

Course-Section: CMSC 104 0201  
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR  
 Instructor: ORDONEZ, PATRIC  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 400  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	7	16	4.28	928/1674	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.07	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	8	19	4.48	609/1674	4.22	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	19	4.55	517/1423	4.40	4.28	4.27	4.16	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	6	19	4.76	212/1609	4.42	4.22	4.22	4.05	4.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	4	0	5	7	4	3.35	1320/1585	3.16	3.37	3.96	3.88	3.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	1	9	11	4.32	598/1535	3.93	4.09	4.08	3.89	4.32	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	9	16	4.39	686/1651	4.39	4.30	4.18	4.10	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	5	22	4.75	958/1673	4.69	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	9	13	4.40	522/1656	3.99	4.07	4.07	3.96	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	410/1586	4.50	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	23	4.72	981/1585	4.68	4.71	4.69	4.60	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	8	20	4.62	496/1582	4.26	4.24	4.26	4.17	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	7	20	4.55	635/1575	4.36	4.20	4.27	4.17	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	3	3	20	4.56	272/1380	4.28	4.04	3.94	3.78	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	3	4	4	9	3.81	986/1520	3.51	3.82	4.01	3.76	3.81	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	2	2	4	11	4.10	993/1515	3.26	4.07	4.24	3.97	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	0	3	4	10	3.90	1139/1511	3.40	4.05	4.27	4.00	3.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	13	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	****/ 994	3.02	3.61	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 265	4.63	4.43	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 278	4.10	4.33	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 260	4.13	4.63	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 259	3.89	4.45	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	2.86	4.62	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	4.13	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	4.71	4.45	4.48	4.18	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 99	4.67	4.38	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 97	4.14	4.60	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	3.30	3.69	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	3.63	4.11	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	4.83	4.69	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.71	4.12	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	3.89	3.99	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	4.38	4.59	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	4.43	4.32	4.44	4.39	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 104 0201  
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR  
 Instructor: ORDONEZ, PATRIC  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 400  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	5	A	14	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	7	Under-grad	29	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 104 0301  
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR  
 Instructor: RATSIMOR, OLGA  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 401  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	9	10	4.17	1046/1674	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.07	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	10	7	3.91	1271/1674	4.22	4.24	4.23	4.16	3.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	11	6	4.05	992/1423	4.40	4.28	4.27	4.16	4.05	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	12	7	4.04	1068/1609	4.42	4.22	4.22	4.05	4.04	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	7	0	5	5	2	2.74	1521/1585	3.16	3.37	3.96	3.88	2.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	4	8	5	3.89	1039/1535	3.93	4.09	4.08	3.89	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	5	7	8	4.00	1097/1651	4.39	4.30	4.18	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	778/1673	4.69	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	1	5	7	2	3.50	1377/1656	3.99	4.07	4.07	3.96	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	6	6	9	4.05	1280/1586	4.50	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	981/1585	4.68	4.71	4.69	4.60	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	3	3	9	6	3.73	1320/1582	4.26	4.24	4.26	4.17	3.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	7	11	4.18	1020/1575	4.36	4.20	4.27	4.17	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	2	0	6	12	4.40	379/1380	4.28	4.04	3.94	3.78	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	2	6	4	4	3.21	1299/1520	3.51	3.82	4.01	3.76	3.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	5	0	5	5	5	3.25	1381/1515	3.26	4.07	4.24	3.97	3.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	5	0	6	5	4	3.15	1394/1511	3.40	4.05	4.27	4.00	3.15	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	13	2	1	2	0	1	2.50	964/ 994	3.02	3.61	3.94	3.73	2.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	4	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	69/ 265	4.63	4.43	4.23	3.97	4.63	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	182/ 278	4.10	4.33	4.19	3.97	4.10	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	2	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	210/ 260	4.13	4.63	4.46	4.41	4.13	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	1	0	2	1	2	4	3.89	207/ 259	3.89	4.45	4.33	4.19	3.89	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	2	2	1	1	2	1	2.86	227/ 233	2.86	4.62	4.20	4.00	2.86	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	6	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 103	****	4.13	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	4	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	48/ 101	4.71	4.45	4.48	4.18	4.71	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	5	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	38/ 95	4.67	4.52	4.31	3.99	4.67	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	5	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	44/ 99	4.67	4.38	4.39	4.10	4.67	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	4	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	49/ 97	4.14	4.60	4.14	3.69	4.14	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	0	2	1	4	3.30	54/ 76	3.30	3.69	3.98	3.32	3.30	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	2	0	0	3	3	3.63	47/ 77	3.63	4.11	3.93	3.42	3.63	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	4	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	21/ 53	4.83	4.69	4.45	4.34	4.83	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	4	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 48	****	4.71	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	3	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 49	5.00	4.92	4.27	4.30	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	40/ 61	3.89	3.99	4.09	3.87	3.89	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	2	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	26/ 52	4.38	4.59	4.26	3.91	4.38	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	3	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	28/ 50	4.43	4.32	4.44	4.39	4.43	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	6	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	6	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 104 0301  
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR  
 Instructor: RATSIMOR, OLGA  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 401  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	23	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 104 0401  
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR  
 Instructor: KUSS, FRED C  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 402  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	4	3	9	4.06	1155/1674	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.07	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	5	8	3.89	1277/1674	4.22	4.24	4.23	4.16	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	684/1423	4.40	4.28	4.27	4.16	4.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	629/1609	4.42	4.22	4.22	4.05	4.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	2	1	4	2	3	3.25	1364/1585	3.16	3.37	3.96	3.88	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	5	3	2	2	5	2.94	1456/1535	3.93	4.09	4.08	3.89	2.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	497/1651	4.39	4.30	4.18	4.10	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1673	4.69	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	6	8	1	3.56	1348/1656	3.99	4.07	4.07	3.96	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	989/1586	4.50	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	1300/1585	4.68	4.71	4.69	4.60	4.41	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	5	7	4.06	1104/1582	4.26	4.24	4.26	4.17	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	4	0	3	10	4.12	1090/1575	4.36	4.20	4.27	4.17	4.12	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	2	4	2	5	3.57	1009/1380	4.28	4.04	3.94	3.78	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	4	1	3	1	3	2.83	1421/1520	3.51	3.82	4.01	3.76	2.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	6	3	2	0	1	1.92	1498/1515	3.26	4.07	4.24	3.97	1.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	4	1	5	1	1	2.50	1476/1511	3.40	4.05	4.27	4.00	2.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	9	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 994	3.02	3.61	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	4.10	4.33	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	4.13	4.63	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	3.89	4.45	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	2.86	4.62	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.13	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	4.71	4.45	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	4.67	4.52	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	4.67	4.38	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	4.14	4.60	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	3.30	3.69	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	3.63	4.11	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	4.83	4.69	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.71	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	5.00	4.92	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	3.89	3.99	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	4.38	4.59	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	4.43	4.32	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 104 0401  
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR  
 Instructor: KUSS, FRED C  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 402  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	7	20	4.61	485/1674	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.07	4.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	21	4.61	460/1674	4.22	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	20	4.57	493/1423	4.40	4.28	4.27	4.16	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	4	5	15	4.46	567/1609	4.42	4.22	4.22	4.05	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	5	3	2	4	8	3.32	1339/1585	3.16	3.37	3.96	3.88	3.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	301/1535	3.93	4.09	4.08	3.89	4.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	5	21	4.64	351/1651	4.39	4.30	4.18	4.10	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	22	5	4.14	1497/1673	4.69	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	10	12	4.48	423/1656	3.99	4.07	4.07	3.96	4.48	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	20	4.74	517/1586	4.50	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	689/1585	4.68	4.71	4.69	4.60	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	8	18	4.63	496/1582	4.26	4.24	4.26	4.17	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	8	18	4.59	590/1575	4.36	4.20	4.27	4.17	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	3	4	18	4.60	241/1380	4.28	4.04	3.94	3.78	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	2	8	7	4.17	726/1520	3.51	3.82	4.01	3.76	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	4	3	4	7	3.78	1197/1515	3.26	4.07	4.24	3.97	3.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	4	5	8	4.06	1034/1511	3.40	4.05	4.27	4.00	4.06	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	2	2	2	4	5	3.53	722/ 994	3.02	3.61	3.94	3.73	3.53	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 265	4.63	4.43	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 278	4.10	4.33	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 260	4.13	4.63	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 259	3.89	4.45	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 233	2.86	4.62	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.13	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	4.71	4.45	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	4.67	4.52	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	4.67	4.38	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	4.14	4.60	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	3.30	3.69	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	3.63	4.11	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	4.83	4.69	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.71	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 49	5.00	4.92	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 61	3.89	3.99	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	4.38	4.59	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	4.43	4.32	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 104 0501  
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR  
 Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M  
 Enrollment: 46  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 403  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: CMSC 121 0201  
 Title INTRODUCTION TO UNIX  
 Instructor: EATON, ERIC R  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 404  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	9	4.64	432/1674	4.64	4.27	4.27	4.07	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	803/1674	4.36	4.24	4.23	4.16	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	575/1423	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.16	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	1	6	4	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.22	4.22	4.05	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	4	4	1	2.93	1480/1585	2.93	3.37	3.96	3.88	2.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	578/1535	4.33	4.09	4.08	3.89	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	432/1651	4.57	4.30	4.18	4.10	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	849/1656	4.14	4.07	4.07	3.96	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	693/1586	4.64	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	689/1585	4.86	4.71	4.69	4.60	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	829/1582	4.36	4.24	4.26	4.17	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	423/1575	4.71	4.20	4.27	4.17	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	213/1380	4.64	4.04	3.94	3.78	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	598/1520	4.30	3.82	4.01	3.76	4.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	1180/1515	3.80	4.07	4.24	3.97	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	4.05	4.27	4.00	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	835/ 994	3.25	3.61	3.94	3.73	3.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 265	****	4.43	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 278	****	4.33	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.63	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 259	****	4.45	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 233	****	4.62	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 103	****	4.13	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 101	****	4.45	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.52	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 99	****	4.38	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	4.60	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 76	****	3.69	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 77	****	4.11	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.69	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.71	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 49	****	4.92	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 61	****	3.99	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 52	****	4.59	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 50	****	4.32	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 121 0201  
 Title INTRODUCTION TO UNIX  
 Instructor: EATON, ERIC R  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 404  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0101  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 405  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	4	4.67	406/1674	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	830/1674	4.57	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	771/1423	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.36	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	173/1609	4.61	4.22	4.22	4.23	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	3.00	1440/1585	3.05	3.37	3.96	3.91	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1535	4.30	4.09	4.08	4.03	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	330/1651	4.59	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1673	4.68	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	381/1656	4.49	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1585	4.80	4.71	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	777/1582	4.57	4.24	4.26	4.35	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	279/1575	4.56	4.20	4.27	4.39	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	114/1380	4.52	4.04	3.94	4.03	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	191/1520	3.88	3.82	4.01	4.03	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	325/1515	4.01	4.07	4.24	4.28	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	751/1511	3.87	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	132/ 265	4.50	4.43	4.23	4.34	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	130/ 278	4.26	4.33	4.19	4.36	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 260	4.57	4.63	4.46	4.51	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	89/ 259	4.27	4.45	4.33	4.42	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	53/ 233	4.68	4.62	4.20	4.48	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	4.47	4.13	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	4.53	4.45	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	4.67	4.52	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	4.25	4.38	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	5.00	4.60	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	3.85	3.69	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	4.15	4.11	3.93	4.20	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	4.69	4.71	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	5.00	4.92	4.27	4.82	****	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: CMSC 201 0102  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 406  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	4.25	954/1674	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	270/1674	4.57	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1423	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.36	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	312/1609	4.61	4.22	4.22	4.23	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	1565/1585	3.05	3.37	3.96	3.91	2.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	169/1535	4.30	4.09	4.08	4.03	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	231/1651	4.59	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1673	4.68	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	615/1656	4.49	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	858/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	917/1585	4.80	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	935/1582	4.57	4.24	4.26	4.35	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	958/1575	4.56	4.20	4.27	4.39	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1380	4.52	4.04	3.94	4.03	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1284/1520	3.88	3.82	4.01	4.03	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	1420/1515	4.01	4.07	4.24	4.28	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	1466/1511	3.87	4.05	4.27	4.28	2.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	881/ 994	3.61	3.61	3.94	3.98	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 265	4.50	4.43	4.23	4.34	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 278	4.26	4.33	4.19	4.36	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 260	4.57	4.63	4.46	4.51	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 259	4.27	4.45	4.33	4.42	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 233	4.68	4.62	4.20	4.48	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0103  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 407  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	4	5	4.56	546/1674	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	673/1674	4.57	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	517/1423	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.36	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	432/1609	4.61	4.22	4.22	4.23	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	1440/1585	3.05	3.37	3.96	3.91	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	169/1535	4.30	4.09	4.08	4.03	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	458/1651	4.59	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	742/1673	4.68	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	615/1656	4.49	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	874/1585	4.80	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	850/1582	4.57	4.24	4.26	4.35	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	203/1575	4.56	4.20	4.27	4.39	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	489/1380	4.52	4.04	3.94	4.03	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	1059/1520	3.88	3.82	4.01	4.03	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	4	0	1	0	2	2.43	1480/1515	4.01	4.07	4.24	4.28	2.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	2	1	1	2	3.14	1396/1511	3.87	4.05	4.27	4.28	3.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 994	3.61	3.61	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	202/ 265	4.50	4.43	4.23	4.34	3.88	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	241/ 278	4.26	4.33	4.19	4.36	3.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	47/ 260	4.57	4.63	4.46	4.51	4.88	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	3	2	0	0	3	2.75	257/ 259	4.27	4.45	4.33	4.42	2.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	134/ 233	4.68	4.62	4.20	4.48	4.14	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	67/ 103	4.47	4.13	4.41	4.07	4.33	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	91/ 101	4.53	4.45	4.48	4.45	3.67	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 95	4.67	4.52	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	70/ 99	4.25	4.38	4.39	4.22	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	5.00	4.60	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	37/ 76	3.85	3.69	3.98	3.97	4.25	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	30/ 77	4.15	4.11	3.93	4.20	4.25	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.69	4.45	4.50	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	11/ 48	4.69	4.71	4.12	4.50	4.75	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 49	5.00	4.92	4.27	4.82	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	42/ 61	4.15	3.99	4.09	4.23	3.75	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	21/ 52	4.75	4.59	4.26	4.53	4.75	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	32/ 50	4.47	4.32	4.44	4.42	4.33	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	4.67	4.50	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 31	4.67	4.75	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0103  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 407  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0104  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 408  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	0	3	4.50	607/1674	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	270/1674	4.57	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1423	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.36	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	743/1609	4.61	4.22	4.22	4.23	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1223/1585	3.05	3.37	3.96	3.91	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1535	4.30	4.09	4.08	4.03	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	524/1651	4.59	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1673	4.68	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	257/1656	4.49	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	496/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	1225/1585	4.80	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	632/1582	4.57	4.24	4.26	4.35	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	958/1575	4.56	4.20	4.27	4.39	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	303/1380	4.52	4.04	3.94	4.03	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1027/1520	3.88	3.82	4.01	4.03	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	1024/1515	4.01	4.07	4.24	4.28	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1308/1511	3.87	4.05	4.27	4.28	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 994	3.61	3.61	3.94	3.98	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 265	4.50	4.43	4.23	4.34	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 278	4.26	4.33	4.19	4.36	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 260	4.57	4.63	4.46	4.51	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	142/ 259	4.27	4.45	4.33	4.42	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 233	4.68	4.62	4.20	4.48	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 103	4.47	4.13	4.41	4.07	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	55/ 101	4.53	4.45	4.48	4.45	4.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 95	4.67	4.52	4.31	4.33	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 99	4.25	4.38	4.39	4.22	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.60	4.14	4.63	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 76	3.85	3.69	3.98	3.97	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 77	4.15	4.11	3.93	4.20	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.69	4.45	4.50	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	4.69	4.71	4.12	4.50	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 49	5.00	4.92	4.27	4.82	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 61	4.15	3.99	4.09	4.23	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	4.75	4.59	4.26	4.53	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 50	4.47	4.32	4.44	4.42	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	4.67	4.50	4.36	4.63	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	4.67	4.75	4.34	4.50	5.00	



