  4.24  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      16   0   0   0   0   1   0   4.00 ****/  16   ****  5.00  4.51  3.95  ****
```

Title   MANAGEMENT INFO SYSTEM   Baltimore County   JUN 14, 2005
Instructor: SMITH, ROBERT A   Spring 2005   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 17   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
  00-27   2   0.00-0.99   0   A   11   Required for Majors   0   Graduate   0   Major   0
  28-55   1   1.00-1.99   0   B   4
  56-83   1   2.00-2.99   4   C   0   General   0   Under-grad 17   Non-major   4
  84-150   2   3.00-3.49   3   D   0
  Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   2   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                             P   0   responses to be significant
                                             I   0   Other   13
                                             ?   0

Title   MANAGEMENT INFO SYSTEM   Baltimore County   JUN 14, 2005
Instructor: LUTTERS, WAYNE   Spring 2005   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 32   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                                 Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean   Rank    Mean   Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0  0  0  2 14  15  4.42  684/1504  4.11  4.24  4.27  4.27  4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  1  1  2 14  13  4.19  910/1503  4.38  4.22  4.20  4.22  4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  5  3  9  14  4.03  924/1290  4.37  4.32  4.28  4.31  4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   0  1  3  3 11  13  4.03  984/1453  4.23  4.22  4.21  4.23  4.03
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   2  1  2  3 11  12  4.07  705/1421  4.30  4.08  4.00  4.01  4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1  1  1  6 11  11  4.00  782/1365  4.02  4.11  4.08  4.08  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  1  2  1 12  15  4.23  795/1485  4.35  4.20  4.16  4.17  4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   1  1  0  0  2  27  4.80  830/1504  4.32  4.68  4.69  4.65  4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 12 1 1  0  3  8   7  4.05  821/1483  4.06  4.07  4.06  4.08  4.05

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         5   0  0  2  0  4  21  4.63  634/1425  4.74  4.41  4.41  4.43  4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    5   0  0  0  1  6  20  4.70  913/1426  4.61  4.72  4.69  4.71  4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6   0  1  1  0  4  20  4.58  488/1418  4.56  4.29  4.25  4.26  4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      5   0  0  1  2  4  20  4.59  534/1416  4.66  4.34  4.26  4.27  4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6  1  0  1  3  6  15  4.40  369/1199  4.12  3.95  3.97  4.02  4.40

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16  0  0  0  0  7   9  4.56  323/1312  4.00  4.12  4.00  4.09  4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16  0  0  0  0  6  10  4.63  488/1303  3.95  4.39  4.24  4.27  4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 0  0  1  6   9  4.50  570/1299  3.99  4.34  4.25  4.30  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                   17  2  0  1  2  3   7  4.23  311/ 758  3.91  4.05  4.01  4.00  4.23
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                   Type                        Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27        2        0.00-0.99    0       A   11        Required for Majors   0     Graduate       0       Major         0
28-55        3        1.00-1.99    0       B   13
56-83        2        2.00-2.99    7       C    0        General               1     Under-grad    32       Non-major     8
84-150       2        3.00-3.49    2       D    0
Grad.        0        3.50-4.00    4       F    0        Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                           I    0        Other                19
                                           ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: IS   300  0301            University of Maryland                              Page  891
Title       MANAGEMENT INFO SYSTEM             Baltimore County                               JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:  PETRY, PHILIP L                     Spring 2005                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   13
Questionnaires:  8                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  0  2  3  2  3.63 1315/1504  4.11  4.24  4.27  4.27  3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  2  5  4.50  495/1503  4.38  4.22  4.20  4.22  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  4  4  4.50  507/1290  4.37  4.32  4.28  4.31  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  1  0  3  4  4.25  775/1453  4.23  4.22  4.21  4.23  4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63  235/1421  4.30  4.08  4.00  4.01  4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 1 3 3  3.88  922/1365  4.02  4.11  4.08  4.08  3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  113/1485  4.35  4.20  4.16  4.17  4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1  0  0  0  6  1  4.14 1353/1504  4.32  4.68  4.69  4.65  4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 1 0 5 1  3.86 1041/1483  4.06  4.07  4.06  4.08  3.86


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  224/1425  4.74  4.41  4.41  4.43  4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  1  0  0  1  6  4.38 1212/1426  4.61  4.72  4.69  4.71  4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63  426/1418  4.56  4.29  4.25  4.26  4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   1  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  198/1416  4.66  4.34  4.26  4.27  4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 5 0 1 0 2 0  3.33  987/1199  4.12  3.95  3.97  4.02  3.33


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 3 0 3 0 1  2.43 1258/1312  4.00  4.12  4.00  4.09  2.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 3 2 1 1 0  2.00 1275/1303  3.95  4.39  4.24  4.27  2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 3 1 1 1 1  2.43 1254/1299  3.99  4.34  4.25  4.30  2.43
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   5  1  0  0  0  1  3.00  680/ 758  3.91  4.05  4.01  4.00  3.00

                                  Frequency Distribution
```

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

```
Course-Section: IS   300  0401                University of Maryland                                    Page 892
Title       MANAGEMENT INFO SYSTEM                 Baltimore County                                     JUN 14, 2005
Instructor: SMITH, DANA H                          Spring 2005                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    39
Questionnaires:  12                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                      NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  1  0  0  1  3  4  3  3.82 1239/1504  4.11  4.24  4.27  4.27  3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1  0  0  0  4  2  5  4.09  996/1503  4.38  4.22  4.20  4.22  4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1  0  0  1  3  2  5  4.00  937/1290  4.37  4.32  4.28  4.31  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  0  5  1  5  4.00 1001/1453  4.23  4.22  4.21  4.23  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 1  0  3  2  4  3.80  943/1421  4.30  4.08  4.00  4.01  3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 5 2 4 3.91 903/1365  4.02  4.11  4.08  4.08  3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1  0  0  2  2  3  4  3.82 1140/1485  4.35  4.20  4.16  4.17  3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1  0  0  0  0  6  5  4.45 1130/1504  4.32  4.68  4.69  4.65  4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 4 4 1 3.67 1170/1483  4.06  4.07  4.06  4.08  3.67


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       4  0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  420/1425  4.74  4.41  4.41  4.43  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  4  0  0  0  1  3  4  4.38 1212/1426  4.61  4.72  4.69  4.71  4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 1 3 4 4.38  736/1418  4.56  4.29  4.25  4.26  4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    4  0  0  0  1  2  5  4.50  623/1416  4.66  4.34  4.26  4.27  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 0 0 0 1 4 2 4.14  574/1199  4.12  3.95  3.97  4.02  4.14


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 1 2 4 4.43  444/1312  4.00  4.12  4.00  4.09  4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 1 2 4 4.43  652/1303  3.95  4.39  4.24  4.27  4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 1 2 4 4.43  656/1299  3.99  4.34  4.25  4.30  4.43
4. Were special techniques successful                 5  4  0  0  1  1  1  4.00  387/ 758  3.91  4.05  4.01  4.00  4.00
```

```
                                            Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: IS   303  0101                          University of Maryland                                    Page 893
Title         HUMAN FACTORS IN COMP                       Baltimore County                                        JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:   CAMPBELL, JEFFR                               Spring 2005                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   26
Questionnaires: 16                               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

General

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	2	5	5	3.73	1276/1504	3.58	4.24	4.27	4.27	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	7	4	3.80	1183/1503	3.60	4.22	4.20	4.22	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	5	6	3	3.67	1109/1290	3.60	4.32	4.28	4.31	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	7	4	3.87	1129/1453	3.82	4.22	4.21	4.23	3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	3	1	5	4	3.57	1073/1421	3.20	4.08	4.00	4.01	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	9	4	4.07	748/1365	3.30	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	4	7	4.07	958/1485	3.55	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	460/1504	4.84	4.68	4.69	4.65	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	0	6	6	1	3.43	1267/1483	3.20	4.07	4.06	4.08	3.43

Lecture

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	2	8	2	3.60	1291/1425	3.70	4.41	4.41	4.43	3.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	1104/1426	4.57	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	2	9	2	3.67	1201/1418	3.75	4.29	4.25	4.26	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	9	4	3.93	1078/1416	3.74	4.34	4.26	4.27	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	542/1199	3.95	3.95	3.97	4.02	4.20

Discussion

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	845/1312	3.40	4.12	4.00	4.09	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	401/1303	4.19	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	869/1299	3.85	4.34	4.25	4.30	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	343/ 758	3.72	4.05	4.01	4.00	4.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	16	Non-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: IS   303  0201              University of Maryland                                    Page  894
Title           HUMAN FACTORS IN COMP          Baltimore County                                      JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:     CAMPBELL, JEFFR                  Spring 2005                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     28
Questionnaires: 17                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies       Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  3  3  6  4  1  2.82 1475/1504  3.58  4.24  4.27  4.27  2.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  2  6  7  2  0  2.53 1483/1503  3.60  4.22  4.20  4.22  2.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   1  3  4  7  2  0  2.50 1276/1290  3.60  4.32  4.28  4.31  2.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1  2  4  3  7  0  2.94 1418/1453  3.82  4.22  4.21  4.23  2.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1  3  7  3  3  0  2.38 1399/1421  3.20  4.08  4.00  4.01  2.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  2  7  5  3  0  2.53 1346/1365  3.30  4.11  4.08  4.08  2.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  3  6  5  2  1  2.53 1451/1485  3.55  4.20  4.16  4.17  2.53
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  1  0  2 14  4.71  953/1504  4.84  4.68  4.69  4.65  4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  1  5  7  0  0  2.46 1449/1483  3.20  4.07  4.06  4.08  2.46

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3   0  1  4  6  3  0  2.79 1399/1425  3.70  4.41  4.41  4.43  2.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3   0  0  1  1  4  8  4.36 1222/1426  4.57  4.72  4.69  4.71  4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4   0  2  2  6  3  0  2.77 1365/1418  3.75  4.29  4.25  4.26  2.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      4   0  1  3  5  4  0  2.92 1340/1416  3.74  4.34  4.26  4.27  2.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  0  0  5  4  3  1  3.00 1050/1199  3.95  3.95  3.97  4.02  3.00

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10  0  3  2  0  2  0  2.14 1283/1312  3.40  4.12  4.00  4.09  2.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10  0  1  0  2  2  2  3.57 1103/1303  4.19  4.39  4.24  4.27  3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0  0  2  3  1  1  3.14 1184/1299  3.85  4.34  4.25  4.30  3.14
4. Were special techniques successful                   11  1  1  1  1  2  0  2.80  719/ 758  3.72  4.05  4.01  4.00  2.80

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   16  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 233  ****  4.07  4.09  4.12  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 244  ****  4.12  4.09  4.20  ****

                Seminar
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  67  ****  4.32  4.34  3.98  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     16  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  76  ****  4.41  4.44  4.51  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 16  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  73  ****  4.17  4.17  4.25  ****

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  16  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  58  ****  3.98  4.43  4.52  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  16  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  56  ****  4.12  4.23  4.13  ****

                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  40  ****  4.28  4.53  4.74  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       16  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  36  ****  4.38  4.60  4.63  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        16  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  20  ****  5.00  4.24  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      16  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  16  ****  5.00  4.51  3.95  ****

                        Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades            Reasons                Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
```

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	4	Under-grad	17	Non-major	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: IS   303  0301          University of Maryland                                          Page  895
Title          HUMAN FACTORS IN COMP      Baltimore County                                             JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:    SMITH, ROBERT B            Spring 2005                                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    28
Questionnaires: 17                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                               Frequencies       Instructor     Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
         Questions                      NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   1  0  1  8  7  4.18  981/1504   3.58  4.24  4.27  4.27  4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0  0  3  3 11  4.47  541/1503   3.60  4.22  4.20  4.22  4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0  0  1  4 12  4.65  367/1290   3.60  4.32  4.28  4.31  4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   8   0  0  1  1  7  4.67  270/1453   3.82  4.22  4.21  4.23  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  5   1  2  1  4  4  3.67 1017/1421   3.20  4.08  4.00  4.01  3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 13  0  0  0  2  2  4.50 ****/1365   3.30  4.11  4.08  4.08  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   1  0  4  4  8  4.06  964/1485   3.55  4.20  4.16  4.17  4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1   0  0  0  2 14  4.88  708/1504   4.84  4.68  4.69  4.65  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1  0  0  5  8  1  3.71 1147/1483   3.20  4.07  4.06  4.08  3.71

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0  0  1  3 13  4.71  510/1425   3.70  4.41  4.41  4.43  4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0  0  1  1 15  4.82  690/1426   4.57  4.72  4.69  4.71  4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0  0  1  1 15  4.82  178/1418   3.75  4.29  4.25  4.26  4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   1  1  0  4 11  4.35  791/1416   3.74  4.34  4.26  4.27  4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  0  1  1  1 14  4.65  189/1199   3.95  3.95  3.97  4.02  4.65

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0   0  0  2  4  4  4.20  632/1312   3.40  4.12  4.00  4.09  4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0   0  0  2  4  5  4.27  783/1303   4.19  4.39  4.24  4.27  4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0  0  0  2  4  5  4.27  786/1299   3.85  4.34  4.25  4.30  4.27
4. Were special techniques successful                  7   5   0  0  2  0  3  4.20  328/ 758   3.72  4.05  4.01  4.00  4.20

                Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 244   ****  4.12  4.09  4.20  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 15 1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 227   ****  4.49  4.40  4.46  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           16   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 225   ****  4.40  4.23  4.29  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 207   ****  4.22  4.09  4.14  ****

                Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  70   ****  4.54  4.35  4.24  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    16   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  76   ****  4.41  4.44  4.51  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                16   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  73   ****  4.17  4.17  4.25  ****

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16   0   1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  58   ****  3.98  4.43  4.52  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  56   ****  4.12  4.23  4.13  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       16   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  44   ****  4.68  4.65  4.77  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   16   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  47   ****  4.32  4.29  4.14  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39   ****  4.61  4.44  4.47  ****

                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  40   ****  4.28  4.53  4.74  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    16   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  35   ****  4.43  4.49  4.36  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      16   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  36   ****  4.38  4.60  4.63  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       16   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  20   ****  5.00  4.24  5.00  ****
```

```
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    16   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  16  ****  5.00  4.51  3.95  ****
```

```
Course-Section: IS   303  0301                          University of Maryland                                    Page  895
Title          HUMAN FACTORS IN COMP                        Baltimore County                                      JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:    SMITH, ROBERT B                                 Spring 2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    28
Questionnaires: 17                              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                   Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned            Cum. GPA          Expected Grades              Reasons                    Type                    Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0         0.00-0.99   0          A    4         Required for Majors   1        Graduate      0        Major        0
 28-55      0         1.00-1.99   0          B    8
 56-83      3         2.00-2.99   4          C    1         General               6        Under-grad   17        Non-major    7
 84-150     3         3.00-3.49   1          D    1
 Grad.      0         3.50-4.00   0          F    0         Electives             0        #### - Means there are not enough
                                             P    0                                        responses to be significant
                                             I    0         Other                 8
                                             ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: IS   304  0101              University of Maryland                          Page  896
Title          ETHICAL ISSUES IN IS           Baltimore County                             JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:    WILSON, RICHARD                   Spring 2005                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    23
Questionnaires: 14                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                             Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  0  2  5  6  4.07 1061/1504  4.11  4.24  4.27  4.27  4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  0  5  8  4.43  618/1503  4.39  4.22  4.20  4.22  4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  1  5  7  4.29  758/1290  4.32  4.32  4.28  4.31  4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  1  0  4  8  4.46  501/1453  4.33  4.22  4.21  4.23  4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  6  0  1  2  1  4  4.00  745/1421  3.84  4.08  4.00  4.01  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 2 2 3 7  4.07  742/1365  4.20  4.11  4.08  4.08  4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   1  1  0  4  5  2  3.58 1253/1485  3.90  4.20  4.16  4.17  3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  3  9  2  3.93 1445/1504  4.04  4.68  4.69  4.65  3.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 0 1 1 3 5  4.20  700/1483  3.89  4.07  4.06  4.08  4.20


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  1  2  4  6  4.15 1100/1425  4.25  4.41  4.41  4.43  4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  1  3  9  4.62 1036/1426  4.76  4.72  4.69  4.71  4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  3  6  4  4.08  990/1418  4.30  4.29  4.25  4.26  4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  1  4  4  4  3.85 1126/1416  4.05  4.34  4.26  4.27  3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3 0 0 7 1 2  3.50  919/1199  3.92  3.95  3.97  4.02  3.50


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0  0  1  0  1  3  4.20  632/1312  4.24  4.12  4.00  4.09  4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40  675/1303  4.34  4.39  4.24  4.27  4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 0 0 1 3  4.75  354/1299  4.45  4.34  4.25  4.30  4.75
4. Were special techniques successful                  10  2  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 758  ****  4.05  4.01  4.00  ****
```