Course-Section: CMSC 201 0104  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 408  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	2	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	4	Non-major	0
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0105  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 409  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	1	3.75	1407/1674	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.32	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1146/1674	4.57	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1016/1423	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.36	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	743/1609	4.61	4.22	4.22	4.23	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1517/1585	3.05	3.37	3.96	3.91	2.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1295/1535	4.30	4.09	4.08	4.03	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1442/1651	4.59	4.30	4.18	4.20	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1673	4.68	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	257/1656	4.49	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1300/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1472/1585	4.80	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1302/1582	4.57	4.24	4.26	4.35	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1445/1575	4.56	4.20	4.27	4.39	3.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	426/1380	4.52	4.04	3.94	4.03	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	1284/1520	3.88	3.82	4.01	4.03	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1420/1515	4.01	4.07	4.24	4.28	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1420/1511	3.87	4.05	4.27	4.28	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	977/ 994	3.61	3.61	3.94	3.98	2.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	214/ 265	4.50	4.43	4.23	4.34	3.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	223/ 278	4.26	4.33	4.19	4.36	3.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 260	4.57	4.63	4.46	4.51	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	191/ 259	4.27	4.45	4.33	4.42	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	108/ 233	4.68	4.62	4.20	4.48	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	74/ 103	4.47	4.13	4.41	4.07	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	72/ 101	4.53	4.45	4.48	4.45	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.60	4.14	4.63	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	73/ 76	3.85	3.69	3.98	3.97	2.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	50/ 77	4.15	4.11	3.93	4.20	3.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.69	4.45	4.50	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	26/ 48	4.69	4.71	4.12	4.50	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	29/ 61	4.15	3.99	4.09	4.23	4.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	4.75	4.59	4.26	4.53	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 50	4.47	4.32	4.44	4.42	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	23/ 35	4.67	4.50	4.36	4.63	4.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	20/ 31	4.67	4.75	4.34	4.50	4.00	

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0105  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 409  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0106  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 410  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	0	0	2.00	1671/1674	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.32	2.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	4.57	4.24	4.23	4.26	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1423	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	4.61	4.22	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	3.05	3.37	3.96	3.91	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	4.59	4.30	4.18	4.20	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	4.68	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	955/1656	4.49	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	4.80	4.71	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1582	4.57	4.24	4.26	4.35	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1575	4.56	4.20	4.27	4.39	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	4.52	4.04	3.94	4.03	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1353/1520	3.88	3.82	4.01	4.03	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1515	4.01	4.07	4.24	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1511	3.87	4.05	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 994	3.61	3.61	3.94	3.98	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 265	4.50	4.43	4.23	4.34	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 278	4.26	4.33	4.19	4.36	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 260	4.57	4.63	4.46	4.51	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 259	4.27	4.45	4.33	4.42	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 233	4.68	4.62	4.20	4.48	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0201  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 411  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	214/1674	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	379/1674	4.57	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	376/1423	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.36	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	374/1609	4.61	4.22	4.22	4.23	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	1	0	2	2.67	1532/1585	3.05	3.37	3.96	3.91	2.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1535	4.30	4.09	4.08	4.03	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	330/1651	4.59	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1673	4.68	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	257/1656	4.49	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	737/1585	4.80	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1582	4.57	4.24	4.26	4.35	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	246/1575	4.56	4.20	4.27	4.39	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	540/1380	4.52	4.04	3.94	4.03	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	726/1520	3.88	3.82	4.01	4.03	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	483/1515	4.01	4.07	4.24	4.28	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	976/1511	3.87	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	205/ 994	3.61	3.61	3.94	3.98	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	229/ 265	4.50	4.43	4.23	4.34	3.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	241/ 278	4.26	4.33	4.19	4.36	3.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	245/ 260	4.57	4.63	4.46	4.51	3.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	236/ 259	4.27	4.45	4.33	4.42	3.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	150/ 233	4.68	4.62	4.20	4.48	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	6
			P 0		Non-major
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	1
					5

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0201  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 412  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	214/1674	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	379/1674	4.57	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	376/1423	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.36	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	374/1609	4.61	4.22	4.22	4.23	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	1	0	2	2.67	1532/1585	3.05	3.37	3.96	3.91	2.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1535	4.30	4.09	4.08	4.03	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	330/1651	4.59	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1673	4.68	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1656	4.49	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	4.80	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1582	4.57	4.24	4.26	4.35	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1575	4.56	4.20	4.27	4.39	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	4.52	4.04	3.94	4.03	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	726/1520	3.88	3.82	4.01	4.03	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	483/1515	4.01	4.07	4.24	4.28	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	976/1511	3.87	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	205/ 994	3.61	3.61	3.94	3.98	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	229/ 265	4.50	4.43	4.23	4.34	3.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	241/ 278	4.26	4.33	4.19	4.36	3.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	245/ 260	4.57	4.63	4.46	4.51	3.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	236/ 259	4.27	4.45	4.33	4.42	3.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	150/ 233	4.68	4.62	4.20	4.48	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0202  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 413  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	4.25	954/1674	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	931/1674	4.57	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1016/1423	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.36	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	490/1609	4.61	4.22	4.22	4.23	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1572/1585	3.05	3.37	3.96	3.91	2.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1509/1535	4.30	4.09	4.08	4.03	2.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	866/1651	4.59	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1673	4.68	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	615/1656	4.49	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	496/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	4.80	4.71	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1582	4.57	4.24	4.26	4.35	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	359/1575	4.56	4.20	4.27	4.39	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1380	4.52	4.04	3.94	4.03	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1353/1520	3.88	3.82	4.01	4.03	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1381/1515	4.01	4.07	4.24	4.28	3.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1221/1511	3.87	4.05	4.27	4.28	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	205/ 994	3.61	3.61	3.94	3.98	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 265	4.50	4.43	4.23	4.34	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	86/ 278	4.26	4.33	4.19	4.36	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 260	4.57	4.63	4.46	4.51	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	115/ 259	4.27	4.45	4.33	4.42	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 233	4.68	4.62	4.20	4.48	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	74/ 103	4.47	4.13	4.41	4.07	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 101	4.53	4.45	4.48	4.45	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 95	4.67	4.52	4.31	4.33	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 99	4.25	4.38	4.39	4.22	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.60	4.14	4.63	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 76	3.85	3.69	3.98	3.97	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 77	4.15	4.11	3.93	4.20	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 61	4.15	3.99	4.09	4.23	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	4.75	4.59	4.26	4.53	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 50	4.47	4.32	4.44	4.42	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	4.67	4.50	4.36	4.63	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	4.67	4.75	4.34	4.50	5.00	

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0202  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 413  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

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



Course-Section: CMSC 201 0203  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 414  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	406/1674	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1674	4.57	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1423	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	490/1609	4.61	4.22	4.22	4.23	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	769/1585	3.05	3.37	3.96	3.91	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1651	4.59	4.30	4.18	4.20	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1673	4.68	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	257/1656	4.49	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1585	4.80	4.71	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1582	4.57	4.24	4.26	4.35	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1575	4.56	4.20	4.27	4.39	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1380	4.52	4.04	3.94	4.03	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	810/1520	3.88	3.82	4.01	4.03	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1024/1515	4.01	4.07	4.24	4.28	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1050/1511	3.87	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 265	4.50	4.43	4.23	4.34	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 278	4.26	4.33	4.19	4.36	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 260	4.57	4.63	4.46	4.51	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 259	4.27	4.45	4.33	4.42	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 233	4.68	4.62	4.20	4.48	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 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 3	Non-major 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0301  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 415  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	6	4.40	768/1674	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	578/1674	4.57	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	575/1423	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.36	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	490/1609	4.61	4.22	4.22	4.23	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	1	2	0	0	2.00	1572/1585	3.05	3.37	3.96	3.91	2.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	1295/1535	4.30	4.09	4.08	4.03	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	175/1651	4.59	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	1463/1673	4.68	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	292/1656	4.49	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	249/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	567/1585	4.80	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	578/1582	4.57	4.24	4.26	4.35	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	635/1575	4.56	4.20	4.27	4.39	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	227/1380	4.52	4.04	3.94	4.03	4.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	768/1520	3.88	3.82	4.01	4.03	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	827/1515	4.01	4.07	4.24	4.28	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	1155/1511	3.87	4.05	4.27	4.28	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 994	3.61	3.61	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	4.50	4.43	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	4.26	4.33	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	4.57	4.63	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	4.27	4.45	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	4.68	4.62	4.20	4.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0301  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 416  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	6	4.40	768/1674	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	578/1674	4.57	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	575/1423	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.36	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	490/1609	4.61	4.22	4.22	4.23	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	1	2	0	0	2.00	1572/1585	3.05	3.37	3.96	3.91	2.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	1295/1535	4.30	4.09	4.08	4.03	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	175/1651	4.59	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	1463/1673	4.68	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	381/1656	4.49	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1585	4.80	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1582	4.57	4.24	4.26	4.35	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1575	4.56	4.20	4.27	4.39	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1380	4.52	4.04	3.94	4.03	4.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	768/1520	3.88	3.82	4.01	4.03	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	827/1515	4.01	4.07	4.24	4.28	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	1155/1511	3.87	4.05	4.27	4.28	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 994	3.61	3.61	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	4.50	4.43	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	4.26	4.33	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	4.57	4.63	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	4.27	4.45	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	4.68	4.62	4.20	4.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0302  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 417  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	4.25	954/1674	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	931/1674	4.57	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1268/1423	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.36	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	743/1609	4.61	4.22	4.22	4.23	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1223/1585	3.05	3.37	3.96	3.91	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	870/1535	4.30	4.09	4.08	4.03	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	866/1651	4.59	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1566/1673	4.68	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	615/1656	4.49	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.33	
-----															
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	496/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1225/1585	4.80	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1582	4.57	4.24	4.26	4.35	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1289/1575	4.56	4.20	4.27	4.39	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	666/1380	4.52	4.04	3.94	4.03	4.00	
-----															
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1169/1520	3.88	3.82	4.01	4.03	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1024/1515	4.01	4.07	4.24	4.28	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1420/1511	3.87	4.05	4.27	4.28	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0303  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 418  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	5	4.57	521/1674	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	314/1674	4.57	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	310/1423	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.36	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1609	4.61	4.22	4.22	4.23	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	769/1585	3.05	3.37	3.96	3.91	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	870/1535	4.30	4.09	4.08	4.03	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1651	4.59	4.30	4.18	4.20	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1397/1673	4.68	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	214/1656	4.49	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	301/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1585	4.80	4.71	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	366/1582	4.57	4.24	4.26	4.35	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	612/1575	4.56	4.20	4.27	4.39	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	567/1380	4.52	4.04	3.94	4.03	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	743/1520	3.88	3.82	4.01	4.03	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	873/1515	4.01	4.07	4.24	4.28	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	729/1511	3.87	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	3.61	3.61	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	4.50	4.43	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	4.26	4.33	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	4.57	4.63	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	4.27	4.45	4.33	4.42	****	

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	0	Major	0	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	7				
				? 0						

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0304  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 419  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	4.00	1196/1674	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	578/1674	4.57	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	845/1423	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.36	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	490/1609	4.61	4.22	4.22	4.23	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1440/1585	3.05	3.37	3.96	3.91	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1535	4.30	4.09	4.08	4.03	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1324/1651	4.59	4.30	4.18	4.20	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1420/1673	4.68	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	955/1656	4.49	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1144/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	917/1585	4.80	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1302/1582	4.57	4.24	4.26	4.35	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1138/1575	4.56	4.20	4.27	4.39	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1036/1380	4.52	4.04	3.94	4.03	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	645/1520	3.88	3.82	4.01	4.03	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	384/1515	4.01	4.07	4.24	4.28	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1050/1511	3.87	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	988/ 994	3.61	3.61	3.94	3.98	1.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 265	4.50	4.43	4.23	4.34	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 278	4.26	4.33	4.19	4.36	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 260	4.57	4.63	4.46	4.51	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 259	4.27	4.45	4.33	4.42	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 233	4.68	4.62	4.20	4.48	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0305  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 420  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	4	4.43	735/1674	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1674	4.57	4.24	4.23	4.26	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	167/1423	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.36	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1609	4.61	4.22	4.22	4.23	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1223/1585	3.05	3.37	3.96	3.91	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1535	4.30	4.09	4.08	4.03	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1651	4.59	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1361/1673	4.68	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	149/1656	4.49	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	689/1585	4.80	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	199/1582	4.57	4.24	4.26	4.35	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1575	4.56	4.20	4.27	4.39	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	103/1380	4.52	4.04	3.94	4.03	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	572/1520	3.88	3.82	4.01	4.03	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1024/1515	4.01	4.07	4.24	4.28	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	816/1511	3.87	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	3.61	3.61	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	4.50	4.43	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	4.26	4.33	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	4.57	4.63	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	4.27	4.45	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	4.68	4.62	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	4.47	4.13	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 101	4.53	4.45	4.48	4.45	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	4.67	4.52	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	4.25	4.38	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	5.00	4.60	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	3.85	3.69	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 77	4.15	4.11	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	5.00	4.69	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	4.69	4.71	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	5.00	4.92	4.27	4.82	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	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	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	7	
?	0			



Course-Section: CMSC 201 0306  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 421  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	0	2	4.33	854/1674	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1674	4.57	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	376/1423	4.51	4.28	4.27	4.36	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1609	4.61	4.22	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1440/1585	3.05	3.37	3.96	3.91	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1535	4.30	4.09	4.08	4.03	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1651	4.59	4.30	4.18	4.20	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1361/1673	4.68	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	257/1656	4.49	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1585	4.80	4.71	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1582	4.57	4.24	4.26	4.35	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1575	4.56	4.20	4.27	4.39	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	200/1380	4.52	4.04	3.94	4.03	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	572/1520	3.88	3.82	4.01	4.03	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1253/1515	4.01	4.07	4.24	4.28	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	816/1511	3.87	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	881/ 994	3.61	3.61	3.94	3.98	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 265	4.50	4.43	4.23	4.34	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	259/ 278	4.26	4.33	4.19	4.36	3.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	257/ 260	4.57	4.63	4.46	4.51	3.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	191/ 259	4.27	4.45	4.33	4.42	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 233	4.68	4.62	4.20	4.48	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 103	4.47	4.13	4.41	4.07	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 101	4.53	4.45	4.48	4.45	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	62/ 95	4.67	4.52	4.31	4.33	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	93/ 99	4.25	4.38	4.39	4.22	3.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.60	4.14	4.63	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	60/ 76	3.85	3.69	3.98	3.97	3.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	63/ 77	4.15	4.11	3.93	4.20	3.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.69	4.45	4.50	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	4.69	4.71	4.12	4.50	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 49	5.00	4.92	4.27	4.82	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	53/ 61	4.15	3.99	4.09	4.23	3.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	29/ 52	4.75	4.59	4.26	4.53	4.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	47/ 50	4.47	4.32	4.44	4.42	3.00	

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0306  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 421  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201H 0101  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 422  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1334/1674	3.89	4.27	4.27	4.32	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	519/1674	4.56	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	648/1423	4.44	4.28	4.27	4.36	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.22	4.22	4.23	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	1	0	0	2	2.50	1543/1585	2.50	3.37	3.96	3.91	2.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1039/1535	3.89	4.09	4.08	4.03	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	613/1651	4.44	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1146/1656	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	249/1586	4.82	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	874/1585	4.89	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	578/1582	4.78	4.24	4.26	4.35	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	2	5	3.89	1225/1575	3.82	4.20	4.27	4.39	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	399/1380	4.35	4.04	3.94	4.03	4.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1321/1520	3.14	3.82	4.01	4.03	3.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1282/1515	3.57	4.07	4.24	4.28	3.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1296/1511	3.57	4.05	4.27	4.28	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.43	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.33	4.19	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.45	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.62	4.20	4.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 201H 0101  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 423  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1334/1674	3.89	4.27	4.27	4.32	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	519/1674	4.56	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	648/1423	4.44	4.28	4.27	4.36	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.22	4.22	4.23	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	1	0	0	2	2.50	1543/1585	2.50	3.37	3.96	3.91	2.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1039/1535	3.89	4.09	4.08	4.03	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	613/1651	4.44	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	719/1656	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	496/1586	4.82	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	4.89	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1582	4.78	4.24	4.26	4.35	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1289/1575	3.82	4.20	4.27	4.39	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	426/1380	4.35	4.04	3.94	4.03	4.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1321/1520	3.14	3.82	4.01	4.03	3.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1282/1515	3.57	4.07	4.24	4.28	3.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1296/1511	3.57	4.05	4.27	4.28	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.43	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.33	4.19	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.45	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.62	4.20	4.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0102  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: WORTMAN, DANA T (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 424  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	4	2	7	4.07	1139/1674	4.34	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	980/1674	4.35	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	750/1423	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.36	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	490/1609	4.07	4.22	4.22	4.23	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	6	0	2	3.00	1440/1585	3.19	3.37	3.96	3.91	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	870/1535	4.18	4.09	4.08	4.03	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	700/1651	4.43	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1673	4.92	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	1124/1656	4.47	4.07	4.07	4.10	3.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	784/1586	4.64	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	689/1585	4.81	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	829/1582	4.62	4.24	4.26	4.35	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	793/1575	4.66	4.20	4.27	4.39	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	463/1380	4.31	4.04	3.94	4.03	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	626/1520	4.05	3.82	4.01	4.03	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	996/1515	4.34	4.07	4.24	4.28	4.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	3	1	6	4.00	1050/1511	4.15	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 994	3.92	3.61	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	85/ 265	4.36	4.43	4.23	4.34	4.55	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	101/ 278	4.42	4.33	4.19	4.36	4.45	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	86/ 260	4.73	4.63	4.46	4.51	4.73	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	35/ 259	4.67	4.45	4.33	4.42	4.90	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	5	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 233	4.71	4.62	4.20	4.48	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	3.00	4.13	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	5.00	4.45	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	5.00	4.52	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	5.00	4.38	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	5.00	4.60	4.14	4.63	****	

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
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B 7	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 2	General 0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 1	Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Non-major 0
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Other 14

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0102  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 425  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	4	2	7	4.07	1139/1674	4.34	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	980/1674	4.35	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	750/1423	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.36	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	490/1609	4.07	4.22	4.22	4.23	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	6	0	2	3.00	1440/1585	3.19	3.37	3.96	3.91	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	870/1535	4.18	4.09	4.08	4.03	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	700/1651	4.43	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1673	4.92	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1656	4.47	4.07	4.07	4.10	3.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1586	4.64	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	4.81	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1582	4.62	4.24	4.26	4.35	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	359/1575	4.66	4.20	4.27	4.39	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1380	4.31	4.04	3.94	4.03	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	626/1520	4.05	3.82	4.01	4.03	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	996/1515	4.34	4.07	4.24	4.28	4.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	3	1	6	4.00	1050/1511	4.15	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 994	3.92	3.61	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	85/ 265	4.36	4.43	4.23	4.34	4.55	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	101/ 278	4.42	4.33	4.19	4.36	4.45	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	86/ 260	4.73	4.63	4.46	4.51	4.73	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	35/ 259	4.67	4.45	4.33	4.42	4.90	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	5	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 233	4.71	4.62	4.20	4.48	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	3.00	4.13	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	5.00	4.45	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	5.00	4.52	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	5.00	4.38	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	5.00	4.60	4.14	4.63	****	

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
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B 7	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 2	General 0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 1	Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Non-major 0
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Electives 0
					Other 14

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0104  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: WORTMAN, DANA T  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 426  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	2	3.80	1385/1674	4.34	4.27	4.27	4.32	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1146/1674	4.35	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	894/1423	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.36	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1094/1609	4.07	4.22	4.22	4.23	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	769/1585	3.19	3.37	3.96	3.91	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	870/1535	4.18	4.09	4.08	4.03	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	393/1651	4.43	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1673	4.92	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	955/1656	4.47	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1144/1586	4.64	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	4.81	4.71	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	632/1582	4.62	4.24	4.26	4.35	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1575	4.66	4.20	4.27	4.39	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1380	4.31	4.04	3.94	4.03	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	4.05	3.82	4.01	4.03	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	483/1515	4.34	4.07	4.24	4.28	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	816/1511	4.15	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	205/ 994	3.92	3.61	3.94	3.98	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	59/ 265	4.36	4.43	4.23	4.34	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	57/ 278	4.42	4.33	4.19	4.36	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 260	4.73	4.63	4.46	4.51	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 259	4.67	4.45	4.33	4.42	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 233	4.71	4.62	4.20	4.48	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	3.00	4.13	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	5.00	4.45	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	5.00	4.52	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	5.00	4.38	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	5.00	4.60	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	4.00	3.69	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	4.00	4.11	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	4.00	4.69	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	5.00	4.71	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	5.00	4.92	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	4.00	3.99	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	4.00	4.59	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.32	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	4.00	4.50	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	5.00	4.75	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0104  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: WORTMAN, DANA T  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 426  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: CMSC 202 0106  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: WORTMAN, DANA T (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 427  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	4.00	1196/1674	4.34	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	2	2	3.67	1421/1674	4.35	4.24	4.23	4.26	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1140/1423	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.36	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1411/1609	4.07	4.22	4.22	4.23	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1440/1585	3.19	3.37	3.96	3.91	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	508/1535	4.18	4.09	4.08	4.03	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1651	4.43	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1673	4.92	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1330/1656	4.47	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1211/1586	4.64	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1071/1585	4.81	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1025/1582	4.62	4.24	4.26	4.35	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	1040/1575	4.66	4.20	4.27	4.39	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	998/1380	4.31	4.04	3.94	4.03	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1221/1520	4.05	3.82	4.01	4.03	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1024/1515	4.34	4.07	4.24	4.28	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1050/1511	4.15	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	3.92	3.61	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	93/ 265	4.36	4.43	4.23	4.34	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	57/ 278	4.42	4.33	4.19	4.36	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	63/ 260	4.73	4.63	4.46	4.51	4.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 259	4.67	4.45	4.33	4.42	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	33/ 233	4.71	4.62	4.20	4.48	4.80	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	3.00	4.13	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	5.00	4.45	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	5.00	4.52	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	5.00	4.38	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	5.00	4.60	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	4.00	3.69	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	4.00	4.11	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	4.00	4.69	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	5.00	4.71	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	5.00	4.92	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	4.00	3.99	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	4.00	4.59	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.32	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	4.00	4.50	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	5.00	4.75	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0106  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: WORTMAN, DANA T (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 427  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0106  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 428  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	4.00	1196/1674	4.34	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	2	2	3.67	1421/1674	4.35	4.24	4.23	4.26	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1140/1423	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.36	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1411/1609	4.07	4.22	4.22	4.23	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1440/1585	3.19	3.37	3.96	3.91	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	508/1535	4.18	4.09	4.08	4.03	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1651	4.43	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1673	4.92	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1656	4.47	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1074/1586	4.64	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1472/1585	4.81	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	632/1582	4.62	4.24	4.26	4.35	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	692/1575	4.66	4.20	4.27	4.39	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1380	4.31	4.04	3.94	4.03	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1221/1520	4.05	3.82	4.01	4.03	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1024/1515	4.34	4.07	4.24	4.28	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1050/1511	4.15	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	3.92	3.61	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	93/ 265	4.36	4.43	4.23	4.34	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	57/ 278	4.42	4.33	4.19	4.36	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	63/ 260	4.73	4.63	4.46	4.51	4.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 259	4.67	4.45	4.33	4.42	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	33/ 233	4.71	4.62	4.20	4.48	4.80	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	3.00	4.13	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	5.00	4.45	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	5.00	4.52	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	5.00	4.38	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	5.00	4.60	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	4.00	3.69	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	4.00	4.11	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	4.00	4.69	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	5.00	4.71	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	5.00	4.92	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	4.00	3.99	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	4.00	4.59	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.32	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	4.00	4.50	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	5.00	4.75	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0106  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 428  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0201  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 429  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	298/1674	4.34	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	270/1674	4.35	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	262/1423	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.36	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	490/1609	4.07	4.22	4.22	4.23	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1121/1585	3.19	3.37	3.96	3.91	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	578/1535	4.18	4.09	4.08	4.03	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	372/1651	4.43	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	760/1673	4.92	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	257/1656	4.47	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	266/1586	4.64	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1585	4.81	4.71	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	199/1582	4.62	4.24	4.26	4.35	4.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	203/1575	4.66	4.20	4.27	4.39	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	227/1380	4.31	4.04	3.94	4.03	4.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	645/1520	4.05	3.82	4.01	4.03	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	898/1515	4.34	4.07	4.24	4.28	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1004/1511	4.15	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	322/ 994	3.92	3.61	3.94	3.98	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	42/ 265	4.36	4.43	4.23	4.34	4.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	86/ 278	4.42	4.33	4.19	4.36	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	77/ 260	4.73	4.63	4.46	4.51	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	62/ 259	4.67	4.45	4.33	4.42	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	72/ 233	4.71	4.62	4.20	4.48	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0201  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 430  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	298/1674	4.34	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	270/1674	4.35	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	262/1423	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.36	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	490/1609	4.07	4.22	4.22	4.23	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1121/1585	3.19	3.37	3.96	3.91	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	578/1535	4.18	4.09	4.08	4.03	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	372/1651	4.43	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	760/1673	4.92	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1656	4.47	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1586	4.64	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1585	4.81	4.71	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1582	4.62	4.24	4.26	4.35	4.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1575	4.66	4.20	4.27	4.39	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	4.31	4.04	3.94	4.03	4.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	645/1520	4.05	3.82	4.01	4.03	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	898/1515	4.34	4.07	4.24	4.28	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1004/1511	4.15	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	322/ 994	3.92	3.61	3.94	3.98	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	42/ 265	4.36	4.43	4.23	4.34	4.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	86/ 278	4.42	4.33	4.19	4.36	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	77/ 260	4.73	4.63	4.46	4.51	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	62/ 259	4.67	4.45	4.33	4.42	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	72/ 233	4.71	4.62	4.20	4.48	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	4.29	916/1674	4.34	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	894/1674	4.35	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	929/1423	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.36	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1423/1609	4.07	4.22	4.22	4.23	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1400/1585	3.19	3.37	3.96	3.91	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1332/1535	4.18	4.09	4.08	4.03	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1097/1651	4.43	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	1155/1673	4.92	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	149/1656	4.47	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	1120/1586	4.64	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1166/1585	4.81	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	748/1582	4.62	4.24	4.26	4.35	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	932/1575	4.66	4.20	4.27	4.39	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	845/1380	4.31	4.04	3.94	4.03	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	700/1520	4.05	3.82	4.01	4.03	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	759/1515	4.34	4.07	4.24	4.28	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	955/1511	4.15	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	964/ 994	3.92	3.61	3.94	3.98	2.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	229/ 265	4.36	4.43	4.23	4.34	3.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	150/ 278	4.42	4.33	4.19	4.36	4.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	190/ 260	4.73	4.63	4.46	4.51	4.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	159/ 259	4.67	4.45	4.33	4.42	4.25	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	118/ 233	4.71	4.62	4.20	4.48	4.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	4.00	3.69	3.98	3.97	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	4.00	4.69	4.45	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	4.00	3.99	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	4.00	4.59	4.26	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0203  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 432  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	0	8	4.36	817/1674	4.34	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	303/1674	4.35	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	901/1423	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.36	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	490/1609	4.07	4.22	4.22	4.23	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	2	1	1	1	2.38	1555/1585	3.19	3.37	3.96	3.91	2.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1535	4.18	4.09	4.08	4.03	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	0	3	5	4.10	1031/1651	4.43	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	706/1673	4.92	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	257/1656	4.47	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	371/1586	4.64	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1585	4.81	4.71	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	481/1582	4.62	4.24	4.26	4.35	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	537/1575	4.66	4.20	4.27	4.39	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	962/1380	4.31	4.04	3.94	4.03	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	537/1520	4.05	3.82	4.01	4.03	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	898/1515	4.34	4.07	4.24	4.28	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	729/1511	4.15	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	474/ 994	3.92	3.61	3.94	3.98	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	28/ 265	4.36	4.43	4.23	4.34	4.89	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	130/ 278	4.42	4.33	4.19	4.36	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	3	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 260	4.73	4.63	4.46	4.51	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	2	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	152/ 259	4.67	4.45	4.33	4.42	4.29	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	4.71	4.62	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	3.00	4.13	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	5.00	4.45	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	5.00	4.52	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	5.00	4.38	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	5.00	4.60	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	4.00	3.69	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	4.00	4.11	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	4.00	4.69	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	5.00	4.71	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	5.00	4.92	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	4.00	3.99	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	4.00	4.59	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.32	4.44	4.42	****	