```
                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0        0.00-0.99   0         A   10        Required for Majors  2      Graduate     0        Major       0
28-55      0        1.00-1.99   0         B    1                                                          
56-83      2        2.00-2.99   2         C    0        General              5      Under-grad  14        Non-major   4
84-150     5        3.00-3.49   3         D    0
Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   2         F    0        Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                          I    0        Other                5
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: IS  304  0201              University of Maryland                              Page 897
Title      ETHICAL ISSUES IN IS                  Baltimore County                             JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:  WILSON, RICHARD                       Spring 2005                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:  29
Questionnaires: 20                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions               NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean   Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  0  5  7  8  4.15 1000/1504  4.11  4.24  4.27  4.27  4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  2  1  5 12  4.35  722/1503  4.39  4.22  4.20  4.22  4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  4  5 11  4.35  691/1290  4.32  4.32  4.28  4.31  4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  5  6  9  4.20  844/1453  4.33  4.22  4.21  4.23  4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  2  2  1  4  2  7  3.69 1004/1421  3.84  4.08  4.00  4.01  3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  3  6  9  4.33  493/1365  4.20  4.11  4.08  4.08  4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1  0  0  1  2  8  8  4.21  806/1485  3.90  4.20  4.16  4.17  4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1  0  0  0  0 16  3  4.16 1345/1504  4.04  4.68  4.69  4.65  4.16
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8  0  1  1  2  6  2  3.58 1204/1483  3.89  4.07  4.06  4.08  3.58


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  0  0  4  5 11  4.35  951/1425  4.25  4.41  4.41  4.43  4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  0  2 18  4.90  502/1426  4.76  4.72  4.69  4.71  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  2  5 12  4.53  552/1418  4.30  4.29  4.25  4.26  4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  0  1  4  4 11  4.25  871/1416  4.05  4.34  4.26  4.27  4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  1  0  0  2  8  8  4.33  429/1199  3.92  3.95  3.97  4.02  4.33


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13  0  0  1  0  2  4  4.29  572/1312  4.24  4.12  4.00  4.09  4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13  0  0  0  1  3  3  4.29  776/1303  4.34  4.39  4.24  4.27  4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13  0  0  0  2  2  3  4.14  869/1299  4.45  4.34  4.25  4.30  4.14
4. Were special techniques successful                 13  5  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 758  ****  4.05  4.01  4.00  ****

                               Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1      0.00-0.99   0      A  15       Required for Majors  2    Graduate     0      Major       0
 28-55     0      1.00-1.99   0      B   4
 56-83     4      2.00-2.99   4      C   0       General             13    Under-grad  20      Non-major   1
 84-150    7      3.00-3.49   5      D   0
 Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   4      F   0       Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                     P   0                                responses to be significant
                                     I   0       Other                2
                                     ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: IS   310  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 898
Title       SOFTWARE/HARDWARE CNCP             Baltimore County                               JUN 14, 2005
Instructor: REDDING, TATE                      Spring 2005                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    32
Questionnaires: 24                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions              NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  0  0  3  8 13  4.42  684/1504  3.77  4.24  4.27  4.27  4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  1  1  4 18  4.63  357/1503  3.95  4.22  4.20  4.22  4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  3  3 18  4.63  389/1290  4.05  4.32  4.28  4.31  4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  0  0  0  4  9 11  4.29  729/1453  3.93  4.22  4.21  4.23  4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  1  2  8 12  4.21  587/1421  3.73  4.08  4.00  4.01  4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  7 12  4  3.79  974/1365  3.52  4.11  4.08  4.08  3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  0  7 17  4.71  251/1485  4.02  4.20  4.16  4.17  4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  1  0  0  1 22  4.79  842/1504  4.43  4.68  4.69  4.65  4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  0  0  0  1  6 14  4.62  250/1483  3.78  4.07  4.06  4.08  4.62


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  0  4 20  4.83  285/1425  4.12  4.41  4.41  4.43  4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  2 22  4.92  451/1426  4.53  4.72  4.69  4.71  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  1  4 19  4.75  261/1418  3.88  4.29  4.25  4.26  4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  1  4 19  4.75  324/1416  4.02  4.34  4.26  4.27  4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  1  0  0  6  2 15  4.39  377/1199  3.91  3.95  3.97  4.02  4.39


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 22  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/1312  3.10  4.12  4.00  4.09  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00  ****/1303  4.44  4.39  4.24  4.27  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/1299  3.95  4.34  4.25  4.30  ****


                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades            Reasons                  Type                      Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0      A   3      Required for Majors  0     Graduate      0       Major        0
 28-55      6       1.00-1.99    1      B  14
 56-83      3       2.00-2.99   10      C   4      General              2     Under-grad   24       Non-major    1
 84-150     3       3.00-3.49    2      D   1
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    2      F   0      Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                responses to be significant
                                        I   0      Other               22
                                        ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: IS   310  0201            University of Maryland                              Page 899
Title      SOFTWARE/HARDWARE CNCP             Baltimore County                              JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:  GREEN, FRANK E.                     Spring 2005                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    35
Questionnaires:  26                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

		Frequencies							Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	4	7	10	1	3.17	1432/1504	3.77	4.24	4.27	4.27	3.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	3	3	9	6	3.50	1304/1503	3.95	4.22	4.20	4.22	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	4	4	7	9	3.88	1034/1290	4.05	4.32	4.28	4.31	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	1	1	7	7	6	3.73	1204/1453	3.93	4.22	4.21	4.23	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	4	4	8	3	3.29	1228/1421	3.73	4.08	4.00	4.01	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	6	1	4	4	5	1	3.07	1289/1365	3.52	4.11	4.08	4.08	3.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	2	2	3	4	10	3.86	1116/1485	4.02	4.20	4.16	4.17	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	13	9	4.41	1173/1504	4.43	4.68	4.69	4.65	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	3	2	7	6	0	2.89	1404/1483	3.78	4.07	4.06	4.08	2.89
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	2	6	10	3	3.43	1322/1425	4.12	4.41	4.41	4.43	3.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	2	4	9	6	3.77	1364/1426	4.53	4.72	4.69	4.71	3.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	3	7	9	0	3.00	1330/1418	3.88	4.29	4.25	4.26	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	2	4	11	2	3.22	1302/1416	4.02	4.34	4.26	4.27	3.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	3	4	4	7	4	3.23	1013/1199	3.91	3.95	3.97	4.02	3.23
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	2	7	4	4	3.20	1108/1312	3.10	4.12	4.00	4.09	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	1	1	3	12	4.16	857/1303	4.44	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.16
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	2	2	7	7	3.89	1000/1299	3.95	4.34	4.25	4.30	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	9	10	2	2	1	2	0	2.43	740/ 758	2.43	4.05	4.01	4.00	2.43
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.20	****
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.14	****

```
                                Frequency Distribution
```

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	8

```
84-150     2        3.00-3.49    3          D    0
Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    3          F    0        Electives        0          #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                            I    0        Other           20
                                            ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: IS   310  0301                University of Maryland                                        Page  900
Title          SOFTWARE/HARDWARE CNCP              Baltimore County                                        JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:    COMITZ, PAUL H.                       Spring 2005                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    39
Questionnaires: 12                            Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1  0  1  0  2  6  2  3.73 1280/1504  3.77  4.24  4.27  4.27  3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  1  0  3  4  3  3.73 1221/1503  3.95  4.22  4.20  4.22  3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  1  1  3  2  4  3.64 1120/1290  4.05  4.32  4.28  4.31  3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  2  0  0  3  5  1  3.78 1181/1453  3.93  4.22  4.21  4.23  3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1  0  0  5  3  2  3.70  991/1421  3.73  4.08  4.00  4.01  3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 5 3 2  3.70 1040/1365  3.52  4.11  4.08  4.08  3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  1  1  2  1  3  3  3.50 1284/1485  4.02  4.20  4.16  4.17  3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  1  0  7  3  4.09 1386/1504  4.43  4.68  4.69  4.65  4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 0 3 1 2  3.83 1061/1483  3.78  4.07  4.06  4.08  3.83


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2  0  0  0  3  3  4  4.10 1129/1425  4.12  4.41  4.41  4.43  4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2  0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  502/1426  4.53  4.72  4.69  4.71  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 1 0 2 3 4  3.90 1098/1418  3.88  4.29  4.25  4.26  3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2  0  0  1  1  4  4  4.10  994/1416  4.02  4.34  4.26  4.27  4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 3 3 4  4.10  600/1199  3.91  3.95  3.97  4.02  4.10


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 1 2 0 4 0  3.00 1149/1312  3.10  4.12  4.00  4.09  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 2 5  4.71  401/1303  4.44  4.39  4.24  4.27  4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 1 0 0 3 3  4.00  922/1299  3.95  4.34  4.25  4.30  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  5  5  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/ 758  2.43  4.05  4.01  4.00  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
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 significant			
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: IS   325  0101                University of Maryland                                    Page  901
Title       INTRO TO MANAGEMENT SC              Baltimore County                                        JUN 14, 2005
Instructor: ROBINSON, RANDA                     Spring 2005                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   18
Questionnaires: 10                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	826/1504	4.60	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	380/1503	4.78	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	344/1290	4.47	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	947/1453	3.77	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	745/1421	4.00	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	614/1365	3.74	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	705/1485	4.68	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	657/1504	4.88	4.68	4.69	4.65	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	602/1483	3.82	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.29
Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1425	4.88	4.41	4.41	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1426	4.88	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	261/1418	4.75	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	324/1416	4.75	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1199	4.50	3.95	3.97	4.02	5.00
Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	196/1312	3.92	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1303	4.67	4.39	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1299	4.67	4.34	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	132/ 758	3.72	4.05	4.01	4.00	4.67

```
                                            Frequency Distribution
```

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

Title   INTRO TO MANAGEMENT SC   Baltimore County   JUN 14, 2005
Instructor: FORGIONNE, GUIS (Instr. A)   Spring 2005   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 8   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                           Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level   Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean   Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  262/1504   4.60  4.24  4.27  4.27   4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  125/1503   4.78  4.22  4.20  4.22   4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  2  1  5  4.38  671/1290   4.47  4.32  4.28  4.31   4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   3  1  0  1  1  2  3.60 1253/1453   3.77  4.22  4.21  4.23   3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2  0  0  2  2  2  4.00  745/1421   4.00  4.08  4.00  4.01   4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4 0 2 0 0 2  3.50 1153/1365   3.74  4.11  4.08  4.08   3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  113/1485   4.68  4.20  4.16  4.17   4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  708/1504   4.88  4.68  4.69  4.65   4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67  211/1483   3.82  4.07  4.06  4.08   3.58

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  420/1425   4.88  4.41  4.41  4.43   4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  1  0  7  4.75  825/1426   4.88  4.72  4.69  4.71   4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1418   4.75  4.29  4.25  4.26   4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1416   4.75  4.34  4.26  4.27   4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 0 1 1 4  4.50  271/1199   4.50  3.95  3.97  4.02   4.25

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  2  0  0  1  3  3.50 1011/1312   3.92  4.12  4.00  4.09   3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  0  3  3  4.50  563/1303   4.67  4.39  4.24  4.27   4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 0 3 3  4.50  570/1299   4.67  4.34  4.25  4.30   4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   2  0  2  0  1  1  3.25  648/ 758   3.72  4.05  4.01  4.00   3.25

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  7   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 233   ****  4.07  4.09  4.12   ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 244   ****  4.12  4.09  4.20   ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 227   ****  4.49  4.40  4.46   ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           7   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 225   ****  4.40  4.23  4.29   ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 7   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 207   ****  4.22  4.09  4.14   ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 7  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  76   ****  4.60  4.61  4.84   ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 7 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  70   ****  4.54  4.35  4.24   ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  67   ****  4.32  4.34  3.98   ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    7   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  76   ****  4.41  4.44  4.51   ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                7   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  73   ****  4.17  4.17  4.25   ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  58   ****  3.98  4.43  4.52   ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  40   ****  4.28  4.53  4.74   ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    7   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  35   ****  4.43  4.49  4.36   ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      7   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  36   ****  4.38  4.60  4.63   ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       7   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  20   ****  5.00  4.24  5.00   ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     7   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  16   ****  5.00  4.51  3.95   ****
```

                                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	8	Non-major	6
84-150	1	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 significant			
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Title   INTRO TO MANAGEMENT SC   Baltimore County   JUN 14, 2005
Instructor: (Instr. B)   Spring 2005   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 8   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                            Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   0   2   6  4.75   262/1504  4.60  4.24  4.27  4.27  4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   1   7  4.88   125/1503  4.78  4.22  4.20  4.22  4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   2   1   5  4.38   671/1290  4.47  4.32  4.28  4.31  4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   3   1   0   1   1   2  3.60  1253/1453  3.77  4.22  4.21  4.23  3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   2   0   0   2   2   2  4.00   745/1421  4.00  4.08  4.00  4.01  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  4   0   2   0   0   2  3.50  1153/1365  3.74  4.11  4.08  4.08  3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   0   1   7  4.88   113/1485  4.68  4.20  4.16  4.17  4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   1   7  4.88   708/1504  4.88  4.68  4.69  4.65  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6  0   1   0   0   1   0  2.50  1448/1483  3.82  4.07  4.06  4.08  3.58

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        7   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/1425  4.88  4.41  4.41  4.43  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   7   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/1426  4.88  4.72  4.69  4.71  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50   578/1418  4.75  4.29  4.25  4.26  4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     6   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50   623/1416  4.75  4.34  4.26  4.27  4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6  0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00   636/1199  4.50  3.95  3.97  4.02  4.25

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0   2   0   0   1   3  3.50  1011/1312  3.92  4.12  4.00  4.09  3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0   0   0   0   3   3  4.50   563/1303  4.67  4.39  4.24  4.27  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0   0   0   0   3   3  4.50   570/1299  4.67  4.34  4.25  4.30  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   2   0   2   0   1   1  3.25   648/ 758  3.72  4.05  4.01  4.00  3.25

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  7   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 233  ****  4.07  4.09  4.12  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 244  ****  4.12  4.09  4.20  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 227  ****  4.49  4.40  4.46  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           7   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 225  ****  4.40  4.23  4.29  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 7   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 207  ****  4.22  4.09  4.14  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 7  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  76  ****  4.60  4.61  4.84  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 7  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  70  ****  4.54  4.35  4.24  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 7  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  67  ****  4.32  4.34  3.98  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    7   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  76  ****  4.41  4.44  4.51  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                7   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  73  ****  4.17  4.17  4.25  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  58  ****  3.98  4.43  4.52  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  40  ****  4.28  4.53  4.74  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    7   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  35  ****  4.43  4.49  4.36  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      7   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  36  ****  4.38  4.60  4.63  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       7   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  20  ****  5.00  4.24  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     7   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  16  ****  5.00  4.51  3.95  ****
```

Title   INTRO TO MANAGEMENT SC   Baltimore County   JUN 14, 2005
Instructor: (Instr. B)   Spring 2005   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 8   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	8	Non-major	6
84-150	1	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 significant			
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: IS   350  0101                University of Maryland                                    Page  904
Title      BUSINESS COMM SYSTEMS                 Baltimore County                                       JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:  GLAZER, DINA                          Spring 2005                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   17
Questionnaires:  14                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  0  2  4  7  4.14 1010/1504  3.87  4.24  4.27  4.27  4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  1  1  2  9  4.21  891/1503  4.21  4.22  4.20  4.22  4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  1  2 10  4.50  507/1290  4.35  4.32  4.28  4.31  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  3  1  1  4  5  3.50 1282/1453  3.60  4.22  4.21  4.23  3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   2  0  1  1  3  7  4.33  479/1421  3.94  4.08  4.00  4.01  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1  2  1  1  3  5  3.67 1065/1365  3.48  4.11  4.08  4.08  3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  1  0  1 11  4.43  563/1485  4.01  4.20  4.16  4.17  4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  6  7  4.54 1069/1504  4.37  4.68  4.69  4.65  4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1  1  1  1  7  0  3.40 1276/1483  3.62  4.07  4.06  4.08  3.40


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  2  0  2  9  4.38  920/1425  4.44  4.41  4.41  4.43  4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  1  2  1  9  4.38 1207/1426  4.44  4.72  4.69  4.71  4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  1  1  0  2  9  4.31  799/1418  4.34  4.29  4.25  4.26  4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  2  0  1  1  9  4.15  953/1416  4.26  4.34  4.26  4.27  4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  1  1  1  0  2  7  4.18  548/1199  4.22  3.95  3.97  4.02  4.18


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0  0  1  0  2  2  4.00  716/1312  3.63  4.12  4.00  4.09  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0  0  0  1  2  2  4.20  833/1303  3.60  4.39  4.24  4.27  4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40  678/1299  3.83  4.34  4.25  4.30  4.40
4. Were special techniques successful                  9   2  0  1  0  0  2  4.00 ****/ 758  ****  4.05  4.01  4.00  ****
```

```
                                  Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                  Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1      0.00-0.99   0        A   5      Required for Majors  0     Graduate      0       Major       0
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0        B   5
 56-83      5      2.00-2.99   4        C   2      General              0     Under-grad   14       Non-major   1
 84-150     2      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 significant
                                        I   0      Other               12
                                        ?   0
```