Course-Section: CMSC 202 0203  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 432  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0204  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 433  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	4	4.43	735/1674	4.34	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	495/1674	4.35	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	575/1423	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.36	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	374/1609	4.07	4.22	4.22	4.23	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1385/1585	3.19	3.37	3.96	3.91	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	870/1535	4.18	4.09	4.08	4.03	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	673/1651	4.43	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	958/1673	4.92	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1200/1656	4.47	4.07	4.07	4.10	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	784/1586	4.64	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	1002/1585	4.81	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	903/1582	4.62	4.24	4.26	4.35	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1040/1575	4.66	4.20	4.27	4.39	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	463/1380	4.31	4.04	3.94	4.03	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1141/1520	4.05	3.82	4.01	4.03	3.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	432/1515	4.34	4.07	4.24	4.28	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	729/1511	4.15	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	638/ 994	3.92	3.61	3.94	3.98	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	59/ 265	4.36	4.43	4.23	4.34	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 278	4.42	4.33	4.19	4.36	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 260	4.73	4.63	4.46	4.51	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	89/ 259	4.67	4.45	4.33	4.42	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 233	4.71	4.62	4.20	4.48	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 0	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	7
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1		

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0205  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 434  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	4.50	607/1674	4.34	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	931/1674	4.35	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1173/1423	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.36	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1320/1609	4.07	4.22	4.22	4.23	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1517/1585	3.19	3.37	3.96	3.91	2.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1535	4.18	4.09	4.08	4.03	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	524/1651	4.43	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1673	4.92	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	257/1656	4.47	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	496/1586	4.64	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	917/1585	4.81	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	632/1582	4.62	4.24	4.26	4.35	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1575	4.66	4.20	4.27	4.39	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	4.31	4.04	3.94	4.03	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	810/1520	4.05	3.82	4.01	4.03	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	629/1515	4.34	4.07	4.24	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1050/1511	4.15	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	474/ 994	3.92	3.61	3.94	3.98	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	132/ 265	4.36	4.43	4.23	4.34	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	188/ 278	4.42	4.33	4.19	4.36	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 260	4.73	4.63	4.46	4.51	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	89/ 259	4.67	4.45	4.33	4.42	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 233	4.71	4.62	4.20	4.48	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	96/ 103	3.00	4.13	4.41	4.07	3.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	4.45	4.48	4.45	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 95	5.00	4.52	4.31	4.33	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 99	5.00	4.38	4.39	4.22	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.60	4.14	4.63	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	41/ 76	4.00	3.69	3.98	3.97	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	37/ 77	4.00	4.11	3.93	4.20	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	41/ 53	4.00	4.69	4.45	4.50	4.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.71	4.12	4.50	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 49	5.00	4.92	4.27	4.82	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	29/ 61	4.00	3.99	4.09	4.23	4.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	29/ 52	4.00	4.59	4.26	4.53	4.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	23/ 35	4.00	4.50	4.36	4.63	4.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.75	4.34	4.50	5.00	

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0205  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 434  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0206  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 435  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	5	4.71	342/1674	4.34	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	314/1674	4.35	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	929/1423	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.36	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1377/1609	4.07	4.22	4.22	4.23	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	1329/1585	3.19	3.37	3.96	3.91	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	870/1535	4.18	4.09	4.08	4.03	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	966/1651	4.43	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1673	4.92	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	381/1656	4.47	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	663/1586	4.64	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1585	4.81	4.71	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	217/1582	4.62	4.24	4.26	4.35	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	246/1575	4.66	4.20	4.27	4.39	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	866/1380	4.31	4.04	3.94	4.03	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	955/1520	4.05	3.82	4.01	4.03	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	568/1515	4.34	4.07	4.24	4.28	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	990/1511	4.15	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	229/ 265	4.36	4.43	4.23	4.34	3.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	188/ 278	4.42	4.33	4.19	4.36	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	175/ 260	4.73	4.63	4.46	4.51	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	159/ 259	4.67	4.45	4.33	4.42	4.25	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	108/ 233	4.71	4.62	4.20	4.48	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	3.00	4.13	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	5.00	4.45	4.48	4.45	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	4.00	3.69	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	4.00	4.11	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	4.00	4.69	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	5.00	4.71	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	5.00	4.92	4.27	4.82	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0206  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 436  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	5	4.71	342/1674	4.34	4.27	4.27	4.32	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	314/1674	4.35	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	929/1423	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.36	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1377/1609	4.07	4.22	4.22	4.23	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	1329/1585	3.19	3.37	3.96	3.91	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	870/1535	4.18	4.09	4.08	4.03	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	966/1651	4.43	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1673	4.92	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1656	4.47	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1586	4.64	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	4.81	4.71	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1582	4.62	4.24	4.26	4.35	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1575	4.66	4.20	4.27	4.39	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1380	4.31	4.04	3.94	4.03	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	955/1520	4.05	3.82	4.01	4.03	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	568/1515	4.34	4.07	4.24	4.28	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	990/1511	4.15	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	229/ 265	4.36	4.43	4.23	4.34	3.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	188/ 278	4.42	4.33	4.19	4.36	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	175/ 260	4.73	4.63	4.46	4.51	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	159/ 259	4.67	4.45	4.33	4.42	4.25	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	108/ 233	4.71	4.62	4.20	4.48	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	3.00	4.13	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	5.00	4.45	4.48	4.45	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	4.00	3.69	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	4.00	4.11	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	4.00	4.69	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	5.00	4.71	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	5.00	4.92	4.27	4.82	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 203 0101  
 Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES  
 Instructor: ARTOLA, PAUL  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 437  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	6	3	3.92	1296/1674	3.62	4.27	4.27	4.32	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	11	2	4.15	1035/1674	3.66	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	540/1423	4.08	4.28	4.27	4.36	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	583/1609	3.99	4.22	4.22	4.23	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	4	4	1	3.40	1297/1585	3.18	3.37	3.96	3.91	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	703/1535	3.99	4.09	4.08	4.03	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	220/1651	4.28	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1673	4.88	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	9	2	4.08	906/1656	3.46	4.07	4.07	4.10	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	618/1586	3.98	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1158/1585	4.61	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	599/1582	3.62	4.24	4.26	4.35	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	343/1575	4.06	4.20	4.27	4.39	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	783/1380	3.70	4.04	3.94	4.03	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	338/1520	3.56	3.82	4.01	4.03	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	629/1515	3.70	4.07	4.24	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	642/1511	3.87	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	9	4	3.83	1366/1674	3.62	4.27	4.27	4.32	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	5	5	3.82	1326/1674	3.66	4.24	4.23	4.26	3.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	986/1423	4.08	4.28	4.27	4.36	4.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	2	1	5	6	3.87	1248/1609	3.99	4.22	4.22	4.23	3.87	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	6	5	2	2	2.88	1495/1585	3.18	3.37	3.96	3.91	2.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	373/1535	3.99	4.09	4.08	4.03	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	700/1651	4.28	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1673	4.88	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	4	7	2	3.64	1308/1656	3.46	4.07	4.07	4.10	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	1	6	6	4.00	1300/1586	3.98	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	397/1585	4.61	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	2	5	3	3	3.36	1453/1582	3.62	4.24	4.26	4.35	3.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	1070/1575	4.06	4.20	4.27	4.39	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	1	6	5	1	3.46	1059/1380	3.70	4.04	3.94	4.03	3.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	810/1520	3.56	3.82	4.01	4.03	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1158/1515	3.70	4.07	4.24	4.28	3.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1050/1511	3.87	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	****	4.33	4.19	4.36	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.69	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.11	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.69	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.71	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.92	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	3.25	3.99	4.09	4.23	****	

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
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 3	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 0
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 0
					Other 18

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	4	2	5	2	3.07	1620/1674	3.62	4.27	4.27	4.32	3.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	6	4	1	3.00	1608/1674	3.66	4.24	4.23	4.26	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	5	3	4	3.64	1226/1423	4.08	4.28	4.27	4.36	3.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1260/1609	3.99	4.22	4.22	4.23	3.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	1	3	1	3	3.20	1385/1585	3.18	3.37	3.96	3.91	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	3	2	4	3	3.58	1251/1535	3.99	4.09	4.08	4.03	3.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	0	3	4	5	3.71	1352/1651	4.28	4.30	4.18	4.20	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	1124/1673	4.88	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.62	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	2	3	3	2	0	2.50	1620/1656	3.46	4.07	4.07	4.10	2.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	3	3	1	6	3.40	1499/1586	3.98	4.43	4.43	4.48	3.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	0	4	7	4.15	1437/1585	4.61	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.15	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	2	5	5	0	2.93	1524/1582	3.62	4.24	4.26	4.35	2.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	4	2	4	3.36	1417/1575	4.06	4.20	4.27	4.39	3.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	2	5	4	3.77	894/1380	3.70	4.04	3.94	4.03	3.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	1	3	1	1	2.56	1467/1520	3.56	3.82	4.01	4.03	2.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	1	6	1	0	2.60	1467/1515	3.70	4.07	4.24	4.28	2.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	0	5	1	0	2.44	1480/1511	3.87	4.05	4.27	4.28	2.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.43	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 278	****	4.33	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	****	4.63	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	4.45	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.62	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	4.13	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 101	****	4.45	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.52	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 99	****	4.38	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.60	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	3.69	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 77	****	4.11	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	1	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.69	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	2	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 48	****	4.71	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 49	****	4.92	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	51/ 61	3.25	3.99	4.09	4.23	3.25	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	2	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.59	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	2	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.32	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 203 0301  
 Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES  
 Instructor: YESHA, YAACOV  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 439  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

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	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 203 0401  
 Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES  
 Instructor: LOMONACO JR, SA  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 440  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	9	8	5	3.67	1449/1674	3.62	4.27	4.27	4.32	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	7	5	8	3.67	1421/1674	3.66	4.24	4.23	4.26	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	7	11	4.08	968/1423	4.08	4.28	4.27	4.36	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	1	4	8	5	3.79	1299/1609	3.99	4.22	4.22	4.23	3.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	4	7	5	4	3.23	1376/1585	3.18	3.37	3.96	3.91	3.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	1	6	4	5	3.65	1218/1535	3.99	4.09	4.08	4.03	3.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	6	12	4.26	855/1651	4.28	4.30	4.18	4.20	4.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	635/1673	4.88	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	6	7	4	3.63	1313/1656	3.46	4.07	4.07	4.10	3.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	8	9	6	3.83	1391/1586	3.98	4.43	4.43	4.48	3.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	917/1585	4.61	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	7	9	5	3.67	1348/1582	3.62	4.24	4.26	4.35	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	7	10	4.00	1138/1575	4.06	4.20	4.27	4.39	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	1	4	13	2	3.67	962/1380	3.70	4.04	3.94	4.03	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	3	4	2	2	3.08	1337/1520	3.56	3.82	4.01	4.03	3.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	1	1	5	4	3.83	1167/1515	3.70	4.07	4.24	4.28	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	610/1511	3.87	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	9	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.43	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.33	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.63	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.45	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.62	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.13	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.45	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.52	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.38	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.60	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 76	****	3.69	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.11	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.69	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.71	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.92	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 61	3.25	3.99	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.59	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.32	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 203 0401  
 Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES  
 Instructor: LOMONACO JR, SA  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 440  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 313 0101  
 Title COMP ORGAN & ASSEMB LA  
 Instructor: BURT, GARY (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 441  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	10	16	11	3.88	1340/1674	3.95	4.27	4.27	4.26	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	14	12	12	3.80	1340/1674	3.83	4.24	4.23	4.21	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	4	11	16	7	3.62	1243/1423	3.64	4.28	4.27	4.27	3.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	6	4	11	9	3.68	1371/1609	3.72	4.22	4.22	4.27	3.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	7	9	6	4	1	2.37	1555/1585	2.69	3.37	3.96	3.95	2.37	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	2	5	3	8	8	3.58	1256/1535	3.61	4.09	4.08	4.15	3.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	6	8	9	9	5	2.97	1570/1651	3.20	4.30	4.18	4.16	2.97	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	10	28	4.74	987/1673	4.71	4.73	4.69	4.68	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	12	20	0	3.58	1344/1656	3.22	4.07	4.07	4.07	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	3	9	11	15	4.00	1300/1586	3.88	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.19	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	3	11	24	4.49	1241/1585	4.31	4.71	4.69	4.66	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	12	16	9	3.82	1261/1582	3.63	4.24	4.26	4.26	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	7	11	16	3.97	1161/1575	3.73	4.20	4.27	4.25	3.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	17	1	2	5	10	4	3.64	980/1380	3.44	4.04	3.94	4.01	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	5	2	1	3.22	****/1520	****	3.82	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	1	0	4	2	2	3.44	****/1515	****	4.07	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	1	0	3	4	1	3.44	****/1511	****	4.05	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	32	5	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 15		
56-83	16	2.00-2.99 9	C 5	General 1	Under-grad 40 Non-major 9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 34	
			? 3		

Course-Section: CMSC 313 0101  
 Title COMP ORGAN & ASSEMB LA  
 Instructor: BOURNER, DAVID (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 442  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	10	16	11	3.88	1340/1674	3.95	4.27	4.27	4.26	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	14	12	12	3.80	1340/1674	3.83	4.24	4.23	4.21	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	4	11	16	7	3.62	1243/1423	3.64	4.28	4.27	4.27	3.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	6	4	11	9	3.68	1371/1609	3.72	4.22	4.22	4.27	3.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	7	9	6	4	1	2.37	1555/1585	2.69	3.37	3.96	3.95	2.37	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	2	5	3	8	8	3.58	1256/1535	3.61	4.09	4.08	4.15	3.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	6	8	9	9	5	2.97	1570/1651	3.20	4.30	4.18	4.16	2.97	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	10	28	4.74	987/1673	4.71	4.73	4.69	4.68	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	1	8	5	13	1	3.18	1503/1656	3.22	4.07	4.07	4.07	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	4	9	18	4.38	1034/1586	3.88	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.19	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	2	6	22	4.58	1158/1585	4.31	4.71	4.69	4.66	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	1	4	8	9	9	3.68	1344/1582	3.63	4.24	4.26	4.26	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	4	1	7	7	13	3.75	1289/1575	3.73	4.20	4.27	4.25	3.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	20	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	626/1380	3.44	4.04	3.94	4.01	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	5	2	1	3.22	****/1520	****	3.82	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	1	0	4	2	2	3.44	****/1515	****	4.07	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	1	0	3	4	1	3.44	****/1511	****	4.05	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	32	5	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 15		Graduate 0
56-83	16	2.00-2.99 9	C 5	General	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		Under-grad 40
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	34
			? 3		

Course-Section: CMSC 313 0201  
 Title COMP ORGAN & ASSEMB LA  
 Instructor: BOURNER, DAVID (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 46  
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 443  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	5	13	15	4.03	1179/1674	3.95	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.03	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	4	4	13	13	3.86	1298/1674	3.83	4.24	4.23	4.21	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	4	7	13	9	3.66	1220/1423	3.64	4.28	4.27	4.27	3.66	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	6	6	13	10	3.77	1306/1609	3.72	4.22	4.22	4.27	3.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	4	8	5	3	5	8	3.00	1440/1585	2.69	3.37	3.96	3.95	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	8	2	2	6	8	7	3.64	1218/1535	3.61	4.09	4.08	4.15	3.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	6	5	3	7	12	3.42	1476/1651	3.20	4.30	4.18	4.16	3.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	0	0	1	8	23	4.69	1051/1673	4.71	4.73	4.69	4.68	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	3	5	11	9	3.83	1184/1656	3.22	4.07	4.07	4.07	3.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	4	4	25	4.46	931/1586	3.88	4.43	4.43	4.42	3.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	6	26	4.63	1118/1585	4.31	4.71	4.69	4.66	4.08	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	4	4	7	20	4.23	967/1582	3.63	4.24	4.26	4.26	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	4	3	6	22	4.31	905/1575	3.73	4.20	4.27	4.25	3.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	2	4	3	4	9	3.64	980/1380	3.44	4.04	3.94	4.01	3.02	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	****/1520	****	3.82	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	****/1515	****	4.07	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	1	2	1	1	3	3.38	****/1511	****	4.05	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	29	4	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 15	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 13		Graduate 0
56-83	13	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	1
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 37
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	32
			? 1		

Course-Section: CMSC 313 0201  
 Title COMP ORGAN & ASSEMB LA  
 Instructor: BURT, GARY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 46  
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 444  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	5	13	15	4.03	1179/1674	3.95	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.03	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	4	4	13	13	3.86	1298/1674	3.83	4.24	4.23	4.21	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	4	7	13	9	3.66	1220/1423	3.64	4.28	4.27	4.27	3.66	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	6	6	13	10	3.77	1306/1609	3.72	4.22	4.22	4.27	3.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	4	8	5	3	5	8	3.00	1440/1585	2.69	3.37	3.96	3.95	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	8	2	2	6	8	7	3.64	1218/1535	3.61	4.09	4.08	4.15	3.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	6	5	3	7	12	3.42	1476/1651	3.20	4.30	4.18	4.16	3.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	0	0	1	8	23	4.69	1051/1673	4.71	4.73	4.69	4.68	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	9	8	8	2	2	2.31	1633/1656	3.22	4.07	4.07	4.07	3.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	10	7	6	3	7	2.70	1565/1586	3.88	4.43	4.43	4.42	3.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	4	6	3	7	12	3.53	1550/1585	4.31	4.71	4.69	4.66	4.08	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	9	4	10	3	6	2.78	1545/1582	3.63	4.24	4.26	4.26	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	3	8	4	7	3	7	2.90	1518/1575	3.73	4.20	4.27	4.25	3.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	7	9	5	6	2	3	2.40	1338/1380	3.44	4.04	3.94	4.01	3.02	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	****/1520	****	3.82	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	****/1515	****	4.07	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	1	2	1	1	3	3.38	****/1511	****	4.05	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	29	4	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 15	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 13		Graduate 0
56-83	13	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	1
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 37
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	32
			? 1		



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	7	16	21	4.22	1004/1674	4.22	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	10	17	17	4.07	1104/1674	4.07	4.24	4.23	4.21	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	12	17	16	4.04	992/1423	4.04	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.04	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	3	2	3	15	14	3.95	1172/1609	3.95	4.22	4.22	4.27	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	16	5	8	7	9	2.73	1521/1585	2.73	3.37	3.96	3.95	2.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	2	2	1	15	15	4.11	817/1535	4.11	4.09	4.08	4.15	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	4	12	10	15	3.62	1394/1651	3.62	4.30	4.18	4.16	3.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	1	0	8	36	4.76	958/1673	4.76	4.73	4.69	4.68	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	1	2	11	16	6	3.67	1297/1656	3.67	4.07	4.07	4.07	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	5	21	18	4.30	1112/1586	4.30	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	7	11	26	4.38	1328/1585	4.38	4.71	4.69	4.66	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	4	11	15	15	3.91	1208/1582	3.91	4.24	4.26	4.26	3.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	5	8	16	14	3.84	1244/1575	3.84	4.20	4.27	4.25	3.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	2	10	12	17	4.00	666/1380	4.00	4.04	3.94	4.01	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	34	0	3	0	3	3	3	3.25	1284/1520	3.25	3.82	4.01	4.09	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	35	0	1	2	3	3	2	3.27	****/1515	****	4.07	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	36	0	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	****/1511	****	4.05	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	36	8	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	44	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 265	****	4.43	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 278	****	4.33	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 260	****	4.63	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.45	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.62	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.13	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.45	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.52	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.38	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.60	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	3.69	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.11	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.69	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.71	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.92	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	3.99	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.59	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.32	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 331 0101  
 Title PRIN OF PROG LANGUAGES  
 Instructor: FININ, TIMOTHY  
 Enrollment: 100  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 445  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	46	Non-major	9
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	38				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0101  
 Title DATA STRUCTURES  
 Instructor: FREY, DENNIS  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 446  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	10	4.60	485/1674	4.69	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	292/1674	4.58	4.24	4.23	4.21	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	697/1423	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	282/1609	4.39	4.22	4.22	4.27	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	3	3	3	3.33	1329/1585	3.33	3.37	3.96	3.95	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	1	0	1	5	4.00	870/1535	4.31	4.09	4.08	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	741/1651	4.63	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1673	4.96	4.73	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	655/1656	4.42	4.07	4.07	4.07	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	284/1586	4.75	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	664/1585	4.83	4.71	4.69	4.66	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	339/1582	4.52	4.24	4.26	4.26	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	391/1575	4.61	4.20	4.27	4.25	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	489/1380	4.34	4.04	3.94	4.01	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1520	4.50	3.82	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1515	4.75	4.07	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1511	4.75	4.05	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 3		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0201  
 Title DATA STRUCTURES  
 Instructor: EDELMAN, MITCHE  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 447  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	367/1674	4.69	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	578/1674	4.58	4.24	4.23	4.21	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	1016/1423	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	892/1609	4.39	4.22	4.22	4.27	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	0	5	2	3.88	936/1585	3.33	3.37	3.96	3.95	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	578/1535	4.31	4.09	4.08	4.15	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	524/1651	4.63	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1673	4.96	4.73	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	561/1656	4.42	4.07	4.07	4.07	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	389/1586	4.75	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	811/1585	4.83	4.71	4.69	4.66	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	850/1582	4.52	4.24	4.26	4.26	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	692/1575	4.61	4.20	4.27	4.25	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	200/1380	4.34	4.04	3.94	4.01	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	397/1520	4.50	3.82	4.01	4.09	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	384/1515	4.75	4.07	4.24	4.32	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	414/1511	4.75	4.05	4.27	4.34	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	3.96	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.13	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.45	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.52	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.38	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.60	4.14	3.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	9

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0301  
 Title DATA STRUCTURES  
 Instructor: EDELMAN, MITCHE  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 448  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	15	4.78	276/1674	4.69	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	721/1674	4.58	4.24	4.23	4.21	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	9	6	4.24	861/1423	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.24	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	1	1	6	6	4.00	1094/1609	4.39	4.22	4.22	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	4	2	4	3	3	2.94	1475/1585	3.33	3.37	3.96	3.95	2.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	817/1535	4.31	4.09	4.08	4.15	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	81/1651	4.63	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	742/1673	4.96	4.73	4.69	4.68	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	719/1656	4.42	4.07	4.07	4.07	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	774/1586	4.75	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	896/1585	4.83	4.71	4.69	4.66	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	10	6	4.29	892/1582	4.52	4.24	4.26	4.26	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	669/1575	4.61	4.20	4.27	4.25	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	639/1380	4.34	4.04	3.94	4.01	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1520	4.50	3.82	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1515	4.75	4.07	4.24	4.32	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 7		0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0401  
 Title DATA STRUCTURES  
 Instructor: FREY, DENNIS  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 449  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	17	4.70	367/1674	4.69	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	16	4.67	379/1674	4.58	4.24	4.23	4.21	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	262/1423	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	343/1609	4.39	4.22	4.22	4.27	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	3	4	1	3	3.17	1400/1585	3.33	3.37	3.96	3.95	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	131/1535	4.31	4.09	4.08	4.15	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	265/1651	4.63	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	353/1673	4.96	4.73	4.69	4.68	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	185/1656	4.42	4.07	4.07	4.07	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	538/1586	4.75	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	664/1585	4.83	4.71	4.69	4.66	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	339/1582	4.52	4.24	4.26	4.26	4.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	453/1575	4.61	4.20	4.27	4.25	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	406/1380	4.34	4.04	3.94	4.01	4.37	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1520	4.50	3.82	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1515	4.75	4.07	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1511	4.75	4.05	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	3.96	****	

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	13	2.00-2.99 4	C 7	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		Under-grad 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	23
			? 2		

Course-Section: CMSC 341H 0101  
 Title  
 Instructor: OATES, TIMOTHY  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 450  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	7	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.27	4.27	4.26	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	379/1674	4.67	4.24	4.23	4.21	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	493/1423	4.57	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	147/1609	4.86	4.22	4.22	4.27	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	2	2	0	3.00	1440/1585	3.00	3.37	3.96	3.95	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	238/1535	4.67	4.09	4.08	4.15	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	276/1651	4.71	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1484/1673	4.17	4.73	4.69	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	136/1656	4.83	4.07	4.07	4.07	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	581/1586	4.71	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.71	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.24	4.26	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	612/1575	4.57	4.20	4.27	4.25	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	567/1380	4.17	4.04	3.94	4.01	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	338/1520	4.60	3.82	4.01	4.09	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	759/1515	4.40	4.07	4.24	4.32	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.05	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 345 0101  
 Title SOFTWARE DESIGN/DEVELO  
 Instructor: MITCHELL, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 451  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	4	8	9	3.69	1434/1674	3.93	4.27	4.27	4.26	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	5	11	5	3.58	1465/1674	3.81	4.24	4.23	4.21	3.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	4	0	8	7	3.67	1214/1423	3.87	4.28	4.27	4.27	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	10	10	4.12	1018/1609	4.35	4.22	4.22	4.27	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	7	3	7	6	3	2.81	1507/1585	3.19	3.37	3.96	3.95	2.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	8	7	8	3.76	1140/1535	3.76	4.09	4.08	4.15	3.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	1	6	7	9	3.80	1289/1651	3.88	4.30	4.18	4.16	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	13	12	12	4.42	1289/1673	4.36	4.73	4.69	4.68	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	6	11	2	3.70	1275/1656	3.75	4.07	4.07	4.07	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	2	8	13	4.28	1120/1586	4.34	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.28	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	9	15	4.56	1175/1585	4.65	4.71	4.69	4.66	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	7	6	10	3.96	1164/1582	4.05	4.24	4.26	4.26	3.96	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	6	9	7	3.68	1322/1575	3.76	4.20	4.27	4.25	3.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	2	3	8	8	4.05	648/1380	3.92	4.04	3.94	4.01	4.05	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	3	7	4	3.87	948/1520	4.14	3.82	4.01	4.09	3.87	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	827/1515	4.53	4.07	4.24	4.32	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	729/1511	4.43	4.05	4.27	4.34	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	396/ 994	4.17	3.61	3.94	3.96	4.18	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	11	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 26 Non-major 1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 12	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 25	
			? 0		



Course-Section: CMSC 345 0201  
 Title SOFTWARE DESIGN/DEVELO  
 Instructor: MITCHELL, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 452  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	7	10	4.09	1123/1674	3.93	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	7	10	4.29	894/1674	3.81	4.24	4.23	4.21	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	12	6	4.10	962/1423	3.87	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	9	11	4.48	536/1609	4.35	4.22	4.22	4.27	4.48	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	8	8	4.00	769/1585	3.19	3.37	3.96	3.95	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	1	4	5	6	3.67	1207/1535	3.76	4.09	4.08	4.15	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	10	9	4.27	843/1651	3.88	4.30	4.18	4.16	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	706/1673	4.36	4.73	4.69	4.68	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	11	4	4.00	955/1656	3.75	4.07	4.07	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	560/1586	4.34	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	786/1585	4.65	4.71	4.69	4.66	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	7	11	4.32	871/1582	4.05	4.24	4.26	4.26	4.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	9	9	4.14	1070/1575	3.76	4.20	4.27	4.25	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	426/1380	3.92	4.04	3.94	4.01	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	760/1520	4.14	3.82	4.01	4.09	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	384/1515	4.53	4.07	4.24	4.32	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	414/1511	4.43	4.05	4.27	4.34	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	408/ 994	4.17	3.61	3.94	3.96	4.17	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 17	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	14	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	21
			? 1		

Course-Section: CMSC 345 0301  
 Title SOFTWARE DESIGN/DEVELO  
 Instructor: VICK, SHON  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 453  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	3	6	9	4.00	1196/1674	3.93	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	9	3	6	3.57	1465/1674	3.81	4.24	4.23	4.21	3.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	4	5	8	3.85	1131/1423	3.87	4.28	4.27	4.27	3.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	552/1609	4.35	4.22	4.22	4.27	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	5	1	1	4	2	2.77	1515/1585	3.19	3.37	3.96	3.95	2.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	3	1	4	5	3.85	1074/1535	3.76	4.09	4.08	4.15	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	6	3	8	3.57	1414/1651	3.88	4.30	4.18	4.16	3.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	1	8	6	5	3.75	1640/1673	4.36	4.73	4.69	4.68	3.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	1	7	5	4	3.56	1353/1656	3.75	4.07	4.07	4.07	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	2	8	8	4.00	1300/1586	4.34	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	6	14	4.57	1166/1585	4.65	4.71	4.69	4.66	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	5	7	7	3.86	1244/1582	4.05	4.24	4.26	4.26	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	6	3	7	3.48	1377/1575	3.76	4.20	4.27	4.25	3.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	4	1	3	4	6	3.39	1103/1380	3.92	4.04	3.94	4.01	3.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	489/1520	4.14	3.82	4.01	4.09	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	629/1515	4.53	4.07	4.24	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1004/1511	4.43	4.05	4.27	4.34	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 994	4.17	3.61	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17
			? 1		