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	5	2	3.60	1322/1504	3.87	4.24	4.27	4.27	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	910/1503	4.21	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	832/1290	4.35	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	0	4	3.70	1214/1453	3.60	4.22	4.21	4.23	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	1	3	3.56	1084/1421	3.94	4.08	4.00	4.01	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	3	2	3.30	1236/1365	3.48	4.11	4.08	4.08	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	1246/1485	4.01	4.20	4.16	4.17	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	1314/1504	4.37	4.68	4.69	4.65	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1061/1483	3.62	4.07	4.06	4.08	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	784/1425	4.44	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	1128/1426	4.44	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	736/1418	4.34	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	776/1416	4.26	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	495/1199	4.22	3.95	3.97	4.02	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1093/1312	3.63	4.12	4.00	4.09	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1195/1303	3.60	4.39	4.24	4.27	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1166/1299	3.83	4.34	4.25	4.30	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		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	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: IS   387  0101          University of Maryland                      Page  906
Title      WEB CONTENT DEVELOPMEN            Baltimore County                      JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:   KOMLODI, ANITA                   Spring 2005                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   12
Questionnaires: 10                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                      Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions              NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70  327/1504  4.70  4.24  4.27  4.27  4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  8  2  4.20  910/1503  4.20  4.22  4.20  4.22  4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1  0  0  0  0  6  3  4.33  711/1290  4.33  4.32  4.28  4.31  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  5  5  4.50  440/1453  4.50  4.22  4.21  4.23  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 5 4  4.30  509/1421  4.30  4.08  4.00  4.01  4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 7 3 4.30  525/1365  4.30  4.11  4.08  4.08  4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  0  0  8  2  4.20  830/1485  4.20  4.20  4.16  4.17  4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  657/1504  4.90  4.68  4.69  4.65  4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 4 3 4.43 433/1483  4.43  4.07  4.06  4.08  4.43


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  331/1425  4.80  4.41  4.41  4.43  4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1  0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  549/1426  4.89  4.72  4.69  4.71  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 4 5  4.56  514/1418  4.56  4.29  4.25  4.26  4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1  0  0  0  0  4  5  4.56  574/1416  4.56  4.34  4.26  4.27  4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 3 6 4.67  177/1199  4.67  3.95  3.97  4.02  4.67


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 2 2 2  4.00  716/1312  4.00  4.12  4.00  4.09  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 2 3 1 3.83 1020/1303  3.83  4.39  4.24  4.27  3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67  445/1299  4.67  4.34  4.25  4.30  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                 4  1  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  154/ 758  4.60  4.05  4.01  4.00  4.60

                              Frequency Distribution
```

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

```
Title          USER INTERFACE DESIGN                  Baltimore County                                       JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:    GOODALL, JOHN R                        Spring 2005                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    18
Questionnaires: 13                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	250/1504	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.33	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	678/1503	4.51	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	400/1290	4.58	4.32	4.28	4.32	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	320/1453	4.63	4.22	4.21	4.22	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	429/1421	4.31	4.08	4.00	4.02	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	441/1365	4.19	4.11	4.08	4.09	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	190/1485	4.62	4.20	4.16	4.14	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	591/1504	4.89	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	635/1483	4.40	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	525/1425	4.80	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	401/1426	4.92	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	171/1418	4.79	4.29	4.25	4.25	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	544/1416	4.70	4.34	4.26	4.26	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	271/1199	4.61	3.95	3.97	4.05	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	276/1312	4.57	4.12	4.00	4.07	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	288/1303	4.74	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	714/1299	4.64	4.34	4.25	4.38	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	154/ 758	4.62	4.05	4.01	4.17	4.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	56/ 233	4.60	4.07	4.09	3.78	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	107/ 244	4.40	4.12	4.09	3.56	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	102/ 227	4.60	4.49	4.40	4.16	4.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	115/ 225	4.40	4.40	4.23	3.81	4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	29/ 207	4.80	4.22	4.09	3.69	4.80

```
                                            Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: IS   403  8020              University of Maryland                                      Page  908
Title      USER INTERFACE DESIGN            Baltimore County                                          JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:   DeVreis, Esther               Spring 2005                                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   17
Questionnaires: 14                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies       Instructor     Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  1  4  9  4.57  455/1504  4.67  4.24  4.27  4.33  4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  3 10  4.64  335/1503  4.51  4.22  4.20  4.18  4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  0  3  0 10  4.54  478/1290  4.58  4.32  4.28  4.32  4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  5  9  4.64  290/1453  4.63  4.22  4.21  4.22  4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  1  0  2  2  8  4.23  563/1421  4.31  4.08  4.00  4.02  4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1  4  2  6  4.00  782/1365  4.19  4.11  4.08  4.09  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  2  3  8  4.46  509/1485  4.62  4.20  4.16  4.14  4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  1  0 13  4.86  743/1504  4.89  4.68  4.69  4.73  4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 0 0 0 4 5  4.56  298/1483  4.40  4.07  4.06  4.11  4.56

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  0  1 11  4.92  161/1425  4.80  4.41  4.41  4.38  4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  1 12  4.92  401/1426  4.92  4.72  4.69  4.72  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  0  3  9  4.75  261/1418  4.79  4.29  4.25  4.25  4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82  243/1416  4.70  4.34  4.26  4.26  4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0 0 0  0  3  8  4.73  144/1199  4.61  3.95  3.97  4.05  4.73

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  2  2  8  4.50  364/1312  4.57  4.12  4.00  4.07  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  0  4  8  4.67  450/1303  4.74  4.39  4.24  4.34  4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0  0  1 11  4.92  182/1299  4.64  4.34  4.25  4.38  4.92
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   0  0  0  1  2  8  4.64  143/ 758  4.62  4.05  4.01  4.17  4.64

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 11   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 233  4.60  4.07  4.09  3.78  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/ 244 4.40 4.12 4.09 3.56 ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 11 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/ 227 4.60 4.49 4.40 4.16 ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          11   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 225  4.40  4.40  4.23  3.81  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 11   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 207  4.80  4.22  4.09  3.69  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  76  ****  4.60  4.61  4.63  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 12 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/  70  ****  4.54  4.35  4.63  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 12  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  67  ****  4.32  4.34  4.34  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   12   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  76  ****  4.41  4.44  4.51  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               12   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  73  ****  4.17  4.17  4.29  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 12  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  58  ****  3.98  4.43  4.83  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 12  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  56  ****  4.12  4.23  4.37  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      12   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  44  ****  4.68  4.65  4.33  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  12   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  47  ****  4.32  4.29  4.12  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 12  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  39  ****  4.61  4.44  4.19  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 12  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  40  ****  4.28  4.53  5.00  ****
```

```
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    12   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  35  ****  4.43  4.49  4.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      12   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  36  ****  4.38  4.60  4.83  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       12   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  20  ****  5.00  4.24  ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     12   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  16  ****  5.00  4.51  ****  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	1			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: IS   410  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  909
Title         INTRO TO DATABASE DESI            Baltimore County                          JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:   MCGINNIS, JOSEP                    Spring 2005                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       29
Questionnaires:   27                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                  Questions            NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   2   0   0   1   3   9  12  4.28  851/1504  4.43  4.24  4.27  4.33  4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2   0   0   0   3   8  14  4.44  587/1503  4.40  4.22  4.20  4.18  4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2   0   0   1   2  10  12  4.32  721/1290  4.40  4.32  4.28  4.32  4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2   2   1   1   3   7  11  4.13  912/1453  4.40  4.22  4.21  4.22  4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  3   0   2   2   9   9  4.14  651/1421  4.22  4.08  4.00  4.02  4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 5  0   2   1  10   7  4.10  726/1365  4.25  4.11  4.08  4.09  4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            3   0   0   0   4   7  13  4.38  625/1485  4.40  4.20  4.16  4.14  4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0   0   0   0   3  22  4.88  691/1504  4.82  4.68  4.69  4.73  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0  0   1   5   5   8  4.05  821/1483  4.19  4.07  4.06  4.11  4.05


                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0   1   2   4  18  4.56  712/1425  4.68  4.41  4.41  4.38  4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   0   0   8  17  4.68  954/1426  4.78  4.72  4.69  4.72  4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0   0   0   2   9  13  4.46  643/1418  4.63  4.29  4.25  4.25  4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   1   1   1   7  15  4.36  784/1416  4.66  4.34  4.26  4.26  4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0  2   1   5   5  12  3.96  680/1199  4.41  3.95  3.97  4.05  3.96


                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17 0  0   1   4   1   4  3.80  877/1312  4.35  4.12  4.00  4.07  3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 0  0   0   3   3   4  4.10  887/1303  4.36  4.39  4.24  4.34  4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0 0   0   2   2   6  4.40  678/1299  4.52  4.34  4.25  4.38  4.40
4. Were special techniques successful                  17   3  0   1   2   1   3  3.86  483/ 758  4.34  4.05  4.01  4.17  3.86


                  Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  22   2   0   0   0   0   3  5.00  ****/ 233  ****  4.07  4.09  3.78  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 22 0 1   0   1   1   2  3.60  ****/ 244  ****  4.12  4.09  3.56  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 22 2  0   0   0   1   2  4.67  ****/ 227  ****  4.49  4.40  4.16  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           22   3   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/ 225  ****  4.40  4.23  3.81  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 22   3   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/ 207  ****  4.22  4.09  3.69  ****


                  Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 1  0   0   1   1   1  4.00  ****/  70  ****  4.54  4.35  4.63  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23 1  0   0   0   2   1  4.33  ****/  67  ****  4.32  4.34  4.34  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    23   2   0   1   0   1   0  3.00  ****/  76  ****  4.41  4.44  4.51  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                23   3   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  73  ****  4.17  4.17  4.29  ****


                  Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 24   0   2   0   1   0   0  1.67  ****/  58  ****  3.98  4.43  4.83  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 24   0   1   0   1   1   0  2.67  ****/  56  ****  4.12  4.23  4.37  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       24   1   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/  44  ****  4.68  4.65  4.33  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   24   2   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  47  ****  4.32  4.29  4.12  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 24   1   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/  39  ****  4.61  4.44  4.19  ****


                  Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 24  0   1   1   0   0   1  2.67  ****/  40  ****  4.28  4.53  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    24   2   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  35  ****  4.43  4.49  4.50  ****
```

```
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       24   2   0   0   0   1   0   4.00 ****/  36  ****  4.38  4.60  4.83  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        24   2   0   0   0   1   0   4.00 ****/  20  ****  5.00  4.24  ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      24   2   0   0   0   1   0   4.00 ****/  16  ****  5.00  4.51  ****  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: IS   410  0301              University of Maryland                              Page  910
Title           INTRO TO DATABASE DESI       Baltimore County                                  JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:     YOON, VICTORIA               Spring 2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     33
Questionnaires: 26                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean  Rank    Mean Mean Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  1  9 16  4.58  455/1504  4.43 4.24 4.27 4.33  4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  2  4 20  4.69  279/1503  4.40 4.22 4.20 4.18  4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  3  7 16  4.50  507/1290  4.40 4.32 4.28 4.32  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   5  0  0  2  6 13  4.52  418/1453  4.40 4.22 4.21 4.22  4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2  1  0  5  7 11  4.13  660/1421  4.22 4.08 4.00 4.02  4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7 0 1  1  9  8  4.26  569/1365  4.25 4.11 4.08 4.09  4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  3  5 17  4.56  391/1485  4.40 4.20 4.16 4.14  4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0 12 14  4.54 1069/1504  4.82 4.68 4.69 4.73  4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 1 0 0  1  7 11  4.53  322/1483  4.19 4.07 4.06 4.11  4.53

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  1  5 19  4.72  492/1425  4.68 4.41 4.41 4.38  4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  2  2 22  4.77  808/1426  4.78 4.72 4.69 4.72  4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  1 10 15  4.54  539/1418  4.63 4.29 4.25 4.25  4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  1  8 17  4.62  511/1416  4.66 4.34 4.26 4.26  4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 2 0 0  5  6 12  4.30  455/1199  4.41 3.95 3.97 4.05  4.30

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0  0  6 10  4.63  283/1312  4.35 4.12 4.00 4.07  4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 0  0  6 10  4.63  488/1303  4.36 4.39 4.24 4.34  4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 0 0  7  9  4.56  530/1299  4.52 4.34 4.25 4.38  4.56
4. Were special techniques successful                  10   8  1  0  0  2  5  4.25  304/ 758  4.34 4.05 4.01 4.17  4.25

                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  23   0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/ 233  **** 4.07 4.09 3.78  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 23 0 0 0 0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 244  **** 4.12 4.09 3.56  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 24 0 0 0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/ 227  **** 4.49 4.40 4.16  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           24   0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/ 225  **** 4.40 4.23 3.81  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 25   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 207  **** 4.22 4.09 3.69  ****

                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 24 0 0 0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  76  **** 4.60 4.61 4.63  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 24 0 0 0 0  0  2  5.00 ****/  70  **** 4.54 4.35 4.63  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 24 0 0 0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  67  **** 4.32 4.34 4.34  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    25   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  76  **** 4.41 4.44 4.51  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                25   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  73  **** 4.17 4.17 4.29  ****

                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 24 0 0 0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  58  **** 3.98 4.43 4.83  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 24 0 0 0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  56  **** 4.12 4.23 4.37  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       24   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  44  **** 4.68 4.65 4.33  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   25   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  47  **** 4.32 4.29 4.12  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 25   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  **** 4.61 4.44 4.19  ****

                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 24 0 0 0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  40  **** 4.28 4.53 5.00  ****
```

```
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    24  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  35  ****  4.43  4.49  4.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      24  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  36  ****  4.38  4.60  4.83  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       25  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  20  ****  5.00  4.24  ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     25  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  16  ****  5.00  4.51  ****  ****
```

Enrollment: 33
Questionnaires: 26   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   0   0.00-0.99   0   A   12   Required for Majors   0   Graduate   0   Major   0
 28-55   3   1.00-1.99   0   B   11
 56-83   6   2.00-2.99   3   C   0   General   0   Under-grad   26   Non-major   1
 84-150   4   3.00-3.49   6   D   0
 Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   7   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P   0   responses to be significant
                                            I   0   Other   23
                                            ?   0

```
Course-Section: IS   410  0401          University of Maryland                              Page  911
Title          INTRO TO DATABASE DESI         Baltimore County                             JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:    ZHOU, LINA                      Spring 2005                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    10
Questionnaires: 10                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions               NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean Mean  Mean Mean   Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1  0  0  1  0  4  4  4.22  927/1504  4.43 4.24  4.27 4.33  4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  3  3  4  4.10  990/1503  4.40 4.22  4.20 4.18  4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  2  3  5  4.30  741/1290  4.40 4.32  4.28 4.32  4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  1  0  0  1  2  6  4.56  385/1453  4.40 4.22  4.21 4.22  4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  0  1  2  1  5  4.11  669/1421  4.22 4.08  4.00 4.02  4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0  1  1  2  5  4.22  614/1365  4.25 4.11  4.08 4.09  4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  1  2  2  5  4.10  938/1485  4.40 4.20  4.16 4.14  4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1504  4.82 4.68  4.69 4.73  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0  0  2  3  1  3.83 1061/1483  4.19 4.07  4.06 4.11  3.83


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1  0  0  0  1  2  6  4.56  724/1425  4.68 4.41  4.41 4.38  4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1  0  0  0  1  0  8  4.78  790/1426  4.78 4.72  4.69 4.72  4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  1  1  7  4.67  378/1418  4.63 4.29  4.25 4.25  4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1  0  0  0  1  1  7  4.67  446/1416  4.66 4.34  4.26 4.26  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0  0  2  1  5  4.38  394/1199  4.41 3.95  3.97 4.05  4.38


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  592/1312  4.35 4.12  4.00 4.07  4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  0  2  0  2  4.00  910/1303  4.36 4.39  4.24 4.34  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0  1  0  0  3  4.25  798/1299  4.52 4.34  4.25 4.38  4.25
4. Were special techniques successful                   6  1  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  132/ 758  4.34 4.05  4.01 4.17  4.67


                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 233  **** 4.07  4.09 3.78  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 9 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 244  **** 4.12  4.09 3.56  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 227  **** 4.49  4.40 4.16  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 225  **** 4.40  4.23 3.81  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 207  **** 4.22  4.09 3.69  ****

                              Frequency Distribution


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     1       1.00-1.99   0        B    4
 56-83     4       2.00-2.99   2        C    1        General              0      Under-grad  10      Non-major  1
 84-150    2       3.00-3.49   2        D    0
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   2        F    0        Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other               10
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: IS   410  8020              University of Maryland                               Page  912
Title       INTRO TO DATABASE DESI               Baltimore County                              JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:   SPONAUGLE, RICH                       Spring 2005                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     9
Questionnaires:  9                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean  Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1  0  0  0  1  1  6  4.63  396/1504  4.43  4.24  4.27  4.33  4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1  0  0  0  1  3  4  4.38  692/1503  4.40  4.22  4.20  4.18  4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1  0  0  0  0  4  4  4.50  507/1290  4.40  4.32  4.28  4.32  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1  0  0  0  1  3  4  4.38  631/1453  4.40  4.22  4.21  4.22  4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  1  2  5  4.50  320/1421  4.22  4.08  4.00  4.02  4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  1  2  4  4.43  395/1365  4.25  4.11  4.08  4.09  4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2  0  0  0  0  3  4  4.57  380/1485  4.40  4.20  4.16  4.14  4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2  0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  743/1504  4.82  4.68  4.69  4.73  4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  1  0  0  1  2  3  4.33  543/1483  4.19  4.07  4.06  4.11  4.33


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1  0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  224/1425  4.68  4.41  4.41  4.38  4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1  0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  572/1426  4.78  4.72  4.69  4.72  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  145/1418  4.63  4.29  4.25  4.25  4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1  0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1416  4.66  4.34  4.26  4.26  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  1  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1199  4.41  3.95  3.97  4.05  5.00


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  221/1312  4.35  4.12  4.00  4.07  4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  1  0  6  4.71  401/1303  4.36  4.39  4.24  4.34  4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  253/1299  4.52  4.34  4.25  4.38  4.86
4. Were special techniques successful                   2  2  0  0  1  0  4  4.60  154/ 758  4.34  4.05  4.01  4.17  4.60

                                          Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: IS   413  8020              University of Maryland                              Page 913
Title          GUI SYSTEMS USING JAVA            Baltimore County                              JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:    CHIANG, CHIYUNK                    Spring 2005                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    18
Questionnaires: 17                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions          NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank    Mean Mean   Mean Mean   Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   2   0  0  1  1  1 12  4.60  416/1504  4.60 4.24  4.27 4.33  4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  3 13  4.81  164/1503  4.81 4.22  4.20 4.18  4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  0  1  1 14  4.81  194/1290  4.81 4.32  4.28 4.32  4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   1  0  0  1  1 13  4.80  158/1453  4.80 4.22  4.21 4.22  4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  1  0  0  0  4 10  4.71  182/1421  4.71 4.08  4.00 4.02  4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 4 1  0  0  0 10  4.64  205/1365  4.64 4.11  4.08 4.09  4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0  0  0  0  2 13  4.87  118/1485  4.87 4.20  4.16 4.14  4.87
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  5 11  4.69  968/1504  4.69 4.68  4.69 4.73  4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 0 0 2  5  5  4.25  635/1483  4.25 4.07  4.06 4.11  4.25


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  0  3 12  4.80  331/1425  4.80 4.41  4.41 4.38  4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  0  0 15  5.00    1/1426  5.00 4.72  4.69 4.72  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  0  2 13  4.87  152/1418  4.87 4.29  4.25 4.25  4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   1  0  0  0  2 12  4.86  198/1416  4.86 4.34  4.26 4.26  4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 1 0 1  0  2 10  4.62  207/1199  4.62 3.95  3.97 4.05  4.62


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  3  2 10  4.47  404/1312  4.47 4.12  4.00 4.07  4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  1  1 13  4.80  299/1303  4.80 4.39  4.24 4.34  4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0  0  2 13  4.87  243/1299  4.87 4.34  4.25 4.38  4.87
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   5  2  0  0  0  8  4.20  328/ 758  4.20 4.05  4.01 4.17  4.20


                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  12  1  0  0  0  1  3  4.75 ****/ 233  **** 4.07  4.09 3.78  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 0 0 0  1  4  4.80   29/ 244  4.80 4.12  4.09 3.56  4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 12 0 0 0 0  0  5  5.00    1/ 227  5.00 4.49  4.40 4.16  5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           12  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   51/ 225  4.80 4.40  4.23 3.81  4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/ 207  5.00 4.22  4.09 3.69  5.00


                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15 1 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/  76  **** 4.60  4.61 4.63  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15 1 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/  70  **** 4.54  4.35 4.63  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    15  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  76  **** 4.41  4.44 4.51  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                15  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  73  **** 4.17  4.17 4.29  ****


                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  58  **** 3.98  4.43 4.83  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  56  **** 4.12  4.23 4.37  ****


                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0      A    7      Required for Majors   1    Graduate      0      Major       0
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0      B    0
```