Course-Section: CMSC 411 0101  
 Title: COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE  
 Instructor: SQUIRE, JON S  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 454  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	15	4.59	497/1674	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.42	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	17	4.68	352/1674	4.30	4.24	4.23	4.31	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	160/1423	4.52	4.28	4.27	4.34	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	292/1609	4.25	4.22	4.22	4.30	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	3	3	5	2	4	3.06	1431/1585	3.64	3.37	3.96	4.01	3.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	767/1535	4.32	4.09	4.08	4.18	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	169/1651	4.45	4.30	4.18	4.23	4.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1673	4.83	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	10	9	4.47	423/1656	4.31	4.07	4.07	4.19	4.47	
-----															
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	284/1586	4.48	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1585	4.70	4.71	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	353/1582	4.42	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	537/1575	4.23	4.20	4.27	4.35	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	1	5	1	5	3.83	845/1380	3.89	4.04	3.94	4.04	3.83	
-----															
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1520	****	3.82	4.01	4.18	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1515	****	4.07	4.24	4.40	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1511	****	4.05	4.27	4.45	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 17	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	20
			? 0		

Course-Section: CMSC 411 0201  
 Title: COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE  
 Instructor: SQUIRE, JON S  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 455  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	6	9	4.50	607/1674	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	578/1674	4.30	4.24	4.23	4.31	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	505/1423	4.52	4.28	4.27	4.34	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	786/1609	4.25	4.22	4.22	4.30	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	3	5	4	3.85	966/1585	3.64	3.37	3.96	4.01	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	578/1535	4.32	4.09	4.08	4.18	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	330/1651	4.45	4.30	4.18	4.23	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1673	4.83	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	437/1656	4.31	4.07	4.07	4.19	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	496/1586	4.48	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	397/1585	4.70	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	409/1582	4.42	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	847/1575	4.23	4.20	4.27	4.35	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	666/1380	3.89	4.04	3.94	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1520	****	3.82	4.01	4.18	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1515	****	4.07	4.24	4.40	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1511	****	4.05	4.27	4.45	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 1		

Course-Section: CMSC 411 0301  
 Title: COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE  
 Instructor: ARISHA, KHALED (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 456  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	4.00	1196/1674	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1146/1674	4.30	4.24	4.23	4.31	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	771/1423	4.52	4.28	4.27	4.34	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1094/1609	4.25	4.22	4.22	4.30	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	976/1585	3.64	3.37	3.96	4.01	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	508/1535	4.32	4.09	4.08	4.18	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	966/1651	4.45	4.30	4.18	4.23	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1072/1673	4.83	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1200/1656	4.31	4.07	4.07	4.19	4.15	
-----															
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1391/1586	4.48	4.43	4.43	4.46	3.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1434/1585	4.70	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1255/1582	4.42	4.24	4.26	4.31	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1329/1575	4.23	4.20	4.27	4.35	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	845/1380	3.89	4.04	3.94	4.04	3.83	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 411 0301  
 Title COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 457  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	4.00	1196/1674	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1146/1674	4.30	4.24	4.23	4.31	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	771/1423	4.52	4.28	4.27	4.34	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1094/1609	4.25	4.22	4.22	4.30	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	976/1585	3.64	3.37	3.96	4.01	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	508/1535	4.32	4.09	4.08	4.18	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	966/1651	4.45	4.30	4.18	4.23	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1072/1673	4.83	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	381/1656	4.31	4.07	4.07	4.19	4.15	
-----															
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1586	4.48	4.43	4.43	4.46	3.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1585	4.70	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1582	4.42	4.24	4.26	4.31	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1575	4.23	4.20	4.27	4.35	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1380	3.89	4.04	3.94	4.04	3.83	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 421 0101  
 Title PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS  
 Instructor: FREY, DENNIS (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 458  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	13	16	4.34	841/1674	4.10	4.27	4.27	4.42	4.34	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	12	19	4.53	542/1674	4.19	4.24	4.23	4.31	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	25	4.66	390/1423	4.04	4.28	4.27	4.34	4.66	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	4	2	4	10	9	3.62	1399/1609	3.74	4.22	4.22	4.30	3.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	5	6	2	5	11	3.38	1311/1585	3.52	3.37	3.96	4.01	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	5	4	5	5	8	3.26	1386/1535	3.46	4.09	4.08	4.18	3.26	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	6	21	4.47	583/1651	4.31	4.30	4.18	4.23	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	21	4.66	1082/1673	4.58	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.66	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	25	4.81	149/1656	3.10	4.07	4.07	4.19	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	214/1586	3.92	4.43	4.43	4.46	3.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	25	4.81	811/1585	4.43	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	24	4.74	326/1582	3.63	4.24	4.26	4.31	3.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	23	4.68	481/1575	3.24	4.20	4.27	4.35	3.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	0	8	9	8	4.00	666/1380	3.19	4.04	3.94	4.04	3.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	13	6	4	3	2	2.11	1502/1520	2.18	3.82	4.01	4.18	2.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	6	4	4	3	9	3.19	1395/1515	3.10	4.07	4.24	4.40	3.19	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	5	1	2	2	15	3.84	1172/1511	3.42	4.05	4.27	4.45	3.84	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	21	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 265	****	4.43	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 278	****	4.33	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 260	****	4.63	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 259	****	4.45	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.62	4.20	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	1
84-150	21	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 421 0101  
 Title PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS  
 Instructor: BURT, GARY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 459  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	13	16	4.34	841/1674	4.10	4.27	4.27	4.42	4.34	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	12	19	4.53	542/1674	4.19	4.24	4.23	4.31	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	25	4.66	390/1423	4.04	4.28	4.27	4.34	4.66	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	4	2	4	10	9	3.62	1399/1609	3.74	4.22	4.22	4.30	3.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	5	6	2	5	11	3.38	1311/1585	3.52	3.37	3.96	4.01	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	5	4	5	5	8	3.26	1386/1535	3.46	4.09	4.08	4.18	3.26	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	6	21	4.47	583/1651	4.31	4.30	4.18	4.23	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	21	4.66	1082/1673	4.58	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.66	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	7	8	8	2	1	2.31	1634/1656	3.10	4.07	4.07	4.19	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	6	7	2	2	0	2.00	1579/1586	3.92	4.43	4.43	4.46	3.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	1	1	3	5	8	4.00	1472/1585	4.43	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	4	5	4	2	1	2.44	1570/1582	3.63	4.24	4.26	4.31	3.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	3	5	5	1	2	0	2.00	1562/1575	3.24	4.20	4.27	4.35	3.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	6	3	2	3	1	0	2.22	1349/1380	3.19	4.04	3.94	4.04	3.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	13	6	4	3	2	2.11	1502/1520	2.18	3.82	4.01	4.18	2.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	6	4	4	3	9	3.19	1395/1515	3.10	4.07	4.24	4.40	3.19	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	5	1	2	2	15	3.84	1172/1511	3.42	4.05	4.27	4.45	3.84	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	21	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 265	****	4.43	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 278	****	4.33	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 260	****	4.63	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 259	****	4.45	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.62	4.20	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	1
84-150	21	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	0						



Course-Section: CMSC 421 0301  
 Title PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS  
 Instructor: YESHA, YELENA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 460  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	3.86	1353/1674	4.10	4.27	4.27	4.42	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	3.86	1305/1674	4.19	4.24	4.23	4.31	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	0	3.43	1293/1423	4.04	4.28	4.27	4.34	3.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1254/1609	3.74	4.22	4.22	4.30	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1121/1585	3.52	3.37	3.96	4.01	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1207/1535	3.46	4.09	4.08	4.18	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	988/1651	4.31	4.30	4.18	4.23	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1203/1673	4.58	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	0	4	0	0	2.60	1616/1656	3.10	4.07	4.07	4.19	2.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1120/1586	3.92	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.39	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	1292/1585	4.43	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1244/1582	3.63	4.24	4.26	4.31	3.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	1437/1575	3.24	4.20	4.27	4.35	3.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1127/1380	3.19	4.04	3.94	4.04	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	1496/1520	2.18	3.82	4.01	4.18	2.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1420/1515	3.10	4.07	4.24	4.40	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1420/1511	3.42	4.05	4.27	4.45	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.43	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.33	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.63	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.45	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.62	4.20	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 421 0301  
 Title PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS  
 Instructor: BURT, GARY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 461  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	3.86	1353/1674	4.10	4.27	4.27	4.42	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	3.86	1305/1674	4.19	4.24	4.23	4.31	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	0	3.43	1293/1423	4.04	4.28	4.27	4.34	3.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1254/1609	3.74	4.22	4.22	4.30	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1121/1585	3.52	3.37	3.96	4.01	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1207/1535	3.46	4.09	4.08	4.18	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	988/1651	4.31	4.30	4.18	4.23	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1203/1673	4.58	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1610/1656	3.10	4.07	4.07	4.19	2.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	858/1586	3.92	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.39	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1225/1585	4.43	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1406/1582	3.63	4.24	4.26	4.31	3.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1487/1575	3.24	4.20	4.27	4.35	3.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1380	3.19	4.04	3.94	4.04	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	1496/1520	2.18	3.82	4.01	4.18	2.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1420/1515	3.10	4.07	4.24	4.40	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1420/1511	3.42	4.05	4.27	4.45	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.43	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.33	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.63	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.45	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.62	4.20	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 432 0101  
 Title OBJECT-ORIENT PROGRAM  
 Instructor: VICK, SHON  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 462  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	8	6	6	3.81	1385/1674	3.81	4.27	4.27	4.42	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	9	4	3.62	1446/1674	3.62	4.24	4.23	4.31	3.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	11	5	3.95	1061/1423	3.95	4.28	4.27	4.34	3.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	3	3	7	4	3.71	1355/1609	3.71	4.22	4.22	4.30	3.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	4	3	4	3	4	3.00	1440/1585	3.00	3.37	3.96	4.01	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	3	4	4	2	3.07	1430/1535	3.07	4.09	4.08	4.18	3.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	5	7	5	3.57	1414/1651	3.57	4.30	4.18	4.23	3.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	2	12	6	4.10	1529/1673	4.10	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.10	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	9	5	6	3.85	1162/1656	3.85	4.07	4.07	4.19	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	9	8	3	3.62	1457/1586	3.62	4.43	4.43	4.46	3.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	1292/1585	4.43	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	6	9	4	3.71	1326/1582	3.71	4.24	4.26	4.31	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	6	7	3.76	1284/1575	3.76	4.20	4.27	4.35	3.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	4	4	8	4	3.48	1053/1380	3.48	4.04	3.94	4.04	3.48	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	3	7	0	3.55	1153/1520	3.55	3.82	4.01	4.18	3.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	694/1515	4.45	4.07	4.24	4.40	4.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	2	1	4	4	3.91	1139/1511	3.91	4.05	4.27	4.45	3.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	11
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 1		### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

Course-Section: CMSC 433 0101  
 Title SCRIPTING LANGUAGES  
 Instructor: HOOD, DANIEL J  
 Enrollment: 75  
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 463  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	4	44	4.92	133/1674	4.92	4.27	4.27	4.42	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	9	37	4.77	259/1674	4.77	4.24	4.23	4.31	4.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	11	35	4.69	349/1423	4.69	4.28	4.27	4.34	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	1	8	33	4.76	212/1609	4.76	4.22	4.22	4.30	4.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	9	0	1	11	4	22	4.24	575/1585	4.24	3.37	3.96	4.01	4.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	0	0	1	6	26	4.76	169/1535	4.76	4.09	4.08	4.18	4.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	5	41	4.85	145/1651	4.85	4.30	4.18	4.23	4.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	13	33	4.72	1015/1673	4.72	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	1	0	0	11	27	4.62	301/1656	4.62	4.07	4.07	4.19	4.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	7	40	4.85	301/1586	4.85	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	45	4.96	284/1585	4.96	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	6	40	4.83	227/1582	4.83	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	1	9	36	4.76	343/1575	4.76	4.20	4.27	4.35	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	0	0	0	7	32	4.82	107/1380	4.82	4.04	3.94	4.04	4.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	1	0	0	5	4.00	****/1520	****	3.82	4.01	4.18	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	****/1515	****	4.07	4.24	4.40	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	43	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/1511	****	4.05	4.27	4.45	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	43	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 23	Required for Majors	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 1	B 13		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 6	C 3	General	22
84-150	19	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		Under-grad 50
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	18
			? 3		

Course-Section: CMSC 435 0101  
 Title: COMPUTER GRAPHICS  
 Instructor: RHEINGANS, PENN  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 464  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	89/1674	4.94	4.27	4.27	4.42	4.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	721/1674	4.41	4.24	4.23	4.31	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	611/1423	4.47	4.28	4.27	4.34	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	743/1609	4.33	4.22	4.22	4.30	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	8	6	4.12	692/1585	4.12	3.37	3.96	4.01	4.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	817/1535	4.11	4.09	4.08	4.18	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	288/1651	4.71	4.30	4.18	4.23	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	424/1673	4.94	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	257/1656	4.67	4.07	4.07	4.19	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	474/1586	4.76	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.71	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	762/1582	4.41	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	975/1575	4.24	4.20	4.27	4.35	4.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	143/1380	4.75	4.04	3.94	4.04	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	173/1520	4.83	3.82	4.01	4.18	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.07	4.24	4.40	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	323/1511	4.83	4.05	4.27	4.45	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 3
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	11
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

Course-Section: CMSC 441 0101  
 Title ALGORITHMS  
 Instructor: YESHA, YAACOV  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 465  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	6	2	0	2.62	1660/1674	3.59	4.27	4.27	4.42	2.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	6	2	1	2.85	1638/1674	3.73	4.24	4.23	4.31	2.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	4	3.85	1135/1423	4.21	4.28	4.27	4.34	3.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	5	0	3.71	1348/1609	4.07	4.22	4.22	4.30	3.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	3	5	1	3.00	1440/1585	3.73	3.37	3.96	4.01	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	5	2	1	3.50	1295/1535	3.84	4.09	4.08	4.18	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	966/1651	4.29	4.30	4.18	4.23	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	814/1673	4.82	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	3	2	6	1	1	2.62	1615/1656	3.54	4.07	4.07	4.19	2.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	2	2	5	3.75	1415/1586	4.30	4.43	4.43	4.46	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	0	2	4	5	3.77	1528/1585	4.37	4.71	4.69	4.76	3.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	4	4	1	1	2.46	1567/1582	3.57	4.24	4.26	4.31	2.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	4	2	1	2.69	1536/1575	3.76	4.20	4.27	4.35	2.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	2	0	3	0	0	2.20	1351/1380	3.29	4.04	3.94	4.04	2.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/1520	****	3.82	4.01	4.18	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	1420/1515	3.00	4.07	4.24	4.40	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1511	****	4.05	4.27	4.45	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1		