56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	17	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough
				P	0			responses to be significant
				I	0	Other	3	
				?	0			

```
Course-Section: IS   420  0101          University of Maryland                          Page  914
Title      DATABASE APPL DEVELOP             Baltimore County                           JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:  KARABATIS, GEOR                 Spring 2005                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    38
Questionnaires:  22                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions             NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0  0  0  0  6  15  4.71  306/1504  4.61 4.24  4.27 4.33  4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  3 10   8  4.24  869/1503  4.42 4.22  4.20 4.18  4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  0  2 10   9  4.33  711/1290  4.44 4.32  4.28 4.32  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   2  0  0  4  5  10  4.32  705/1453  4.44 4.22  4.21 4.22  4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   4  1  1  3  4   7  3.94  827/1421  4.04 4.08  4.00 4.02  3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 8  1  1  1  3   6  4.00  782/1365  4.13 4.11  4.08 4.09  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0  0  1  2  5  12  4.40  591/1485  4.58 4.20  4.16 4.14  4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0  0  0  0  0  20  5.00    1/1504  4.92 4.68  4.69 4.73  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 0  0  6  8   2  3.75 1123/1483  4.05 4.07  4.06 4.11  3.75


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  1  4  16  4.71  492/1425  4.77 4.41  4.41 4.38  4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  6  15  4.71  895/1426  4.75 4.72  4.69 4.72  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  1  7  13  4.57  488/1418  4.67 4.29  4.25 4.25  4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0  0  1  6  2  10  4.11  994/1416  4.36 4.34  4.26 4.26  4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 4 0  0  4  3   8  4.27  487/1199  4.52 3.95  3.97 4.05  4.27


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0  0  0  1  2   8  4.64  276/1312  4.19 4.12  4.00 4.07  4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0  0  0  5  3   3  3.82 1028/1303  3.72 4.39  4.24 4.34  3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 1 0  4  4   2  3.55 1100/1299  3.77 4.34  4.25 4.38  3.55
4. Were special techniques successful                  11   8  0  0  1  1   1  4.00 ****/ 758  3.67 4.05  4.01 4.17  ****


                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  17   0  0  0  0  0   5  5.00 ****/ 233  **** 4.07  4.09 3.78  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 0 0  0  1   4  4.80 ****/ 244  **** 4.12  4.09 3.56  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 17 0 0 0  0  1   4  4.80 ****/ 227  **** 4.49  4.40 4.16  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           17   0  0  0  0  2   3  4.60 ****/ 225  **** 4.40  4.23 3.81  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  17  0  0  0  1  2   2  4.20 ****/ 207  **** 4.22  4.09 3.69  ****

                                     Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type              Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0      A    7       Required for Majors  0    Graduate     0      Major       0
 28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0      B    9
 56-83      5       2.00-2.99    5      C    3       General              0    Under-grad  22      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
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other               19
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: IS   420  0201                    University of Maryland                                    Page  915
Title       DATABASE APPL DEVELOP                     Baltimore County                                    JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:    BANDARU, PRAKAS                          Spring 2005                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    25
Questionnaires: 18                           Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                             Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  2  5 11  4.50  549/1504  4.61  4.24  4.27  4.33  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  7 11  4.61  368/1503  4.42  4.22  4.20  4.18  4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  8 10  4.56  459/1290  4.44  4.32  4.28  4.32  4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2  0  0  1  5 10  4.56  374/1453  4.44  4.22  4.21  4.22  4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  3  1  0  2  5  7  4.13  651/1421  4.04  4.08  4.00  4.02  4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 1  0  0  8  7  4.25  581/1365  4.13  4.11  4.08  4.09  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   1  0  0  0  4 13  4.76  190/1485  4.58  4.20  4.16  4.14  4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  3 15  4.83  778/1504  4.92  4.68  4.69  4.73  4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0  1  9  7  4.35  518/1483  4.05  4.07  4.06  4.11  4.35


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  3 15  4.83  285/1425  4.77  4.41  4.41  4.38  4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  4 14  4.78  790/1426  4.75  4.72  4.69  4.72  4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  4 14  4.78  233/1418  4.67  4.29  4.25  4.25  4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  2  3 13  4.61  511/1416  4.36  4.34  4.26  4.26  4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0  0  1  2 14  4.76  124/1199  4.52  3.95  3.97  4.05  4.76


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 1  0  2  2  3  3.75  902/1312  4.19  4.12  4.00  4.07  3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 1  1  1  2  3  3.63 1089/1303  3.72  4.39  4.24  4.34  3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 1  0  1  2  4  4.00  922/1299  3.77  4.34  4.25  4.38  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  10   2  0  0  3  2  1  3.67  535/ 758  3.67  4.05  4.01  4.17  3.67


               Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  15   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 233  ****  4.07  4.09  3.78  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15 0 0 0 0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 244  ****  4.12  4.09  3.56  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 15 0 0 0 0  2  1  4.33 ****/ 227  ****  4.49  4.40  4.16  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           15   0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/ 225  ****  4.40  4.23  3.81  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 15   1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 207  ****  4.22  4.09  3.69  ****


               Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  76  ****  4.60  4.61  4.63  ****


               Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  58  ****  3.98  4.43  4.83  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  56  ****  4.12  4.23  4.37  ****


               Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  40  ****  4.28  4.53  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    17   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  35  ****  4.43  4.49  4.50  ****


                          Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected 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      B   12
56-83      0        2.00-2.99   1      C    0      General      0      Under-grad  18      Non-major   1
84-150    11        3.00-3.49   7      D    0
Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   1      F    0      Electives    0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                         responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other       16
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: IS  425  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  916
Title      DECISION SUPPORT SYSTE            Baltimore County                              JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:  EVERHART, AMY                     Spring 2005                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   44
Questionnaires:  37                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions          NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  3  4  4 15 11  3.73 1280/1504  4.10  4.24  4.27 4.33  3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1   0  1  1  5 12 17  4.19  910/1503  4.41  4.22  4.20 4.18  4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  1  2  7 11 16  4.05  915/1290  4.30  4.32  4.28 4.32  4.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  1  3  9 13 11  3.81 1161/1453  4.33  4.22  4.21 4.22  3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1  6  2 11  8  8  3.29 1228/1421  3.58  4.08  4.00 4.02  3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1  4  2  9 11  9  3.54 1133/1365  4.01  4.11  4.08 4.09  3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0  2  0  4  9 21  4.31  705/1485  4.52  4.20  4.16 4.14  4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   2  0  0  0  0 34  5.00    1/1504  4.97  4.68  4.69 4.73  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 3 1  0  4 11 12  4.18  720/1483  4.21  4.07  4.06 4.11  4.18


                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  1  1  5 30  4.73  474/1425  4.72  4.41  4.41 4.38  4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  1  1  9 26  4.62 1022/1426  4.70  4.72  4.69 4.72  4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  1  3  9 23  4.50  578/1418  4.52  4.29  4.25 4.25  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  2  1  3  8 22  4.31  829/1416  4.52  4.34  4.26 4.26  4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0  0  4 12 19  4.43  349/1199  4.46  3.95  3.97 4.05  4.43


                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0  4  2  2  7 10  3.68  937/1312  4.09  4.12  4.00 4.07  3.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0  3  2  1  3 16  4.08  891/1303  4.29  4.39  4.24 4.34  4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 2  2  1  7 13  4.08  902/1299  4.45  4.34  4.25 4.38  4.08
4. Were special techniques successful                12   4  0  1  5  5 10  4.14  354/ 758  4.28  4.05  4.01 4.17  4.14

                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1       0.00-0.99    1     A    7       Required for Majors   1     Graduate       0      Major       0
 28-55      1       1.00-1.99    0     B   22
 56-83      2       2.00-2.99    9     C    7       General               0     Under-grad    37      Non-major   0
 84-150    22       3.00-3.49   16     D    0
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    2     F    0       Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0       Other                34
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: IS   425  0201              University of Maryland                              Page  917
Title        DECISION SUPPORT SYSTE            Baltimore County                               JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:  CHIANG, WEI-YU                      Spring 2005                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    37
Questionnaires: 27                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                 Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level   Sect
                 Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean   Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0   1   1   1  12  11  4.19  962/1504  4.10  4.24  4.27  4.33  4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0   0   0   4   6  16  4.46  556/1503  4.41  4.22  4.20  4.18  4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0   0   1   2   8  15  4.42  615/1290  4.30  4.32  4.28  4.32  4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   2   0   1   1   8  14  4.46  517/1453  4.33  4.22  4.21  4.22  4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   7   1   1   3   5   9  4.05  712/1421  3.58  4.08  4.00  4.02  4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2   1   0   4   6  13  4.25  581/1365  4.01  4.11  4.08  4.09  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0   0   0   2   6  18  4.62  339/1485  4.52  4.20  4.16  4.14  4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0   0   1   0  25  4.92  525/1504  4.97  4.68  4.69  4.73  4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 1   0   0   4   7   9  4.25  635/1483  4.21  4.07  4.06  4.11  4.25

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0   0   1   1   4  20  4.65  587/1425  4.72  4.41  4.41  4.38  4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0   0   1   0   3  22  4.77  808/1426  4.70  4.72  4.69  4.72  4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   0   1   4   6  15  4.35  763/1418  4.52  4.29  4.25  4.25  4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0   1   0   2   4  19  4.54  593/1416  4.52  4.34  4.26  4.26  4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  1   0   0   1   8  14  4.57  236/1199  4.46  3.95  3.97  4.05  4.57

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12  0   0   2   2   3   8  4.13  670/1312  4.09  4.12  4.00  4.07  4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12  0   0   1   2   3   9  4.33  737/1303  4.29  4.39  4.24  4.34  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0   0   1   1   1  12  4.60  504/1299  4.45  4.34  4.25  4.38  4.60
4. Were special techniques successful                   12  5   0   0   3   1   6  4.30  286/ 758  4.28  4.05  4.01  4.17  4.30

                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   20  0   0   0   0   4   3  4.43   84/ 233  4.43  4.07  4.09  3.78  4.43
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 20 0  0   1   1   2   3  4.00  145/ 244  4.00  4.12  4.09  3.56  4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 20 0   0   0   1   2   4  4.43  142/ 227  4.43  4.49  4.40  4.16  4.43
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            20  0   0   0   1   2   4  4.43  112/ 225  4.43  4.40  4.23  3.81  4.43
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  20  1   1   0   0   2   3  4.00 ****/ 207  ****  4.22  4.09  3.69  ****

                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 25  1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  76  ****  4.60  4.61  4.63  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 25 0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  70  ****  4.54  4.35  4.63  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 25  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  67  ****  4.32  4.34  4.34  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     25  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  76  ****  4.41  4.44  4.51  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 25  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  73  ****  4.17  4.17  4.29  ****

                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  25  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  58  ****  3.98  4.43  4.83  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  25  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  56  ****  4.12  4.23  4.37  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        25  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  44  ****  4.68  4.65  4.33  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    25  0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  47  ****  4.32  4.29  4.12  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  25  1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  39  ****  4.61  4.44  4.19  ****

                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 25  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  40  ****  4.28  4.53  5.00  ****
```

```
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    25   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  35  ****  4.43  4.49  4.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      25   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  36  ****  4.38  4.60  4.83  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       25   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  20  ****  5.00  4.24  ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     25   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  16  ****  5.00  4.51  ****  ****
```

                                                  Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	4
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	1						

```
Title      DECISION SUPPORT SYSTE                 Baltimore County                                         JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:    CHIANG, WEI-YU                        Spring 2005                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    18
Questionnaires: 18                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  0  1  5 11  4.39   725/1504  4.10  4.24  4.27  4.33  4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  1  5 11  4.59   403/1503  4.41  4.22  4.20  4.18  4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  1  0  7  9  4.41   628/1290  4.30  4.32  4.28  4.32  4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   2  0  0  1  2 12  4.73   208/1453  4.33  4.22  4.21  4.22  4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  1  4  0  1  6  4  3.40  1175/1421  3.58  4.08  4.00  4.02  3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 3 0 0 2 5 5  4.25   581/1365  4.01  4.11  4.08  4.09  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0  0  0  1  4 11  4.63   329/1485  4.52  4.20  4.16  4.14  4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0  0  0  0  0 16  5.00     1/1504  4.97  4.68  4.69  4.73  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 5 2 8  4.20   700/1483  4.21  4.07  4.06  4.11  4.20


                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  4 13  4.76   402/1425  4.72  4.41  4.41  4.38  4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  5 12  4.71   913/1426  4.70  4.72  4.69  4.72  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  5 12  4.71   331/1418  4.52  4.29  4.25  4.25  4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  0  5 12  4.71   394/1416  4.52  4.34  4.26  4.26  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 1 1 5  9  4.38   394/1199  4.46  3.95  3.97  4.05  4.38


                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0  0  0  1  3  5  4.44   424/1312  4.09  4.12  4.00  4.07  4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0  0  0  1  3  5  4.44   630/1303  4.29  4.39  4.24  4.34  4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 0 3  6  4.67   445/1299  4.45  4.34  4.25  4.38  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                  9   4  0  0  0  3  2  4.40   243/ 758  4.28  4.05  4.01  4.17  4.40


                  Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 14   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  ****/ 233  4.43  4.07  4.09  3.78  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 ****/ 244  4.00  4.12  4.09  3.56  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 14 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 ****/ 227  4.43  4.49  4.40  4.16  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          15   0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33  ****/ 225  4.43  4.40  4.23  3.81  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 15  0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33  ****/ 207  ****  4.22  4.09  3.69  ****


                  Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00  ****/  76  ****  4.60  4.61  4.63  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  70  ****  4.54  4.35  4.63  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00  ****/  67  ****  4.32  4.34  4.34  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  76  ****  4.41  4.44  4.51  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  73  ****  4.17  4.17  4.29  ****


                  Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00  ****/  40  ****  4.28  4.53  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  35  ****  4.43  4.49  4.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  36  ****  4.38  4.60  4.83  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  20  ****  5.00  4.24  ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  16  ****  5.00  4.51  ****  ****


                          Frequency Distribution
```

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	3
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

| | | Frequencies | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	788/1504	4.33	4.24	4.27	4.33	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	633/1503	4.42	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	853/1290	4.17	4.32	4.28	4.32	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	578/1453	4.42	4.22	4.21	4.22	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	2	5	3.83	919/1421	3.83	4.08	4.00	4.02	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	2	4	3.73	1025/1365	3.73	4.11	4.08	4.09	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	577/1485	4.42	4.20	4.16	4.14	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	1087/1504	4.50	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	1093/1483	3.80	4.07	4.06	4.11	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	842/1425	4.45	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	502/1426	4.91	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	0	3	6	4.18	913/1418	4.18	4.29	4.25	4.25	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	0	9	4.55	583/1416	4.55	4.34	4.26	4.26	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	1	2	6	4.09	603/1199	4.09	3.95	3.97	4.05	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	297/1312	4.60	4.12	4.00	4.07	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	507/1303	4.60	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	504/1299	4.60	4.34	4.25	4.38	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	273/ 758	4.33	4.05	4.01	4.17	4.33

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: IS   430  8020              University of Maryland                                   Page 920
Title       INFO SYSTEMS & SECURIT            Baltimore County                                    JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:   DIAMOND, ROBERT                 Spring 2005                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires: 15                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies       Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0  0  0  2  7  5  4.21  940/1504  4.21  4.24 4.27 4.33  4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  4 10  4.60  380/1503  4.60  4.22 4.20 4.18  4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  2  7  5  4.07  911/1290  4.07  4.32 4.28 4.32  4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  3  5  7  4.27  764/1453  4.27  4.22 4.21 4.22  4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  0  1  2  5  6  4.14  642/1421  4.14  4.08 4.00 4.02  4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 1  1  2  4  7  4.00  782/1365  4.00  4.11 4.08 4.09  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  4  4  7  4.20  830/1485  4.20  4.20 4.16 4.14  4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  1  5  8  4.50 1087/1504  4.50  4.68 4.69 4.73  4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 2 0 0  0  3  6  4.67  211/1483  4.67  4.07 4.06 4.11  4.67


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  7  8  4.53  748/1425  4.53  4.41 4.41 4.38  4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  3 12  4.80  738/1426  4.80  4.72 4.69 4.72  4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  1  7  7  4.40  709/1418  4.40  4.29 4.25 4.25  4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  1  6  8  4.47  675/1416  4.47  4.34 4.26 4.26  4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 1  2  2  4  6  3.80  795/1199  3.80  3.95 3.97 4.05  3.80


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  3  5  6  4.21  619/1312  4.21  4.12 4.00 4.07  4.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  2  5  7  4.36  719/1303  4.36  4.39 4.24 4.34  4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  1  7  6  4.36  723/1299  4.36  4.34 4.25 4.38  4.36
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   4  0  1  3  4  2  3.70  521/ 758  3.70  4.05 4.01 4.17  3.70


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  13  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 233  ****  4.07 4.09 3.78  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 0 0 0  2  0  4.00 ****/ 244  ****  4.12 4.09 3.56  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 1 1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 227  ****  4.49 4.40 4.16  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 1 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  76  ****  4.60 4.61 4.63  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 0 0 0 0  1  1  4.50 ****/  70  ****  4.54 4.35 4.63  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  67  ****  4.32 4.34 4.34  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    13  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/  76  ****  4.41 4.44 4.51  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                13  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  73  ****  4.17 4.17 4.29  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  58  ****  3.98 4.43 4.83  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  56  ****  4.12 4.23 4.37  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   13  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  47  ****  4.32 4.29 4.12  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/  40  ****  4.28 4.53 5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    13  0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/  35  ****  4.43 4.49 4.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      13  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  36  ****  4.38 4.60 4.83  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	13	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

```
Title       STRUCT SYST ANALY/DESI                Baltimore County                                        JUN 14, 2005
Instructor: KORU, GUNES A                         Spring 2005                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   12
Questionnaires:  8                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1267/1504	4.04	4.24	4.27	4.33	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	972/1503	4.32	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	853/1290	4.36	4.32	4.28	4.32	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	563/1453	4.34	4.22	4.21	4.22	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	967/1421	3.94	4.08	4.00	4.02	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	493/1365	4.22	4.11	4.08	4.09	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1485	4.64	4.20	4.16	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	4.76	4.68	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	635/1483	4.18	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	1036/1425	4.52	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1073/1426	4.71	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1013/1418	4.44	4.29	4.25	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	977/1416	4.35	4.34	4.26	4.26	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	636/1199	4.20	3.95	3.97	4.05	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	255/1312	4.01	4.12	4.00	4.07	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	450/1303	4.24	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299	4.33	4.34	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 758	3.98	4.05	4.01	4.17	5.00

```
                                           Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                      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         B    4
 56-83      0        2.00-2.99    1         C    0       General               0        Under-grad     8        Non-major   4
 84-150     4        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 significant
                                            I    0       Other                 5
                                            ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: IS   436  0201            University of Maryland                                    Page  922
Title        STRUCT SYST ANALY/DESI           Baltimore County                                      JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:  NORCIO, ANTHONY                    Spring 2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     32
Questionnaires: 26                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies      Instructor     Course Dept  UMBC Level   Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean   Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  1  2  6  8  9  3.85 1224/1504  4.04  4.24  4.27  4.33  3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  3  3  8 11  4.08 1002/1503  4.32  4.22  4.20  4.18  4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  3  3 11  9  4.00  937/1290  4.36  4.32  4.28  4.32  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  2  1  3  3  8  9  3.88 1123/1453  4.34  4.22  4.21  4.22  3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  7 11  7  3.92  839/1421  3.94  4.08  4.00  4.02  3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  2  1  4 12  6  3.76  996/1365  4.22  4.11  4.08  4.09  3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  1  0  1 12 12  4.31  705/1485  4.64  4.20  4.16  4.14  4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0 15 10  4.40 1173/1504  4.76  4.68  4.69  4.73  4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 3  0  2  5  8  3  3.67 1170/1483  4.18  4.07  4.06  4.11  3.67

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  2  5  3 15  4.24 1050/1425  4.52  4.41  4.41  4.38  4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  4  4 17  4.52 1112/1426  4.71  4.72  4.69  4.72  4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  0  2  7  1 15  4.16  930/1418  4.44  4.29  4.25  4.25  4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  1  1  7  3 13  4.04 1015/1416  4.35  4.34  4.26  4.26  4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 5  2  3  6  2  6  3.37  977/1199  4.20  3.95  3.97  4.05  3.37

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0  6  2  5  2  4  2.79 1203/1312  4.01  4.12  4.00  4.07  2.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0  6  0  4  4  4  3.00 1195/1303  4.24  4.39  4.24  4.34  3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0  4  1  6  4  4  3.16 1182/1299  4.33  4.34  4.25  4.38  3.16
4. Were special techniques successful                  7  8  4  1  4  2  0  2.36  744/ 758  3.98  4.05  4.01  4.17  2.36

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  22  1  3  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 233  ****  4.07  4.09  3.78  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 23 0  0  0  1  2  0  3.67 ****/ 244  ****  4.12  4.09  3.56  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 23 1  0  1  0  1  0  3.00 ****/ 227  ****  4.49  4.40  4.16  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           23  1  1  0  1  0  0  2.00 ****/ 225  ****  4.40  4.23  3.81  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 23  1  0  1  1  0  0  2.50 ****/ 207  ****  4.22  4.09  3.69  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 24 1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  76  ****  4.60  4.61  4.63  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 25 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  70  ****  4.54  4.35  4.63  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 25 0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  67  ****  4.32  4.34  4.34  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 25 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  58  ****  3.98  4.43  4.83  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 25 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  56  ****  4.12  4.23  4.37  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 25 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  40  ****  4.28  4.53  5.00  ****


                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades              Reasons                   Type                   Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
```

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	7	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	4
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	26				
				?	1						

Course-Section: IS   436 0301   University of Maryland   Page 923
Title   STRUCT SYST ANALY/DESI   Baltimore County   JUN 14, 2005
Instructor: SEAMAN, CAROLYN   Spring 2005   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 22   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                 Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank       Mean  Mean  Mean Mean   Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1  0  1  0  7  7  6  3.81 1244/1504  4.04  4.24  4.27  4.33  3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  0  4  8  9  4.24  869/1503  4.32  4.22  4.20  4.18  4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  1  3  6 11  4.29  758/1290  4.36  4.32  4.28  4.32  4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  0  0  2  2  8  9  4.14  901/1453  4.34  4.22  4.21  4.22  4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  2  2  3  3  7  4  3.42 1162/1421  3.94  4.08  4.00  4.02  3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  2  1  1  1  8  7  4.06  754/1365  4.22  4.11  4.08  4.09  4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  1  2  7 11  4.33  670/1485  4.64  4.20  4.16  4.14  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  1  0  0  0  7 13  4.65  991/1504  4.76  4.68  4.69  4.73  4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5  1  0  0  5  7  4  3.94  947/1483  4.18  4.07  4.06  4.11  3.94

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  2  3 16  4.67  572/1425  4.52  4.41  4.41  4.38  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  1  3 17  4.76  808/1426  4.71  4.72  4.69  4.72  4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  1  5 15  4.67  378/1418  4.44  4.29  4.25  4.25  4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  2  2  6 11  4.24  887/1416  4.35  4.34  4.26  4.26  4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  1  0  1  2  4 12  4.42  349/1199  4.20  3.95  3.97  4.05  4.42

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15  0  0  1  2  3  1  3.57  986/1312  4.01  4.12  4.00  4.07  3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15  0  0  0  2  1  4  4.29  776/1303  4.24  4.39  4.24  4.34  4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15  0  0  0  2  2  3  4.14  869/1299  4.33  4.34  4.25  4.38  4.14
4. Were special techniques successful                  15  0  0  0  3  3  1  3.71  518/ 758  3.98  4.05  4.01  4.17  3.71

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  21  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 233  ****  4.07  4.09  3.78  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 21  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 244  ****  4.12  4.09  3.56  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 21  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 227  ****  4.49  4.40  4.16  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           21  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 225  ****  4.40  4.23  3.81  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  21  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 207  ****  4.22  4.09  3.69  ****

                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  76  ****  4.60  4.61  4.63  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  70  ****  4.54  4.35  4.63  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  67  ****  4.32  4.34  4.34  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    21  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  76  ****  4.41  4.44  4.51  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                21  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  73  ****  4.17  4.17  4.29  ****

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  58  ****  3.98  4.43  4.83  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  21  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  56  ****  4.12  4.23  4.37  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       21  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  44  ****  4.68  4.65  4.33  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   21  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  47  ****  4.32  4.29  4.12  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  21  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  39  ****  4.61  4.44  4.19  ****

                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  40  ****  4.28  4.53  5.00  ****
```

```
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    21   0   0   0   0   1   0   4.00 ****/   35   ****   4.43   4.49   4.50   ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      21   0   0   0   1   0   0   3.00 ****/   36   ****   4.38   4.60   4.83   ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       21   0   0   0   1   0   0   3.00 ****/   20   ****   5.00   4.24   ****   ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     21   0   0   0   1   0   0   3.00 ****/   16   ****   5.00   4.51   ****   ****
```

```
Title         STRUCT SYST ANALY/DESI                    Baltimore County                                   JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:   SEAMAN, CAROLYN                             Spring 2005                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   31
Questionnaires: 22                            Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades              Reasons                    Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0        A    6          Required for Majors   0      Graduate      0      Major        0
28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0        B   11
56-83      0        2.00-2.99    3        C    3          General               0      Under-grad   22      Non-major    5
84-150    12        3.00-3.49   10        D    0
Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    1        F    0          Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                       responses to be significant
                                          I    0          Other                20
                                          ?    0
```

```
Title      STRUCT SYST ANALY/DESI                  Baltimore County                                     JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:   DeVreis, Esther                      Spring 2005                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   16
Questionnaires:  14                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  1   0  0  0  1  1  11  4.77  250/1504  4.04  4.24  4.27  4.33  4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1   0  0  0  0  2  11  4.85  145/1503  4.32  4.22  4.20  4.18  4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  2   0  0  0  0  0  12  5.00    1/1290  4.36  4.32  4.28  4.32  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   2   0  0  0  0  1  11  4.92   91/1453  4.34  4.22  4.21  4.22  4.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  0  1  0  0  0  11  4.67  212/1421  3.94  4.08  4.00  4.02  4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  0  3  9  4.75  139/1365  4.22  4.11  4.08  4.09  4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           2   0  0  0  0  1  11  4.92   88/1485  4.64  4.20  4.16  4.14  4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled                 2   0  0  0  0  0  12  5.00    1/1504  4.76  4.68  4.69  4.73  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6  0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88   94/1483  4.18  4.07  4.06  4.11  4.88


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2   0  0  0  0  1  11  4.92  161/1425  4.52  4.41  4.41  4.38  4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2   0  0  0  0  0  12  5.00    1/1426  4.71  4.72  4.69  4.72  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  0  1  11  4.92  113/1418  4.44  4.29  4.25  4.25  4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    3   0  0  0  0  0  11  5.00    1/1416  4.35  4.34  4.26  4.26  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  0  0  0  0  0  10  5.00    1/1199  4.20  3.95  3.97  4.05  5.00


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1312  4.01  4.12  4.00  4.07  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1303  4.24  4.39  4.24  4.34  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1299  4.33  4.34  4.25  4.38  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 6   1  0  0  0  1  6  4.86   73/ 758  3.98  4.05  4.01  4.17  4.86

                                    Frequency Distribution
```

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

```
Course-Section: IS   438  0101                University of Maryland                              Page  925
Title      PROJECT MANAGEMENT                     Baltimore County                                JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:   RICHBURG, TASHA                        Spring 2005                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   36
Questionnaires: 27                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level   Sect
              Questions               NR  NA  1  2   3  4   5  Mean   Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean   Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   2  3   5  8   9  3.70 1290/1504  4.12  4.24  4.27  4.33  3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   3  2   7  7   8  3.56 1288/1503  3.90  4.22  4.20  4.18  3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   4  2   6  6   9  3.52 1152/1290  3.87  4.32  4.28  4.32  3.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   1  4   6  7   8  3.65 1233/1453  3.83  4.22  4.21  4.22  3.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0   1  4   5  7   9  3.73  976/1421  4.17  4.08  4.00  4.02  3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  2  2   7  6   9  3.69 1046/1365  4.12  4.11  4.08  4.09  3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   2  3   5  6  10  3.73 1188/1485  4.06  4.20  4.16  4.14  3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0  0   1  0  26  4.93  525/1504  4.92  4.68  4.69  4.73  4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0  2  1  10  5   4  3.36 1291/1483  3.87  4.07  4.06  4.11  3.36


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   4  3   1  8   9  3.60 1291/1425  4.22  4.41  4.41  4.38  3.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0  1   2  4  19  4.58 1073/1426  4.71  4.72  4.69  4.72  4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   2  0   4  9  10  4.00 1013/1418  4.25  4.29  4.25  4.25  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   3  2   3  9   8  3.68 1194/1416  4.13  4.34  4.26  4.26  3.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 2  5  3   3  5   6  3.18 1022/1199  3.73  3.95  3.97  4.05  3.18


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16 0  1  1   1  3   5  3.91  814/1312  4.04  4.12  4.00  4.07  3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16 0  0  0   0  5   6  4.55  540/1303  4.44  4.39  4.24  4.34  4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 0  0   3  2   6  4.27  786/1299  4.34  4.34  4.25  4.38  4.27
4. Were special techniques successful                  16   2  0  1   1  4   3  4.00  387/ 758  3.65  4.05  4.01  4.17  4.00

                                         Frequency Distribution
```

```
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                   Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      1           0.00-0.99   0      A   11        Required for Majors  0    Graduate     0      Major       0
28-55      0           1.00-1.99   0      B   13
56-83      2           2.00-2.99   3      C    0        General             17    Under-grad  27      Non-major   2
84-150    10           3.00-3.49  11      D    0
Grad.      0           3.50-4.00   2      F    0        Electives            2    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                3
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: IS   438  8020            University of Maryland                        Page 926
Title       PROJECT MANAGEMENT                Baltimore County                          JUN 14, 2005
Instructor: SPONAUGLE, RICH                    Spring 2005                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    14
Questionnaires: 14                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean  Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1  0  0  0  2  2  9  4.54  509/1504  4.12  4.24  4.27  4.33  4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2  0  0  0  3  3  6  4.25  848/1503  3.90  4.22  4.20  4.18  4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  0  3  4  6  4.23  800/1290  3.87  4.32  4.28  4.32  4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  0  0  2  3  1  7  4.00 1001/1453  3.83  4.22  4.21  4.22  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  1  3  9  4.62  241/1421  4.17  4.08  4.00  4.02  4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0  0  2  2  9  4.54  274/1365  4.12  4.11  4.08  4.09  4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  0  1  6  6  4.38  613/1485  4.06  4.20  4.16  4.14  4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0  1 12  4.92  525/1504  4.92  4.68  4.69  4.73  4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 0 0  1  3  4  4.38  493/1483  3.87  4.07  4.06  4.11  4.38

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2  0  0  0  0  2 10  4.83  285/1425  4.22  4.41  4.41  4.38  4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2  0  0  0  0  2 10  4.83  667/1426  4.71  4.72  4.69  4.72  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  1  4  7  4.50  578/1418  4.25  4.29  4.25  4.25  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2  0  0  0  1  3  8  4.58  544/1416  4.13  4.34  4.26  4.26  4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 1 0 0  2  4  5  4.27  479/1199  3.73  3.95  3.97  4.05  4.27

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  3  4  5  4.17  651/1312  4.04  4.12  4.00  4.07  4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  1  6  5  4.33  737/1303  4.44  4.39  4.24  4.34  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0  0  1  5  6  4.42  667/1299  4.34  4.34  4.25  4.38  4.42
4. Were special techniques successful                  2  2  3  0  0  5  2  3.30  638/ 758  3.65  4.05  4.01  4.17  3.30

             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  13  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 233  ****  4.07  4.09  3.78  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 244  ****  4.12  4.09  3.56  ****

             Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  70  ****  4.54  4.35  4.63  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  67  ****  4.32  4.34  4.34  ****

                            Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                     Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0       A   4          Required for Majors  2       Graduate      0         Major        0
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0       B   6
 56-83      0      2.00-2.99   0       C   1          General              7       Under-grad   14         Non-major    3
 84-150     1      3.00-3.49   0       D   0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   1       F   0          Electives            0       #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0                                      responses to be significant
                                       I   0          Other                3
                                       ?   1
```

```
Title        INTEG TECH BUS PROC                   Baltimore County                                          JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:  KAHL, MARGARET                        Spring 2005                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:  17
Questionnaires: 12                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	6	2	3.75	1267/1504	4.14	4.24	4.27	4.33	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	848/1503	4.55	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	507/1290	4.71	4.32	4.28	4.32	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	643/1453	4.49	4.22	4.21	4.22	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	2	0	2	3	3.22	1249/1421	3.96	4.08	4.00	4.02	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	358/1365	4.53	4.11	4.08	4.09	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	636/1485	4.37	4.20	4.16	4.14	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	812/1504	4.83	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	5	2	0	3.29	1319/1483	3.98	4.07	4.06	4.11	3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	930/1425	4.54	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	549/1426	4.94	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	972/1418	4.46	4.29	4.25	4.25	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	701/1416	4.62	4.34	4.26	4.26	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	1115/1199	3.60	3.95	3.97	4.05	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	902/1312	3.75	4.12	4.00	4.07	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	910/1303	4.00	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1053/1299	3.75	4.34	4.25	4.38	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	728/ 758	2.67	4.05	4.01	4.17	2.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.29	****