-----

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CMSC 441 0201  
 Title ALGORITHMS  
 Instructor: WHITE, TAD  
 Enrollment: 46  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 466  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	11	21	4.56	546/1674	3.59	4.27	4.27	4.42	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	25	4.62	446/1674	3.73	4.24	4.23	4.31	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	8	22	4.58	493/1423	4.21	4.28	4.27	4.34	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	3	11	16	4.43	598/1609	4.07	4.22	4.22	4.30	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	4	6	20	4.45	369/1585	3.73	3.37	3.96	4.01	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	1	1	4	7	14	4.19	747/1535	3.84	4.09	4.08	4.18	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	9	20	4.41	658/1651	4.29	4.30	4.18	4.23	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	27	4.79	901/1673	4.82	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	2	8	19	4.47	437/1656	3.54	4.07	4.07	4.19	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	30	4.85	301/1586	4.30	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	170/1585	4.37	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	7	25	4.68	423/1582	3.57	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	29	4.82	257/1575	3.76	4.20	4.27	4.35	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	16	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	399/1380	3.29	4.04	3.94	4.04	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	****/1520	****	3.82	4.01	4.18	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/1515	3.00	4.07	4.24	4.40	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	****/1511	****	4.05	4.27	4.45	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	27	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 11	General	0
84-150	20	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 34
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	29
			? 1		

Course-Section: CMSC 442 0101  
 Title INFO & CODING THEORY  
 Instructor: COLE, FLOYD  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 467  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	7	4.42	751/1674	4.42	4.27	4.27	4.42	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	1026/1674	4.17	4.24	4.23	4.31	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	4	2	3.42	1296/1423	3.42	4.28	4.27	4.34	3.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1266/1609	3.83	4.22	4.22	4.30	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	692/1585	4.11	3.37	3.96	4.01	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1147/1535	3.75	4.09	4.08	4.18	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	658/1651	4.42	4.30	4.18	4.23	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	1203/1673	4.50	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	6	5	1	3.58	1339/1656	3.58	4.07	4.07	4.19	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1300/1586	4.00	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	917/1585	4.75	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	4	3	3.75	1302/1582	3.75	4.24	4.26	4.31	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	2	4.00	1138/1575	4.00	4.20	4.27	4.35	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1380	****	4.04	3.94	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1520	****	3.82	4.01	4.18	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1515	****	4.07	4.24	4.40	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1471/1511	2.67	4.05	4.27	4.45	2.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: CMSC 445 0101  
 Title SOFTWARE ENGINEERING  
 Instructor: CALLAHAN, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 468  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	11	4.85	205/1674	4.85	4.27	4.27	4.42	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	259/1674	4.77	4.24	4.23	4.31	4.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	173/1609	4.80	4.22	4.22	4.30	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	307/1585	4.54	3.37	3.96	4.01	4.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	328/1535	4.56	4.09	4.08	4.18	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	700/1651	4.38	4.30	4.18	4.23	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	1383/1673	4.31	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	324/1656	4.58	4.07	4.07	4.19	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	192/1586	4.92	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.71	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	217/1582	4.83	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	154/1575	4.92	4.20	4.27	4.35	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	161/1380	4.73	4.04	3.94	4.04	4.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1520	****	3.82	4.01	4.18	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1515	****	4.07	4.24	4.40	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1511	****	4.05	4.27	4.45	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 4	C 0	General	8
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

Course-Section: CMSC 451 0101  
 Title AUTOMATA THRY& FORM LA  
 Instructor: CHANG, RICHARD  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 469  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	12	11	4.22	991/1674	4.22	4.27	4.27	4.42	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	6	17	4.37	776/1674	4.37	4.24	4.23	4.31	4.37	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	5	18	4.54	540/1423	4.54	4.28	4.27	4.34	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	673/1609	4.39	4.22	4.22	4.30	4.39	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	4	2	8	5	3.60	1164/1585	3.60	3.37	3.96	4.01	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	2	3	5	8	3.75	1147/1535	3.75	4.09	4.08	4.18	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	1	23	4.70	288/1651	4.70	4.30	4.18	4.23	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	15	9	4.28	680/1656	4.28	4.07	4.07	4.19	4.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	371/1586	4.81	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	689/1585	4.85	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	4	9	10	3.96	1164/1582	3.96	4.24	4.26	4.31	3.96	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	6	9	10	3.93	1200/1575	3.93	4.20	4.27	4.35	3.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	14	0	1	4	4	1	3.50	1036/1380	3.50	4.04	3.94	4.04	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	****/1520	****	3.82	4.01	4.18	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	****/1515	****	4.07	4.24	4.40	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	****/1511	****	4.05	4.27	4.45	****	

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 3	C 4	General	7
84-150	13	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		Under-grad 27
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17
			? 0		

Course-Section: CMSC 455 0101  
 Title NUMERICAL COMPUTATIONS  
 Instructor: STEPHENS, ARTHU  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 470  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	0	4	4.60	485/1674	4.60	4.27	4.27	4.42	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.24	4.23	4.31	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	459/1423	4.60	4.28	4.27	4.34	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	852/1609	4.25	4.22	4.22	4.30	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1572/1585	2.00	3.37	3.96	4.01	2.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	283/1535	4.60	4.09	4.08	4.18	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	4.30	4.18	4.23	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1463/1673	4.20	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1237/1656	3.75	4.07	4.07	4.19	3.75	
-----															
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	1460/1586	3.60	4.43	4.43	4.46	3.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1142/1585	4.60	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	0	2	0	2.60	1563/1582	2.60	4.24	4.26	4.31	2.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1350/1575	3.60	4.20	4.27	4.35	3.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1160/1380	3.25	4.04	3.94	4.04	3.25	

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	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	5	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 461 0101  
 Title DATABASE MANGMT SYSTEM  
 Instructor: KALPAKIS, KONST  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 471  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	11	13	4.42	735/1674	4.42	4.27	4.27	4.42	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	10	9	4.04	1125/1674	4.04	4.24	4.23	4.31	4.04	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	12	9	4.08	974/1423	4.08	4.28	4.27	4.34	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	4	9	8	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.22	4.22	4.30	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	9	11	2	3.50	1223/1585	3.50	3.37	3.96	4.01	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	7	4	10	4.05	853/1535	4.05	4.09	4.08	4.18	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	10	6	9	3.88	1240/1651	3.88	4.30	4.18	4.23	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	0	24	4.92	565/1673	4.92	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	10	9	4.27	693/1656	4.27	4.07	4.07	4.19	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	9	16	4.64	693/1586	4.64	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	23	4.88	615/1585	4.88	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	13	9	4.20	998/1582	4.20	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	7	12	4.20	1010/1575	4.20	4.20	4.27	4.35	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	4	9	7	4.15	576/1380	4.15	4.04	3.94	4.04	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1141/1520	3.57	3.82	4.01	4.18	3.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	4.07	4.24	4.40	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	990/1511	4.14	4.05	4.27	4.45	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 13		Graduate
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	7
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 0		

Course-Section: CMSC 471 0101  
 Title ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENC  
 Instructor: PENG, YUN  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 472  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	5	4.36	817/1674	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.42	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.24	4.23	4.31	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	739/1423	4.36	4.28	4.27	4.34	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	786/1609	4.30	4.22	4.22	4.30	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	769/1585	4.00	3.37	3.96	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	1207/1535	3.67	4.09	4.08	4.18	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	945/1651	4.18	4.30	4.18	4.23	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	1001/1673	4.73	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	5	0	3.56	1353/1656	3.56	4.07	4.07	4.19	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	389/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	811/1585	4.80	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	1217/1582	3.90	4.24	4.26	4.31	3.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1216/1575	3.90	4.20	4.27	4.35	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	902/1380	3.75	4.04	3.94	4.04	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1315/1520	3.17	3.82	4.01	4.18	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1303/1515	3.50	4.07	4.24	4.40	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1265/1511	3.67	4.05	4.27	4.45	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	835/ 994	3.25	3.61	3.94	4.19	3.25	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.33	4.19	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	11	Non-major	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 473 0101  
 Title NATURAL LANG PROCESSIN  
 Instructor: NIRUNBERG, SERG  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 473  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	298/1674	4.75	4.27	4.27	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.24	4.23	4.31	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1423	4.75	4.28	4.27	4.34	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	222/1609	4.75	4.22	4.22	4.30	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	769/1585	4.00	3.37	3.96	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.09	4.08	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	866/1651	4.25	4.30	4.18	4.23	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.07	4.07	4.19	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1300/1586	4.00	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.71	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	935/1582	4.25	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	958/1575	4.25	4.20	4.27	4.35	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	666/1380	4.00	4.04	3.94	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	397/1520	4.50	3.82	4.01	4.18	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.07	4.24	4.40	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.05	4.27	4.45	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	3.61	3.94	4.19	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 481 0101  
 Title: COMPUTER NETWORKS  
 Instructor: SIDHU, DEEPINDE  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 474  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	7	11	11	3.76	1402/1674	3.76	4.27	4.27	4.42	3.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	7	7	9	9	3.47	1511/1674	3.47	4.24	4.23	4.31	3.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	4	7	9	10	3.50	1268/1423	3.50	4.28	4.27	4.34	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	4	1	5	7	7	3.50	1452/1609	3.50	4.22	4.22	4.30	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	3	2	7	9	8	3.59	1175/1585	3.59	3.37	3.96	4.01	3.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	1	1	7	9	6	3.75	1147/1535	3.75	4.09	4.08	4.18	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	5	10	14	3.97	1149/1651	3.97	4.30	4.18	4.23	3.97	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	10	22	4.69	1051/1673	4.69	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	3	14	5	3	3.23	1482/1656	3.23	4.07	4.07	4.19	3.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	4	9	6	12	3.59	1464/1586	3.59	4.43	4.43	4.46	3.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	5	9	18	4.26	1392/1585	4.26	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	11	9	9	3.64	1359/1582	3.64	4.24	4.26	4.31	3.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	4	6	7	11	3.45	1384/1575	3.45	4.20	4.27	4.35	3.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	3	3	4	4	8	3.50	1036/1380	3.50	4.04	3.94	4.04	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	****/1520	****	3.82	4.01	4.18	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	****/1515	****	4.07	4.24	4.40	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/1511	****	4.05	4.27	4.45	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	28	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	4.19	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	3.69	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.11	3.93	4.24	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.71	4.12	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	13	Under-grad	34	Non-major	3
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	3						

Course-Section: CMSC 482 0101  
 Title COMPUTER SYSTEMS SECUR  
 Instructor: COPELAND, KENNE  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 475  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	7	4.58	509/1674	4.58	4.27	4.27	4.42	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	721/1674	4.42	4.24	4.23	4.31	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	482/1423	4.58	4.28	4.27	4.34	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	1035/1609	4.09	4.22	4.22	4.30	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	482/1585	4.33	3.37	3.96	4.01	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.18	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	658/1651	4.42	4.30	4.18	4.23	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	1361/1673	4.33	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1146/1656	3.88	4.07	4.07	4.19	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	1198/1586	4.18	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	1267/1585	4.45	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	819/1582	4.36	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	857/1575	4.36	4.20	4.27	4.35	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	4	3	3	3.64	980/1380	3.64	4.04	3.94	4.04	3.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	397/1520	4.50	3.82	4.01	4.18	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	898/1515	4.25	4.07	4.24	4.40	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	896/1511	4.25	4.05	4.27	4.45	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	811/ 994	3.33	3.61	3.94	4.19	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 265	****	4.43	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 278	****	4.33	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.63	4.46	4.24	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.45	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 95	****	4.52	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.38	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.60	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.69	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.11	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.69	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.71	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	4.92	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	3.99	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.59	4.26	5.00	****	



Course-Section: CMSC 482 0101  
 Title COMPUTER SYSTEMS SECUR  
 Instructor: COPELAND, KENNE  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 475  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 486 0101  
 Title MOBILE RADIO COMM  
 Instructor: GREEN, FRANK E.  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 476  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	5	8	4.12	1105/1674	4.12	4.27	4.27	4.42	4.12	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	5	4	3.53	1489/1674	3.53	4.24	4.23	4.31	3.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	4	7	3.88	1116/1423	3.88	4.28	4.27	4.34	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	2	3	5	2	3.58	1419/1609	3.58	4.22	4.22	4.30	3.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	2	4	5	3.71	1084/1585	3.71	3.37	3.96	4.01	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	5	3	5	3.79	1125/1535	3.79	4.09	4.08	4.18	3.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	6	4	3.69	1368/1651	3.69	4.30	4.18	4.23	3.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	760/1673	4.88	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	4	3	5	0	2.92	1572/1656	2.92	4.07	4.07	4.19	2.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	4	2	8	4.07	1270/1586	4.07	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.07	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	1	2	10	4.27	1392/1585	4.27	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.27	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	1	6	3	3	3.27	1470/1582	3.27	4.24	4.26	4.31	3.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	3	3	5	3.40	1402/1575	3.40	4.20	4.27	4.35	3.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	3	1	3	5	3.62	992/1380	3.62	4.04	3.94	4.04	3.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1520	****	3.82	4.01	4.18	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1515	****	4.07	4.24	4.40	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1511	****	4.05	4.27	4.45	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	10
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0		17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CMSC 491I 0101  
 Title INFORMATION ASSURANCE  
 Instructor: SHERMAN, ALAN  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 477  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	0	3	2	3.57	1489/1674	3.57	4.27	4.27	4.42	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	1	0	2.57	1658/1674	2.57	4.24	4.23	4.31	2.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1423	****	4.28	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	1557/1609	3.00	4.22	4.22	4.30	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	2	0	1	2.50	1543/1585	2.50	3.37	3.96	4.01	2.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	3	0	3.14	1419/1535	3.14	4.09	4.08	4.18	3.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1485/1651	3.40	4.30	4.18	4.23	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	3	1	1	1	0	2.00	1641/1656	2.00	4.07	4.07	4.19	2.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	0	1	2	1	2.71	1564/1586	2.71	4.43	4.43	4.46	2.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	1441/1585	4.14	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.14	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	0	4	0	2.86	1536/1582	2.86	4.24	4.26	4.31	2.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	1	0	0	1.57	1574/1575	1.57	4.20	4.27	4.35	1.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1290/1380	2.75	4.04	3.94	4.04	2.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	512/1520	4.40	3.82	4.01	4.18	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	543/1515	4.60	4.07	4.24	4.40	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	358/1511	4.80	4.05	4.27	4.45	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.61	3.94	4.19	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.43	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 278	****	4.33	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.63	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.45	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.62	4.20	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	87/ 103	3.67	4.13	4.41	4.42	3.67	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	97/ 101	3.33	4.45	4.48	4.65	3.33	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	76/ 95	3.67	4.52	4.31	4.60	3.67	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	59/ 99	4.33	4.38	4.39	4.57	4.33	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	50/ 97	4.00	4.60	4.14	4.46	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 6	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Under-grad 2
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Non-major 0
				P 0	
				I 0	Electives 0
				? 0	Other 0

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CMSC 491Q 0101  
 Title QUANTUM COMPUTATION  
 Instructor: LOMONACO JR, SA  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 478  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.27	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.24	4.23	4.31	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.22	4.22	4.30	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	769/1585	4.00	3.37	3.96	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1535	4.50	4.09	4.08	4.18	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1653/1673	3.50	4.73	4.69	4.67	3.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.07	4.07	4.19	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.71	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.24	4.26	4.31	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.20	4.27	4.35	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1380	4.50	4.04	3.94	4.04	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	3.82	4.01	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.07	4.24	4.40	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.05	4.27	4.45	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	2	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	2	Under-grad	0	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	0				
				? 0						