```
                                            Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades              Reasons                        Type                     Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1        0.00-0.99    0         A    2        Required for Majors   0        Graduate        0        Major        0
 28-55     0        1.00-1.99    0         B    7
 56-83     2        2.00-2.99    1         C    1        General               0        Under-grad      12       Non-major    2
 84-150    4        3.00-3.49    1         D    0
 Grad.     0        3.50-4.00    1         F    0        Electives             0        #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                       responses to be significant
                                           I    0        Other                 10
                                           ?    0
```

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	509/1504	4.14	4.24	4.27	4.33	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	145/1503	4.55	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	105/1290	4.71	4.32	4.28	4.32	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	320/1453	4.49	4.22	4.21	4.22	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	194/1421	3.96	4.08	4.00	4.02	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	217/1365	4.53	4.11	4.08	4.09	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	0	10	4.38	613/1485	4.37	4.20	4.16	4.14	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	760/1504	4.83	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	211/1483	3.98	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	525/1425	4.54	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1426	4.94	4.72	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	191/1418	4.46	4.29	4.25	4.25	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	255/1416	4.62	4.34	4.26	4.26	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	320/1199	3.60	3.95	3.97	4.05	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1312	3.75	4.12	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1303	4.00	4.39	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1299	3.75	4.34	4.25	4.38	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 758	2.67	4.05	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: IS   450  0101                University of Maryland                                    Page  929
Title         DATA COMM & NETWORKS              Baltimore County                                        JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:   LIU, HONGFANG                     Spring 2005                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    18
Questionnaires: 13                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                     Frequencies        Instructor     Course Dept  UMBC Level   Sect
                  Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean   Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  1  0  0  4  8  4.38   725/1504   4.04  4.24  4.27  4.33  4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  3  6  4  4.08  1008/1503   3.81  4.22  4.20  4.18  4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  7  5  4.31   741/1290   4.27  4.32  4.28  4.32  4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1  0  1  1  8  2  3.92  1093/1453   4.04  4.22  4.21  4.22  3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1  1  1  1  4  5  3.92   851/1421   3.78  4.08  4.00  4.02  3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0  0  0  7  5  4.42   407/1365   4.01  4.11  4.08  4.09  4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  1  2  3  7  4.23   784/1485   4.02  4.20  4.16  4.14  4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  3  9  4.75   891/1504   4.85  4.68  4.69  4.73  4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1  0  0  2  5  2  4.00   850/1483   4.07  4.07  4.06  4.11  4.00

                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  1  0  7  5  4.23  1050/1425   3.73  4.41  4.41  4.38  4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  1  2  4  6  4.15  1298/1426   4.07  4.72  4.69  4.72  4.15
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  1  0  6  2  4  3.62  1221/1418   3.49  4.29  4.25  4.25  3.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  1  5  7  4.46   675/1416   3.93  4.34  4.26  4.26  4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  1  0  0  0  7  4  4.36   403/1199   3.37  3.95  3.97  4.05  4.36

                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5   0  0  1  2  3  2  3.75   902/1312   3.70  4.12  4.00  4.07  3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5   0  0  2  1  3  2  3.63  1089/1303   3.73  4.39  4.24  4.34  3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0  0  2  1  1  4  3.88  1008/1299   4.05  4.34  4.25  4.38  3.88
4. Were special techniques successful                   5   4  0  1  0  2  1  3.75   508/ 758   3.71  4.05  4.01  4.17  3.75

                  Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  11   1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/ 233   ****  4.07  4.09  3.78  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0  1  1  0  1  0  2.33  ****/ 244   ****  4.12  4.09  3.56  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 1  0  1  0  1  0  3.00  ****/ 227   ****  4.49  4.40  4.16  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           10   1  0  0  0  2  0  4.00  ****/ 225   ****  4.40  4.23  3.81  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 10   1  1  0  0  1  0  2.50  ****/ 207   ****  4.22  4.09  3.69  ****

                  Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10  1  0  0  1  1  0  3.50  ****/  76   ****  4.60  4.61  4.63  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/  70   ****  4.54  4.35  4.63  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10  1  0  1  1  0  0  2.50  ****/  67   ****  4.32  4.34  4.34  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    10   1  1  0  1  0  0  2.00  ****/  76   ****  4.41  4.44  4.51  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                10   1  0  0  1  1  0  3.50  ****/  73   ****  4.17  4.17  4.29  ****

                  Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 11   0  0  1  0  1  0  3.00  ****/  58   ****  3.98  4.43  4.83  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 11   0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50  ****/  56   ****  4.12  4.23  4.37  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       10   1  0  0  1  1  0  3.50  ****/  44   ****  4.68  4.65  4.33  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   10   1  0  0  0  2  0  4.00  ****/  47   ****  4.32  4.29  4.12  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 10   1  0  0  1  1  0  3.50  ****/  39   ****  4.61  4.44  4.19  ****

                  Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 10  0  1  0  0  1  1  3.33  ****/  40   ****  4.28  4.53  5.00  ****
```

```
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    10   0   0   0   0   2   1   4.33 ****/   35   ****   4.43   4.49   4.50   ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      10   1   0   0   0   1   1   4.50 ****/   36   ****   4.38   4.60   4.83   ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       10   1   0   0   0   1   1   4.50 ****/   20   ****   5.00   4.24   ****   ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     10   1   0   0   0   1   1   4.50 ****/   16   ****   5.00   4.51   ****   ****
```

Title   DATA COMM & NETWORKS   Baltimore County   JUN 14, 2005
Instructor: LIU, HONGFANG   Spring 2005   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 13   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected 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	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	8
84-150	1	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 significant			
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: IS   450  0201            University of Maryland                                        Page  930
Title        DATA COMM & NETWORKS              Baltimore County                                        JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:  MEISE, JOHN D                      Spring 2005                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:  42
Questionnaires:  27                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  3  1  2 10 11  3.93 1173/1504  4.04  4.24  4.27 4.33  3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  3  2  4 11  7  3.63 1263/1503  3.81  4.22  4.20 4.18  3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  2  1  3  9 12  4.04  924/1290  4.27  4.32  4.28 4.32  4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   4  2  1  3  8  8  3.86 1129/1453  4.04  4.22  4.21 4.22  3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   4  3  2  5  3  8  3.52 1101/1421  3.78  4.08  4.00 4.02  3.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 6  3  0  4  6  7  3.70 1040/1365  4.01  4.11  4.08 4.09  3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  1  0  5  8 13  4.19  842/1485  4.02  4.20  4.16 4.14  4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  5 22  4.81  812/1504  4.85  4.68  4.69 4.73  4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1  1  2  4  7  9  3.91  975/1483  4.07  4.07  4.06 4.11  3.91


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3   0  3  3  5  7  6  3.42 1326/1425  3.73  4.41  4.41 4.38  3.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3   0  0  0  4  3 17  4.54 1096/1426  4.07  4.72  4.69 4.72  4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5   0  4  1  3 10  4  3.41 1282/1418  3.49  4.29  4.25 4.25  3.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3   1  3  1  3  9  7  3.70 1191/1416  3.93  4.34  4.26 4.26  3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 10  2  4  4  2  2  2.86 1104/1199  3.37  3.95  3.97 4.05  2.86


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 20  0  1  0  1  3  2  3.71  922/1312  3.70  4.12  4.00 4.07  3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 20  0  1  0  1  2  3  3.86 1012/1303  3.73  4.39  4.24 4.34  3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 20 0  0  1  1  1  4  4.14  869/1299  4.05  4.34  4.25 4.38  4.14
4. Were special techniques successful                   20  4  0  1  0  2  0  3.33 ****/ 758  3.71  4.05  4.01 4.17  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0      A   12      Required for Majors  0     Graduate      0      Major       0
28-55      3       1.00-1.99    0      B    8                                                      
56-83      6       2.00-2.99    3      C    3      General              1     Under-grad   27      Non-major   4
84-150     5       3.00-3.49    4      D    0
Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    7      F    0      Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other               21
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: IS   450  8020                University of Maryland                                    Page  931
Title          DATA COMM & NETWORKS               Baltimore County                                   JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:    CHIANG, CHIYUNK                      Spring 2005                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    12
Questionnaires: 11                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                  Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  1  1  4  4  3.82 1239/1504  4.04 4.24  4.27 4.33  3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  1  2  3  4  3.73 1221/1503  3.81 4.22  4.20 4.18  3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  2  2  7  4.45  574/1290  4.27 4.32  4.28 4.32  4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2  0  0  2  2  5  4.33  680/1453  4.04 4.22  4.21 4.22  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  0  2  4  4  3.91  863/1421  3.78 4.08  4.00 4.02  3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 1  1  1  2  5  3.90  903/1365  4.01 4.11  4.08 4.09  3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  2  1  1  2  5  3.64 1234/1485  4.02 4.20  4.16 4.14  3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1504  4.85 4.68  4.69 4.73  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0  0  2  1  4  4.29  602/1483  4.07 4.07  4.06 4.11  4.29

                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  2  0  3  2  4  3.55 1301/1425  3.73 4.41  4.41 4.38  3.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  2  0  2  3  3  3.50 1381/1426  4.07 4.72  4.69 4.72  3.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  2  0  4  1  4  3.45 1266/1418  3.49 4.29  4.25 4.25  3.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  2  0  2  3  4  3.64 1207/1416  3.93 4.34  4.26 4.26  3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 2 3  1  0  2  2  2.88 1101/1199  3.37 3.95  3.97 4.05  2.88

                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  1  0  2  3  2  3.63  966/1312  3.70 4.12  4.00 4.07  3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  1  1  0  2  3  3.71 1059/1303  3.73 4.39  4.24 4.34  3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0  1  1  2  4  4.13  883/1299  4.05 4.34  4.25 4.38  4.13
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   2  1  1  0  1  3  3.67  535/ 758  3.71 4.05  4.01 4.17  3.67

                  Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 233  **** 4.07  4.09 3.78  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 244  **** 4.12  4.09 3.56  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 227  **** 4.49  4.40 4.16  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          10   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 225  **** 4.40  4.23 3.81  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 10   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 207  **** 4.22  4.09 3.69  ****
```

                          Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades       Reasons                    Type                    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       B    2
 56-83      0      2.00-2.99    0       C    2       General              0      Under-grad  11      Non-major    8
 84-150     1      3.00-3.49    0       D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    1       F    0       Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                5
                                        ?    0
```

Enrollment: 58
Questionnaires: 16   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                                    Frequencies       Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank     Mean Mean   Mean Mean   Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   3  6  1  3  3  2.81 1476/1504   2.81 4.24   4.27 4.33   2.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   6  4  1  1  4  2.56 1480/1503   2.56 4.22   4.20 4.18   2.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   5  3  2  2  4  2.81 1253/1290   2.81 4.32   4.28 4.32   2.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   9   2  1  2  0  2  2.86 1430/1453   2.86 4.22   4.21 4.22   2.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   3  3  1  4  5  3.31 1217/1421   3.31 4.08   4.00 4.02   3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 9  2  2  1  0  2  2.71 1332/1365   2.71 4.11   4.08 4.09   2.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   1  4  1  1  9  3.81 1140/1485   3.81 4.20   4.16 4.14   3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0  0  0  2 14  4.88  708/1504   4.88 4.68   4.69 4.73   4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  5  4  2  2  1  2.29 1457/1483   2.29 4.07   4.06 4.11   2.29

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   4  1  5  3  3  3.00 1367/1425   3.00 4.41   4.41 4.38   3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   1  0  4  5  6  3.94 1337/1426   3.94 4.72   4.69 4.72   3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   6  2  2  4  2  2.63 1385/1418   2.63 4.29   4.25 4.25   2.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   7  3  1  2  3  2.44 1385/1416   2.44 4.34   4.26 4.26   2.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 4  3  3  1  2  3  2.92 1093/1199   2.92 3.95   3.97 4.05   2.92

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0  0  2  1  0  0  2.33 ****/1312   **** 4.12   4.00 4.07   ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0  0  1  0  2  0  3.33 ****/1303   **** 4.39   4.24 4.34   ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0  0  1  1  1  0  3.00 ****/1299   **** 4.34   4.25 4.38   ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  13   2   1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 758   **** 4.05   4.01 4.17   ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                    Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0        0.00-0.99     1        A    3       Required for Majors   0      Graduate      0       Major       0
28-55      0        1.00-1.99     0        B    5
56-83      2        2.00-2.99     3        C    6       General               0      Under-grad   16       Non-major   0
84-150    12        3.00-3.49    10        D    1
Grad.      0        3.50-4.00     0        F    0       Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                           I    0       Other                14
                                           ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: IS   451M 0101            University of Maryland                        Page 933
Title         LAN MGT USING MICROSOF        Baltimore County                          JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:   GLAZER, DINA                    Spring 2005                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    9
Questionnaires: 9                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                    Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions          NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  0  1  3  5  4.44  639/1504  4.50  4.24  4.27  4.33  4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  119/1503  4.61  4.22  4.20  4.18  4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  1  0  8  4.78  230/1290  4.83  4.32  4.28  4.32  4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  6  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1453  4.93  4.22  4.21  4.22  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 2 0 1 4  3.63 1043/1421  3.75  4.08  4.00  4.02  3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/1365 4.17  4.11  4.08  4.09  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1485  4.78  4.20  4.16  4.14  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1504  4.61  4.68  4.69  4.73  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 1 4 4 4.33 543/1483 4.42  4.07  4.06  4.11  4.33

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1425  4.88  4.41  4.41  4.38  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  549/1426  4.88  4.72  4.69  4.72  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 8  4.89  139/1418  4.76  4.29  4.25  4.25  4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1416  5.00  4.34  4.26  4.26  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0 0 2 2 4 4.25 495/1199 4.50  3.95  3.97  4.05  4.25

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 1 0 2 1 0 2.75 1209/1312 2.75  4.12  4.00  4.07  2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75  356/1303  4.75  4.39  4.24  4.34  4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 570/1299 4.50  4.34  4.25  4.38  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                 5  3  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 758  ****  4.05  4.01  4.17  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 233  ****  4.07  4.09  3.78  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 244  ****  4.12  4.09  3.56  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 227  ****  4.49  4.40  4.16  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          8  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 225  ****  4.40  4.23  3.81  ****
```

```
                              Frequency Distribution

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       B   3                                                       
 56-83      0      2.00-2.99   3       C   0        General              8     Under-grad    9      Non-major   1
 84-150     6      3.00-3.49   5       D   0                                                        
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   1       F   0        Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   1                                  responses to be significant
                                       I   0        Other                1
                                       ?   0
```

| | | Frequencies | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	482/1504	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.33	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	751/1503	4.61	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	145/1290	4.83	4.32	4.28	4.32	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	129/1453	4.93	4.22	4.21	4.22	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	887/1421	3.75	4.08	4.00	4.02	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	672/1365	4.17	4.11	4.08	4.09	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	402/1485	4.78	4.20	4.16	4.14	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	1294/1504	4.61	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	338/1483	4.42	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	420/1425	4.88	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	572/1426	4.88	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	426/1418	4.76	4.29	4.25	4.25	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.34	4.26	4.26	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	129/1199	4.50	3.95	3.97	4.05	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1312	2.75	4.12	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1303	4.75	4.39	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1299	4.50	4.34	4.25	4.38	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Title        LAN MGNT USING UNIX         Baltimore County                                        JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:  PELKEY, KEVIN                 Spring 2005                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:  21
Questionnaires: 12                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

			Freq	uenc	ies			Instr	uctor	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	6	6	4.50	549/1504	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.33	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	937/1503	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	344/1290	4.67	4.32	4.28	4.32	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.22	4.21	4.22	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	2	1	2	2	2.80	1360/1421	2.80	4.08	4.00	4.02	2.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	717/1365	4.11	4.11	4.08	4.09	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	636/1485	4.36	4.20	4.16	4.14	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	1064/1504	4.55	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	315/1425	4.82	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	643/1418	4.45	4.29	4.25	4.25	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	243/1416	4.82	4.34	4.26	4.26	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	2	0	1	6	4.22	519/1199	4.22	3.95	3.97	4.05	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	1043/1312	3.43	4.12	4.00	4.07	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	776/1303	4.29	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	741/1299	4.33	4.34	4.25	4.38	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	3.69	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	239/1504	4.78	4.24	4.27	4.33	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	312/1503	4.67	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	344/1290	4.67	4.32	4.28	4.32	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	775/1453	4.25	4.22	4.21	4.22	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	745/1421	4.00	4.08	4.00	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1365	****	4.11	4.08	4.09	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.20	4.16	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	420/1425	4.75	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	572/1426	4.88	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	848/1418	4.25	4.29	4.25	4.25	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	776/1416	4.38	4.34	4.26	4.26	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	271/1199	4.50	3.95	3.97	4.05	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1070/1312	3.33	4.12	4.00	4.07	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1303	****	4.39	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1299	****	4.34	4.25	4.38	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	3.69	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	4.38	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.24	****	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Title   INTERNETWORKING   Baltimore County   JUN 14, 2005
Instructor: SHUJA, HASSAN   Spring 2005   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 15   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                                  Frequencies     Instructor   Course Dept UMBC Level  Sect
                   Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean Mean Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                   General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  1  2 12  4.73  284/1504  4.73 4.24 4.27 4.33  4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  4 11  4.73  238/1503  4.73 4.22 4.20 4.18  4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  6  9  4.60  412/1290  4.60 4.32 4.28 4.32  4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  7  8  4.53  407/1453  4.53 4.22 4.21 4.22  4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  5 10  4.67  212/1421  4.67 4.08 4.00 4.02  4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0  0  0  5  9  4.64  199/1365  4.64 4.11 4.08 4.09  4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  4 11  4.73  220/1485  4.73 4.20 4.16 4.14  4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0 10  5  4.33 1221/1504  4.33 4.68 4.69 4.73  4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 1 1 0 0  2  5  4.25  635/1483  4.25 4.07 4.06 4.11  4.25


                   Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  6  9  4.60  665/1425  4.60 4.41 4.41 4.38  4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  2 13  4.87  596/1426  4.87 4.72 4.69 4.72  4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  1  2 12  4.73  289/1418  4.73 4.29 4.25 4.25  4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  0  4 11  4.73  352/1416  4.73 4.34 4.26 4.26  4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0  0  0  3 11  4.79  114/1199  4.79 3.95 3.97 4.05  4.79


                   Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  1  0  0  1  7  4.44  424/1312  4.44 4.12 4.00 4.07  4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  217/1303  4.89 4.39 4.24 4.34  4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0  0  1  1  7  4.67  445/1299  4.67 4.34 4.25 4.38  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                  6   4  1  0  0  1  3  4.00  387/ 758  4.00 4.05 4.01 4.17  4.00


                   Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 13   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 233  **** 4.07 4.09 3.78  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 0 0 0 0  2  5.00 ****/ 244  **** 4.12 4.09 3.56  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 0 0 0 0 0  2  5.00 ****/ 227  **** 4.49 4.40 4.16  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          13   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 225  **** 4.40 4.23 3.81  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 207  **** 4.22 4.09 3.69  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: IS   454  0101              University of Maryland                        Page 938
Title        SURVEY OF TELECOMMUNIC              Baltimore County                         JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:  MEISE, JOHN D                        Spring 2005                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   21
Questionnaires: 14                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies       Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  0  1  4  9  4.57  455/1504  4.57  4.24  4.27  4.33  4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  4 10  4.71  258/1503  4.71  4.22  4.20  4.18  4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  0  3 11  4.79  220/1290  4.79  4.32  4.28  4.32  4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  4 10  4.71  222/1453  4.71  4.22  4.21  4.22  4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  1  2  0  1  7  3  3.69  997/1421  3.69  4.08  4.00  4.02  3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  0  0  0  1  7  6  4.36  472/1365  4.36  4.11  4.08  4.09  4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  0  2  3  9  4.50  455/1485  4.50  4.20  4.16  4.14  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  9  5  4.36 1207/1504  4.36  4.68  4.69  4.73  4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  1  0  0  0  2  1 10  4.62  250/1483  4.62  4.07  4.06  4.11  4.62


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  0  0  1  4  9  4.57  700/1425  4.57  4.41  4.41  4.38  4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1426  5.00  4.72  4.69  4.72  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0  0  0  0  1  4  9  4.57  488/1418  4.57  4.29  4.25  4.25  4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  0  1  0  4  9  4.50  623/1416  4.50  4.34  4.26  4.26  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  0  3  1  1  2  1  6  3.91  748/1199  3.91  3.95  3.97  4.05  3.91


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  10  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  196/1312  4.75  4.12  4.00  4.07  4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  10  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1303  5.00  4.39  4.24  4.34  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1299  5.00  4.34  4.25  4.38  5.00
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	10	Under-grad	14	Non-major	1
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: IS   498D 0101                    University of Maryland                                    Page 939
Title          DATA MINING                          Baltimore County                                      JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:    ZHOU, LINA                              Spring 2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    8
Questionnaires: 5                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                      Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                       NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1504   5.00  4.24  4.27  4.33  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  171/1503   4.80  4.22  4.20  4.18  4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  201/1290   4.80  4.32  4.28  4.32  4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  158/1453   4.80  4.22  4.21  4.22  4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  0  0  4  4.40  410/1421   4.40  4.08  4.00  4.02  4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 1 2  4.25  581/1365   4.25  4.11  4.08  4.09  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  1  2  2  4.20  830/1485   4.20  4.20  4.16  4.14  4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1504   5.00  4.68  4.69  4.73  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50  338/1483   4.50  4.07  4.06  4.11  4.50


                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  331/1425   4.80  4.41  4.41  4.38  4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1426   5.00  4.72  4.69  4.72  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 2 3  4.60  450/1418   4.60  4.29  4.25  4.25  4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1416   5.00  4.34  4.26  4.26  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 1 0 4  4.60  213/1199   4.60  3.95  3.97  4.05  4.60


                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 4  5.00    1/1312   5.00  4.12  4.00  4.07  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 0 4  5.00    1/1303   5.00  4.39  4.24  4.34  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75  354/1299   4.75  4.34  4.25  4.38  4.75
4. Were special techniques successful                 1   2  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/ 758   5.00  4.05  4.01  4.17  5.00

                              Frequency Distribution
```

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected 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        B    1
56-83       0        2.00-2.99    0        C    0        General               5        Under-grad   5        Non-major    0
84-150      4        3.00-3.49    2        D    0
Grad.       0        3.50-4.00    2        F    0        Electives             0        #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                       responses to be significant
                                           I    0        Other                 0
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: IS   601  0101                University of Maryland                                    Page  940
Title        FOUNDATIONS OF IS                    Baltimore County                                    JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:  LUTTERS, WAYNE                         Spring 2005                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     22
Questionnaires: 19                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	788/1504	4.33	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.22	4.20	4.28	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	937/1290	4.00	4.32	4.28	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	878/1453	4.17	4.22	4.21	4.34	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	7	7	4.06	712/1421	4.06	4.08	4.00	4.27	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	9	6	4.18	663/1365	4.18	4.11	4.08	4.35	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	2	13	4.44	536/1485	4.44	4.20	4.16	4.24	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	394/1504	4.94	4.68	4.69	4.79	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	282/1483	4.57	4.07	4.06	4.20	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	603/1425	4.65	4.41	4.41	4.51	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	995/1426	4.65	4.72	4.69	4.80	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	552/1418	4.53	4.29	4.25	4.36	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	6	9	4.35	791/1416	4.35	4.34	4.26	4.38	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	224/1199	4.59	3.95	3.97	4.04	4.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	290/1312	4.62	4.12	4.00	4.31	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	563/1303	4.50	4.39	4.24	4.58	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.34	4.25	4.56	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	462/ 758	3.92	4.05	4.01	4.24	3.92
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	4.56	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.69	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.40	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	4.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.74	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.41	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	4.55	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.37	****

```
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   17   0   0   0   0   1   1   4.50 ****/   35   ****   4.43   4.49   4.46   ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     17   0   0   0   0   1   1   4.50 ****/   36   ****   4.38   4.60   4.75   ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      17   0   0   0   0   1   1   4.50 ****/   20   ****   5.00   4.24   3.16   ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    17   0   0   0   0   1   1   4.50 ****/   16   ****   5.00   4.51   4.40   ****
```

                                                      Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: IS   603  0101                University of Maryland                              Page 941
Title      DECISION MAKING SUPPOR                 Baltimore County                             JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:   ZHANG, DONGSONG                     Spring 2005                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   25
Questionnaires: 22                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                       Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                       NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean     Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  1  5  16  4.68   337/1504   4.68  4.24  4.27  4.44  4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  2  5  14  4.45   572/1503   4.45  4.22  4.20  4.28  4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  7  14  4.59   421/1290   4.59  4.32  4.28  4.36  4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  1  1  5  15  4.55   396/1453   4.55  4.22  4.21  4.34  4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  1  4  6  10  4.05   718/1421   4.05  4.08  4.00  4.27  4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  1  3  6  12  4.32   514/1365   4.32  4.11  4.08  4.35  4.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  2  5  14  4.57   380/1485   4.57  4.20  4.16  4.24  4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  22  5.00     1/1504   5.00  4.68  4.69  4.79  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0  0  1  7  11  4.53   322/1483   4.53  4.07  4.06  4.20  4.53


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  3  18  4.86   255/1425   4.86  4.41  4.41  4.51  4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  1  20  4.95   251/1426   4.95  4.72  4.69  4.80  4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  2  4  14  4.60   450/1418   4.60  4.29  4.25  4.36  4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  0  0  1  4  15  4.70   407/1416   4.70  4.34  4.26  4.38  4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1  0  0  0  2  18  4.90    77/1199   4.90  3.95  3.97  4.04  4.90


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  0  4  5   9  4.28   579/1312   4.28  4.12  4.00  4.31  4.28
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  1  0  0  6  11  4.44   630/1303   4.44  4.39  4.24  4.58  4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0  0  0  1  5  12  4.61   494/1299   4.61  4.34  4.25  4.56  4.61
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   6  1  0  1  3   6  4.18   333/ 758   4.18  4.05  4.01  4.24  4.18
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	14	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	14	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: IS   610  0101          University of Maryland                              Page 942
Title      DATABASE PROGRAM DEV              Baltimore County                           JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:   ZHOU, LINA                       Spring 2005                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   13
Questionnaires: 10                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean  Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean   Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0  1  0  1  8  4.60  416/1504  4.60  4.24  4.27  4.44  4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0  0  0  3  7  4.70  279/1503  4.70  4.22  4.20  4.28  4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   0  0  0  5  5  4.50  507/1290  4.50  4.32  4.28  4.36  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0   0  0  1  4  5  4.40  594/1453  4.40  4.22  4.21  4.34  4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  1  0  1  3  1  4  3.89  879/1421  3.89  4.08  4.00  4.27  3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  1  0  1  0  3  5  4.33  493/1365  4.33  4.11  4.08  4.35  4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0  0  1  2  7  4.60  349/1485  4.60  4.20  4.16  4.24  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0  0  0  1  9  4.90  657/1504  4.90  4.68  4.69  4.79  4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  2  0  0  0  1  7  0  3.88 1020/1483  3.88  4.07  4.06  4.20  3.88


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0  0  0  2  8  4.80  331/1425  4.80  4.41  4.41  4.51  4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0  0  0  1  9  4.90  502/1426  4.90  4.72  4.69  4.80  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0  0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  191/1418  4.80  4.29  4.25  4.36  4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   0  0  0  1  9  4.90  142/1416  4.90  4.34  4.26  4.38  4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  0  1  0  0  2  1  6  4.44  329/1199  4.44  3.95  3.97  4.04  4.44


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1  0  0  0  0  3  6  4.67  255/1312  4.67  4.12  4.00  4.31  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  1  0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  217/1303  4.89  4.39  4.24  4.58  4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1  0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  333/1299  4.78  4.34  4.25  4.56  4.78
4. Were special techniques successful                 1   1   0  0  1  2  5  4.50  185/ 758  4.50  4.05  4.01  4.24  4.50


               Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  5  1  0  0  0  2  2  4.50   71/ 233  4.50  4.07  4.09  4.56  4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information  6  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75   38/ 244  4.75  4.12  4.09  4.09  4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  6  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/ 227  5.00  4.49  4.40  4.66  5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          6   0   0  0  0  1  3  4.75   63/ 225  4.75  4.40  4.23  4.69  4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  6  3  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 207  ****  4.22  4.09  4.40  ****


               Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  7  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/  76  5.00  4.60  4.61  4.57  5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  7  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/  70  5.00  4.54  4.35  4.21  5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  7  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/  67  5.00  4.32  4.34  4.48  5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   7   0   0  0  0  1  2  4.67   39/  76  4.67  4.41  4.44  4.39  4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               7   0   0  0  0  1  2  4.67   26/  73  4.67  4.17  4.17  4.15  4.67


               Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  7  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/  58  5.00  3.98  4.43  4.31  5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  7  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/  56  5.00  4.12  4.23  4.26  5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      7   0   0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/  44  5.00  4.68  4.65  4.74  5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  7   0   0  0  1  0  2  4.33   27/  47  4.33  4.32  4.29  4.41  4.33
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  7  1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  39  ****  4.61  4.44  4.55  ****


               Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  7  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   26/  40  4.67  4.28  4.53  4.37  4.67
```

```
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal      7   0   0   0   0   1   2   4.67    23/  35   4.67   4.43   4.49   4.46   4.67
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful        7   0   0   0   0   1   2   4.67    25/  36   4.67   4.38   4.60   4.75   4.67
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful         7   1   0   0   0   1   1   4.50  ****/  20   ****   5.00   4.24   3.16   ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students       7   1   0   0   0   0   2   5.00  ****/  16   ****   5.00   4.51   4.40   ****
```

Title   DATABASE PROGRAM DEV   Baltimore County   JUN 14, 2005
Instructor: ZHOU, LINA   Spring 2005   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 10   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: IS   620  0101              University of Maryland                        Page 943
Title      ADV DATABASE PROJECTS                  Baltimore County                         JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:  Chen, Zhiyaun                        Spring 2005                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   30
Questionnaires: 26                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies       Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
         ------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   1   1  12  12  4.35  775/1504  4.35  4.24  4.27  4.44  4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   3  12  11  4.31  795/1503  4.31  4.22  4.20  4.28  4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0   0   0   2   6  17  4.60  412/1290  4.60  4.32  4.28  4.36  4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   1   0   0   2   8  14  4.50  440/1453  4.50  4.22  4.21  4.34  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   4   1   0   8   4   8  3.86  903/1421  3.86  4.08  4.00  4.27  3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  1   0   0   1   6  17  4.67  187/1365  4.67  4.11  4.08  4.35  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   0   2   6  17  4.60  349/1485  4.60  4.20  4.16  4.24  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0   1  24  4.96  263/1504  4.96  4.68  4.69  4.79  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  0   0   0   0  16   6  4.27  613/1483  4.27  4.07  4.06  4.20  4.27


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   1   5  20  4.73  456/1425  4.73  4.41  4.41  4.51  4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   3   6  17  4.54 1104/1426  4.54  4.72  4.69  4.80  4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   5   4  17  4.46  630/1418  4.46  4.29  4.25  4.36  4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   1   0   1   2   4  18  4.56  564/1416  4.56  4.34  4.26  4.38  4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  2   0   0   3   6  14  4.48  300/1199  4.48  3.95  3.97  4.04  4.48


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0   0   0   2   3  14  4.63  276/1312  4.63  4.12  4.00  4.31  4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0   0   1   1   4  13  4.53  551/1303  4.53  4.39  4.24  4.58  4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7  0   0   1   2   2  14  4.53  556/1299  4.53  4.34  4.25  4.56  4.53
4. Were special techniques successful                  8   5   0   0   2   3   8  4.46  208/ 758  4.46  4.05  4.01  4.24  4.46


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  24   1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 233  ****  4.07  4.09  4.56  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 25  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 244  ****  4.12  4.09  4.09  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 25  0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/ 227  ****  4.49  4.40  4.66  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           25   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 225  ****  4.40  4.23  4.69  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 25   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 207  ****  4.22  4.09  4.40  ****

                                   Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                    Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    5        0.00-0.99    0       A    20        Required for Majors   1      Graduate     11      Major        0
  28-55    0        1.00-1.99    0       B     4
  56-83    0        2.00-2.99    0       C     0        General               0      Under-grad   15      Non-major    2
  84-150   5        3.00-3.49    5       D     0
  Grad.   11        3.50-4.00    8       F     0        Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P     0                                      responses to be significant
                                         I     0        Other                24
                                         ?     0
```

```
Title       HUMAN FACTORS: INFO SY                 Baltimore County                                     JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:  KOMLODI, ANITA                         Spring 2005                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    10
Questionnaires:  9                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

		Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	639/1504	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	587/1503	4.44	4.22	4.20	4.28	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1030/1290	3.89	4.32	4.28	4.36	3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	935/1453	4.11	4.22	4.21	4.34	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	479/1421	4.33	4.08	4.00	4.27	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	370/1365	4.44	4.11	4.08	4.35	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	402/1485	4.56	4.20	4.16	4.24	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	691/1504	4.89	4.68	4.69	4.79	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	635/1483	4.25	4.07	4.06	4.20	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	784/1425	4.50	4.41	4.41	4.51	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	848/1418	4.25	4.29	4.25	4.36	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.34	4.26	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	495/1199	4.25	3.95	3.97	4.04	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	572/1312	4.29	4.12	4.00	4.31	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	4.05	4.01	4.24	4.00

```
                                              Frequency Distribution
```

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

```
Course-Section: IS   636  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  945
Title       STRUC SYS ANALY & DES               Baltimore County                             JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:    CAMPBELL, JEFFR                     Spring 2005                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    19
Questionnaires: 16                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions              NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  2  1  0  8  5  3.81 1239/1504  3.81 4.24  4.27 4.44  3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  2  2  1  8  3  3.50 1304/1503  3.50 4.22  4.20 4.28  3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  1  3  4  3  4  3.40 1175/1290  3.40 4.32  4.28 4.36  3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2  1  0  2  0  5  6  4.15  890/1453  4.15 4.22  4.21 4.34  4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  1  2  0  1  6  4  3.77  962/1421  3.77 4.08  4.00 4.27  3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  0  1  2  3  2  6  3.71 1032/1365  3.71 4.11  4.08 4.35  3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  1  0  4  4  6  3.93 1057/1485  3.93 4.20  4.16 4.24  3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0  1 14  4.93  460/1504  4.93 4.68  4.69 4.79  4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  1  2  0  2  6  1  3.36 1291/1483  3.36 4.07  4.06 4.20  3.36


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2  0  2  2  3  5  2  3.21 1354/1425  3.21 4.41  4.41 4.51  3.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2  0  1  1  4  1  7  3.86 1353/1426  3.86 4.72  4.69 4.80  3.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  2  1  2  7  2  3.43 1275/1418  3.43 4.29  4.25 4.36  3.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2  1  2  1  2  4  4  3.54 1238/1416  3.54 4.34  4.26 4.38  3.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0  2  1  2  5  4  3.57  894/1199  3.57 3.95  3.97 4.04  3.57


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  1  0  2  4  4  3.91  814/1312  3.91 4.12  4.00 4.31  3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  0  0  2  3  6  4.36  710/1303  4.36 4.39  4.24 4.58  4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0  1  1  1  2  6  4.00  922/1299  4.00 4.34  4.25 4.56  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  5  3  1  1  2  3  1  3.25  648/ 758  3.25 4.05  4.01 4.24  3.25

                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                   Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      2       0.00-0.99    1        A   9        Required for Majors   0     Graduate     3        Major        0
 28-55      2       1.00-1.99    0        B   3                                    Under-grad  13        Non-major    7
 56-83      0       2.00-2.99    0        C   0        General               0
 84-150     1       3.00-3.49    0        D   0                                    #### - Means there are not enough
 Grad.      3       3.50-4.00    6        F   0        Electives             0          responses to be significant
                                          P   0
                                          I   0        Other                13
                                          ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: IS   650  0101                University of Maryland                               Page  946
Title          DATA COMM & NETWORKS              Baltimore County                                 JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:    KARABATIS, GEOR                    Spring 2005                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    14
Questionnaires: 12                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                             Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean  Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0  0  1  1 10  4.75  262/1504  4.75  4.24  4.27  4.44  4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0  0  2  3  7  4.42  633/1503  4.42  4.22  4.20  4.28  4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0  1  1  3  7  4.33  711/1290  4.33  4.32  4.28  4.36  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   0   0  0  1  6  4  4.27  752/1453  4.27  4.22  4.21  4.34  4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0  0  2  3  7  4.42  401/1421  4.42  4.08  4.00  4.27  4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0   0  0  2  6  4  4.17  672/1365  4.17  4.11  4.08  4.35  4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0  1  0  1 10  4.67  290/1485  4.67  4.20  4.16  4.24  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0  0  0  0 12  5.00    1/1504  5.00  4.68  4.69  4.79  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  0  0  7  2  4.22  668/1483  4.22  4.07  4.06  4.20  4.22

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0   0  0  0  2  9  4.82  315/1425  4.82  4.41  4.41  4.51  4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0   0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1426  5.00  4.72  4.69  4.80  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   0  0  1  2  8  4.64  414/1418  4.64  4.29  4.25  4.36  4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0  0  1  3  8  4.58  544/1416  4.58  4.34  4.26  4.38  4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  0   0  0  0  5  6  4.55  247/1199  4.55  3.95  3.97  4.04  4.55

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11  0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1312  ****  4.12  4.00  4.31  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11  0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1303  ****  4.39  4.24  4.58  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1299  ****  4.34  4.25  4.56  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   11  0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 758  ****  4.05  4.01  4.24  ****

                              Frequency Distribution
```

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

```
Course-Section: IS   698B 0101            University of Maryland                              Page  947
Title      E-GOVERNMENT                     Baltimore County                                 JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:  HOLDEN, STEPHEN                  Spring 2005                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   10
Questionnaires:  10                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	416/1504	4.60	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	795/1503	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.28	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1290	****	4.32	4.28	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	718/1453	4.30	4.22	4.21	4.34	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	509/1421	4.30	4.08	4.00	4.27	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	169/1365	4.70	4.11	4.08	4.35	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.20	4.16	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	211/1483	4.67	4.07	4.06	4.20	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	665/1425	4.60	4.41	4.41	4.51	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	450/1418	4.60	4.29	4.25	4.36	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	407/1416	4.70	4.34	4.26	4.38	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	242/1199	4.56	3.95	3.97	4.04	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.12	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	356/1303	4.75	4.39	4.24	4.58	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	354/1299	4.75	4.34	4.25	4.56	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	4.05	4.01	4.24	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: IS   698C 0101              University of Maryland                              Page  948
Title         TOPICS IN IS                  Baltimore County                                   JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:   LIU, HONGFANG                 Spring 2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   11
Questionnaires: 10                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions          NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean   Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   2  0  1  1  0  1  5  4.00 1092/1504  4.00  4.24  4.27  4.44  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2  0  0  1  2  1  4  4.00 1052/1503  4.00  4.22  4.20  4.28  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2  7  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1290  ****  4.32  4.28  4.36  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2  2  0  1  1  0  4  4.17  878/1453  4.17  4.22  4.21  4.34  4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  145/1421  4.78  4.08  4.00  4.27  4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 1 0 0 2 0 5  4.43  395/1365  4.43  4.11  4.08  4.35  4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  1  0  0  2  1  5  4.38  625/1485  4.38  4.20  4.16  4.24  4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  1  1  0  7  4.44 1138/1504  4.44  4.68  4.69  4.79  4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 2 3 2 4.00  850/1483  4.00  4.07  4.06  4.20  4.00


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3  0  0  2  0  2  3  3.86 1234/1425  3.86  4.41  4.41  4.51  3.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   5  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1426  5.00  4.72  4.69  4.80  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0  0  0  0  4  3  4.43  682/1418  4.43  4.29  4.25  4.36  4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3  0  0  1  0  0  6  4.57  554/1416  4.57  4.34  4.26  4.38  4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 0 0 0 0 1 4  4.80  105/1199  4.80  3.95  3.97  4.04  4.80


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  137/1312  4.86  4.12  4.00  4.31  4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  401/1303  4.71  4.39  4.24  4.58  4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 1 6  4.86  253/1299  4.86  4.34  4.25  4.56  4.86
4. Were special techniques successful                  3  4  0  1  0  0  2  4.00  387/ 758  4.00  4.05  4.01  4.24  4.00


                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 233  ****  4.07  4.09  4.56  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 9 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 244  ****  4.12  4.09  4.09  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 227  ****  4.49  4.40  4.66  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 225  ****  4.40  4.23  4.69  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 207  ****  4.22  4.09  4.40  ****


                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 7 0  1  0  0  0  2  3.67   69/  76  3.67  4.60  4.61  4.57  3.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 8 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/  70  ****  4.54  4.35  4.21  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 7 0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/  67  5.00  4.32  4.34  4.48  5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    8  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  76  ****  4.41  4.44  4.39  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                7  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/  73  5.00  4.17  4.17  4.15  5.00


                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  58  ****  3.98  4.43  4.31  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 9  0  1  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  56  ****  4.12  4.23  4.26  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  44  ****  4.68  4.65  4.74  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  47  ****  4.32  4.29  4.41  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  4.61  4.44  4.55  ****


                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  40  ****  4.28  4.53  4.37  ****
```

```
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       9   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  35  ****  4.43  4.49  4.46  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         9   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  36  ****  4.38  4.60  4.75  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful          9   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  20  ****  5.00  4.24  3.16  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        9   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  16  ****  5.00  4.51  4.40  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

Title   SUPPLY CHAIN MNGMT   Baltimore County   JUN 14, 2005
Instructor: CHIANG, WEI-YU   Spring 2005   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 9   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	482/1504	4.56	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	312/1503	4.67	4.22	4.20	4.28	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	459/1290	4.56	4.32	4.28	4.36	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	385/1453	4.56	4.22	4.21	4.34	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	283/1421	4.56	4.08	4.00	4.27	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	129/1365	4.78	4.11	4.08	4.35	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	108/1485	4.89	4.20	4.16	4.24	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.07	4.06	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	209/1425	4.89	4.41	4.41	4.51	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.29	4.25	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.34	4.26	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	119/1199	4.78	3.95	3.97	4.04	4.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	221/1312	4.71	4.12	4.00	4.31	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	401/1303	4.71	4.39	4.24	4.58	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	395/1299	4.71	4.34	4.25	4.56	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	231/ 758	4.43	4.05	4.01	4.24	4.43

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: IS   733  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page  950
Title       DATA WAREHOUSING/MININ           Baltimore County                                         JUN 14, 2005
Instructor: GANGOPADHYAY, A                  Spring 2005                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     16
Questionnaires: 14                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   Frequencies       Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                  Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
           ----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0  1  0  0  5  7  4.31  826/1504  4.31  4.24  4.27  4.44  4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  5  8  4.62  368/1503  4.62  4.22  4.20  4.28  4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   8  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  412/1290  4.60  4.32  4.28  4.36  4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2   0  0  0  3  2  7  4.33  680/1453  4.33  4.22  4.21  4.34  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1  0  0  2  6  4  4.17  623/1421  4.17  4.08  4.00  4.27  4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 2  3  8  4.46  346/1365  4.46  4.11  4.08  4.35  4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  2  1 10  4.62  339/1485  4.62  4.20  4.16  4.24  4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0  0  0  0  1 11  4.92  591/1504  4.92  4.68  4.69  4.79  4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0  5  4  4.44  409/1483  4.44  4.07  4.06  4.20  4.44

                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  1  1 10  4.75  420/1425  4.75  4.41  4.41  4.51  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  1  1 10  4.75  825/1426  4.75  4.72  4.69  4.80  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  1  3  8  4.58  475/1418  4.58  4.29  4.25  4.36  4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  0  0  2  3  7  4.42  740/1416  4.42  4.34  4.26  4.38  4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 3  3  7  4.31  455/1199  4.31  3.95  3.97  4.04  4.31

                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  6  2  4  3.83  858/1312  3.83  4.12  4.00  4.31  3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  1  2  6  2  3.82 1028/1303  3.82  4.39  4.24  4.58  3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 2  6  3  4.09  899/1299  4.09  4.34  4.25  4.56  4.09
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   6  0  1  1  1  1  3.50  580/ 758  3.50  4.05  4.01  4.24  3.50

                  Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  12  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/ 233  ****  4.07  4.09  4.56  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 0 0 0  1  1  4.50  ****/ 244  ****  4.12  4.09  4.09  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 12 0 0 0 0  0  2  5.00  ****/ 227  ****  4.49  4.40  4.66  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           12  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/ 225  ****  4.40  4.23  4.69  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/ 207  ****  4.22  4.09  4.40  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	864/1504	4.27	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	707/1503	4.36	4.22	4.20	4.28	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	832/1290	4.20	4.32	4.28	4.36	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.22	4.21	4.34	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	212/1421	4.67	4.08	4.00	4.27	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	654/1365	4.18	4.11	4.08	4.35	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	738/1485	4.27	4.20	4.16	4.24	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	830/1504	4.80	4.68	4.69	4.79	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	772/1483	4.13	4.07	4.06	4.20	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	971/1425	4.33	4.41	4.41	4.51	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	967/1426	4.67	4.72	4.69	4.80	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	877/1418	4.22	4.29	4.25	4.36	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	806/1416	4.33	4.34	4.26	4.38	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	860/1199	3.67	3.95	3.97	4.04	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	364/1312	4.50	4.12	4.00	4.31	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	356/1303	4.75	4.39	4.24	4.58	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	570/1299	4.50	4.34	4.25	4.56	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	328/ 758	4.20	4.05	4.01	4.24	4.20
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.15	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	6	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	5	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: IS   804  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page 952
Title          ADV EXPER DESIGN METHO          Baltimore County                                       JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:    FORGIONNE, GUIS                   Spring 2005                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    13
Questionnaires: 12                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies      Instructor      Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank      Mean Mean   Mean Mean   Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1  0  0  0  4  2  5  4.09 1052/1504  4.09 4.24  4.27 4.44  4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1  0  0  0  2  6  3  4.09  996/1503  4.09 4.22  4.20 4.28  4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1  0  0  0  1  6  4  4.27  766/1290  4.27 4.32  4.28 4.36  4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1  0  0  0  1  3  7  4.55  396/1453  4.55 4.22  4.21 4.34  4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1  0  1  2  5  2  3.80  943/1421  3.80 4.08  4.00 4.27  3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  2  0  0  4  2  3  3.89  915/1365  3.89 4.11  4.08 4.35  3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1  0  0  1  1  3  6  4.27  738/1485  4.27 4.20  4.16 4.24  4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1504  5.00 4.68  4.69 4.79  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  1  0  0  1  5  1  4.00  850/1483  4.00 4.07  4.06 4.20  4.00

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2  0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  331/1425  4.80 4.41  4.41 4.51  4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1  0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1426  5.00 4.72  4.69 4.80  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  3  6  2  3.91 1098/1418  3.91 4.29  4.25 4.36  3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1  0  0  0  2  5  4  4.18  929/1416  4.18 4.34  4.26 4.38  4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  4  1  1  2  1  2  3.29 1001/1199  3.29 3.95  3.97 4.04  3.29

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  2  4  5  4.27  579/1312  4.27 4.12  4.00 4.31  4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  2  1  8  4.55  540/1303  4.55 4.39  4.24 4.58  4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  0  3  8  4.73  385/1299  4.73 4.34  4.25 4.56  4.73
4. Were special techniques successful                   1  5  0  0  2  1  3  4.17  343/ 758  4.17 4.05  4.01 4.24  4.17

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  10  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/ 233  **** 4.07  4.09 4.56  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 244  **** 4.12  4.09 4.09  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 11  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 227  **** 4.49  4.40 4.66  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           11  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 225  **** 4.40  4.23 4.69  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 11  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  76  **** 4.60  4.61 4.57  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 11  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  70  **** 4.54  4.35 4.21  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 11  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  67  **** 4.32  4.34 4.48  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    11  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  76  **** 4.41  4.44 4.39  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                11  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  73  **** 4.17  4.17 4.15  ****
```

                            Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                      Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     3         0.00-0.99    1       A    7         Required for Majors   0        Graduate      2         Major       0
 28-55     3         1.00-1.99    0       B    1
 56-83     0         2.00-2.99    0       C    0         General               1        Under-grad   10         Non-major   4
 84-150    0         3.00-3.49    1       D    0
 Grad.     2         3.50-4.00    5       F    0         Electives             0        #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                        responses to be significant
```

```
I     0              Other              6
?     1
```