Course-Section: CMSC 491W 0101  
 Title WIRELESS SENSOR NETWORK  
 Instructor: YOUNIS, MOHAMED  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 479  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	10	4	3.94	1271/1674	3.94	4.27	4.27	4.42	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	5	7	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.24	4.23	4.31	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	845/1423	4.25	4.28	4.27	4.34	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	2	6	6	3.88	1242/1609	3.88	4.22	4.22	4.30	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	6	7	4.00	769/1585	4.00	3.37	3.96	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	3	4	4	3.57	1256/1535	3.57	4.09	4.08	4.18	3.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	988/1651	4.14	4.30	4.18	4.23	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	0	9	3	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.19	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	723/1586	4.63	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	340/1585	4.94	4.71	4.69	4.76	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	3	11	4.35	829/1582	4.35	4.24	4.26	4.31	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	5	8	4.06	1119/1575	4.06	4.20	4.27	4.35	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	1	8	6	4.00	666/1380	4.00	4.04	3.94	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	6	5	3.93	889/1520	3.93	3.82	4.01	4.18	3.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	1	3	8	4.21	930/1515	4.21	4.07	4.24	4.40	4.21	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	729/1511	4.43	4.05	4.27	4.45	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	773/ 994	3.43	3.61	3.94	4.19	3.43	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.43	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 278	****	4.33	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.63	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 259	****	4.45	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 233	****	4.62	4.20	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 103	****	4.13	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 101	****	4.45	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 95	****	4.52	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 99	****	4.38	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 97	****	4.60	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	3.69	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.11	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 53	****	4.69	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 48	****	4.71	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 49	****	4.92	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 61	****	3.99	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 52	****	4.59	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 50	****	4.32	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.36	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.34	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 491W 0101  
 Title WIRELESS SENSOR NETWOR  
 Instructor: YOUNIS, MOHAMED  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 479  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	5	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	12	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 615 8010  
 Title INTRO. TO SYSTEMS ENGR  
 Instructor: MacCarthy, John  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 480  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1115/1674	4.10	4.27	4.27	4.44	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	1401/1674	3.70	4.24	4.23	4.34	3.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1016/1423	4.00	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	5	2	3.60	1411/1609	3.60	4.22	4.22	4.34	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	1385/1585	3.20	3.37	3.96	4.23	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	737/1535	4.20	4.09	4.08	4.27	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	673/1651	4.40	4.30	4.18	4.32	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.73	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	2	3	0	3.14	1513/1656	3.14	4.07	4.07	4.15	3.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1250/1586	4.10	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	811/1585	4.80	4.71	4.69	4.79	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	4	3	2	3.50	1406/1582	3.50	4.24	4.26	4.33	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1216/1575	3.90	4.20	4.27	4.30	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	4	4	1	3.50	1036/1380	3.50	4.04	3.94	3.85	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	2	2	1	2.88	1417/1520	2.88	3.82	4.01	4.19	2.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	523/1515	4.63	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1155/1511	3.88	4.05	4.27	4.49	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	937/ 994	2.80	3.61	3.94	4.07	2.80	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 621 0101  
 Title ADV OPERATING SYSTEMS  
 Instructor: SIVALINGAM, KRI  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 481  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	6	13	4.25	954/1674	4.25	4.27	4.27	4.44	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	12	8	4.13	1060/1674	4.13	4.24	4.23	4.34	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	3	7	10	3.96	1061/1423	3.96	4.28	4.27	4.28	3.96	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	4	6	8	3.90	1224/1609	3.90	4.22	4.22	4.34	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	8	10	4.04	742/1585	4.04	3.37	3.96	4.23	4.04	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	8	11	4.13	807/1535	4.13	4.09	4.08	4.27	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	4	4	12	4.04	1070/1651	4.04	4.30	4.18	4.32	4.04	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	760/1673	4.88	4.73	4.69	4.78	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	5	10	3	3.70	1275/1656	3.70	4.07	4.07	4.15	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	18	4.63	723/1586	4.63	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	9	12	4.33	1354/1585	4.33	4.71	4.69	4.79	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	11	9	4.17	1025/1582	4.17	4.24	4.26	4.33	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	11	9	4.08	1107/1575	4.08	4.20	4.27	4.30	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	0	2	6	6	1	3.40	1094/1380	3.40	4.04	3.94	3.85	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	3	10	2	3.71	1068/1520	3.71	3.82	4.01	4.19	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	6	3	7	3.88	1145/1515	3.88	4.07	4.24	4.47	3.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	855/1511	4.29	4.05	4.27	4.49	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	14	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	4	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 265	****	4.43	4.23	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 278	****	4.33	4.19	4.42	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 260	****	4.63	4.46	4.67	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	3	0	0	1	2.75	****/ 259	****	4.45	4.33	4.66	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 233	****	4.62	4.20	4.53	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.45	4.48	4.62	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.52	4.31	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	4.38	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.60	4.14	4.26	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 76	****	3.69	3.98	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	4.11	3.93	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 53	****	4.69	4.45	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.71	4.12	4.35	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	4.92	4.27	4.46	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 61	****	3.99	4.09	4.46	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.59	4.26	4.59	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.32	4.44	4.64	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.36	4.84	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.34	4.64	****	



Course-Section: CMSC 621 0101  
 Title ADV OPERATING SYSTEMS  
 Instructor: SIVALINGAM, KRI  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 481  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	4	A	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	11	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	13	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 635 0101  
 Title ADV COMP GRAPHICS  
 Instructor: OLANO, MARC  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 482  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	4	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.27	4.27	4.44	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.24	4.23	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	312/1609	4.67	4.22	4.22	4.34	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	121/1585	4.83	3.37	3.96	4.23	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	283/1535	4.60	4.09	4.08	4.27	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	4.30	4.18	4.32	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	832/1673	4.83	4.73	4.69	4.78	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1074/1586	4.33	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.71	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	850/1582	4.33	4.24	4.26	4.33	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	1010/1575	4.20	4.20	4.27	4.30	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	426/1380	4.33	4.04	3.94	3.85	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	572/1520	4.33	3.82	4.01	4.19	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.07	4.24	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.05	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	4.07	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.13	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.45	4.48	4.62	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.52	4.31	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.38	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.60	4.14	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 636 0101  
 Title DATA VISUALIZATION  
 Instructor: RHEINGANS, PENN  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 483  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	148/1674	4.90	4.27	4.27	4.44	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	870/1674	4.30	4.24	4.23	4.34	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	****	4.28	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	432/1609	4.56	4.22	4.22	4.34	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	204/1585	4.70	3.37	3.96	4.23	4.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	215/1535	4.70	4.09	4.08	4.27	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	809/1651	4.30	4.30	4.18	4.32	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.73	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	310/1656	4.60	4.07	4.07	4.15	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	1004/1586	4.40	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.71	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.24	4.26	4.33	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	1100/1575	4.10	4.20	4.27	4.30	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	540/1380	4.20	4.04	3.94	3.85	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	572/1520	4.33	3.82	4.01	4.19	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.07	4.24	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	358/1511	4.80	4.05	4.27	4.49	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	811/ 994	3.33	3.61	3.94	4.07	3.33	

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	6	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	4	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 641 0101  
 Title DESIGN & ANALY ALGORTH  
 Instructor: SHERMAN, ALAN  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 484  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	5	4.45	687/1674	4.45	4.27	4.27	4.44	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	530/1674	4.55	4.24	4.23	4.34	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	739/1423	4.36	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	7	3	4.09	1035/1609	4.09	4.22	4.22	4.34	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1006/1585	3.80	3.37	3.96	4.23	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	608/1535	4.30	4.09	4.08	4.27	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	5	1	3.70	1360/1651	3.70	4.30	4.18	4.32	3.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	706/1673	4.90	4.73	4.69	4.78	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	5	2	3.82	1397/1586	3.82	4.43	4.43	4.50	3.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	1191/1585	4.55	4.71	4.69	4.79	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	4	3	1	3.18	1483/1582	3.18	4.24	4.26	4.33	3.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	4	1	3.10	1474/1575	3.10	4.20	4.27	4.30	3.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	1149/1380	3.29	4.04	3.94	3.85	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	572/1520	4.33	3.82	4.01	4.19	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	707/1515	4.44	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	927/1511	4.22	4.05	4.27	4.49	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	881/ 994	3.00	3.61	3.94	4.07	3.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.13	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.45	4.48	4.62	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.52	4.31	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.38	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.60	4.14	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 661 0101  
 Title PRIN OF DATABASE SYS  
 Instructor: MUNDUR, PADMA  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 485  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	5	10	4.25	954/1674	4.25	4.27	4.27	4.44	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	9	4.25	931/1674	4.25	4.24	4.23	4.34	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	648/1423	4.45	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	799/1609	4.29	4.22	4.22	4.34	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	5	5	8	3.95	838/1585	3.95	3.37	3.96	4.23	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	715/1535	4.21	4.09	4.08	4.27	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	7	9	4.20	934/1651	4.20	4.30	4.18	4.32	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	5	4.25	1420/1673	4.25	4.73	4.69	4.78	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	3	11	1	3.87	1154/1656	3.87	4.07	4.07	4.15	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	7	9	4.20	1191/1586	4.20	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	1183/1585	4.55	4.71	4.69	4.79	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	7	8	4.15	1034/1582	4.15	4.24	4.26	4.33	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	7	8	4.10	1100/1575	4.10	4.20	4.27	4.30	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	1	5	3	3	3.46	1059/1380	3.46	4.04	3.94	3.85	3.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	3	2	3	3	3.55	1153/1520	3.55	3.82	4.01	4.19	3.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	4	1	4	3.55	1291/1515	3.55	4.07	4.24	4.47	3.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1238/1511	3.73	4.05	4.27	4.49	3.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.43	4.23	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 278	****	4.33	4.19	4.42	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.63	4.46	4.67	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	4.45	4.33	4.66	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.62	4.20	4.53	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.45	4.48	4.62	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.52	4.31	4.43	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.60	4.14	4.26	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 76	****	3.69	3.98	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 77	****	4.11	3.93	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 53	****	4.69	4.45	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.71	4.12	4.35	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	4.92	4.27	4.46	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	3.99	4.09	4.46	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.59	4.26	4.59	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.32	4.44	4.64	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.36	4.84	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.34	4.64	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 661 0101  
 Title PRIN OF DATABASE SYS  
 Instructor: MUNDUR, PADMA  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 485  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	15	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	7	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	13	Non-major	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 671 0101  
 Title PRIN ARTIFICIAL INTELL  
 Instructor: DESJARDINS, MAR  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 486  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	298/1674	4.75	4.27	4.27	4.44	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	270/1674	4.75	4.24	4.23	4.34	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	575/1423	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	353/1609	4.63	4.22	4.22	4.34	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	442/1585	4.38	3.37	3.96	4.23	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	578/1535	4.33	4.09	4.08	4.27	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	231/1651	4.75	4.30	4.18	4.32	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.73	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	136/1656	4.83	4.07	4.07	4.15	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	496/1586	4.75	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	917/1585	4.75	4.71	4.69	4.79	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	496/1582	4.63	4.24	4.26	4.33	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	551/1575	4.63	4.20	4.27	4.30	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	363/1380	4.43	4.04	3.94	3.85	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	810/1520	4.00	3.82	4.01	4.19	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	483/1515	4.67	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	507/1511	4.67	4.05	4.27	4.49	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	811/ 994	3.33	3.61	3.94	4.07	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 681 0101  
 Title ADVANCED COMP NETWORKS  
 Instructor: SIDHU, DEEPINDE  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 487  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.27	4.27	4.44	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1077/1674	4.10	4.24	4.23	4.34	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1249/1423	3.60	4.28	4.27	4.28	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1285/1609	3.80	4.22	4.22	4.34	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	0	6	4.00	769/1585	4.00	3.37	3.96	4.23	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	3	4	3.70	1185/1535	3.70	4.09	4.08	4.27	3.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1240/1651	3.89	4.30	4.18	4.32	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	1525/1673	4.10	4.73	4.69	4.78	4.10	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1300/1586	4.00	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	1225/1585	4.50	4.71	4.69	4.79	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	777/1582	4.40	4.24	4.26	4.33	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	1100/1575	4.10	4.20	4.27	4.30	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	666/1380	4.00	4.04	3.94	3.85	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1221/1520	3.40	3.82	4.01	4.19	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1341/1515	3.40	4.07	4.24	4.47	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1194/1511	3.80	4.05	4.27	4.49	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.61	3.94	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.33	4.19	4.42	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	****	4.63	4.46	4.67	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	4.45	4.33	4.66	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.62	4.20	4.53	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.13	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.45	4.48	4.62	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.52	4.31	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	4.38	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.60	4.14	4.26	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	3.69	3.98	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 77	****	4.11	3.93	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.69	4.45	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.71	4.12	4.35	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	3.99	4.09	4.46	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.59	4.26	4.59	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.32	4.44	4.64	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.36	4.84	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.34	4.64	****	



Course-Section: CMSC 681 0101  
 Title ADVANCED COMP NETWORKS  
 Instructor: SIDHU, DEEPIINDE  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 487  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	6	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	4	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 691C 0101  
 Title COMPUTATIONAL COMPLEXI  
 Instructor: CHANG, RICHARD  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 488  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.27	4.27	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.24	4.23	4.34	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.22	4.22	4.34	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1585	5.00	3.37	3.96	4.23	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.09	4.08	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.30	4.18	4.32	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.73	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.07	4.07	4.15	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.43	4.43	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.71	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.24	4.26	4.33	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.20	4.27	4.30	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	3.82	4.01	4.19	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.07	4.24	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.05	4.27	4.49	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 1	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 2	Non-major 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CMSC 691D 0101  
 Title DISTRIBUTED DATA MININ  
 Instructor: KARGUPTA, HILLO  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 489  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	4.25	954/1674	4.25	4.27	4.27	4.44	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	1291/1674	3.88	4.24	4.23	4.34	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1016/1423	4.00	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	1007/1609	4.13	4.22	4.22	4.34	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	557/1585	4.25	3.37	3.96	4.23	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1048/1535	3.88	4.09	4.08	4.27	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	1	1	3.14	1547/1651	3.14	4.30	4.18	4.32	3.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	4.00	1566/1673	4.00	4.73	4.69	4.78	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	1415/1586	3.75	4.43	4.43	4.50	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	640/1585	4.88	4.71	4.69	4.79	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1233/1582	3.88	4.24	4.26	4.33	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	0	2	3.00	1487/1575	3.00	4.20	4.27	4.30	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	1217/1380	3.00	4.04	3.94	3.85	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1141/1520	3.57	3.82	4.01	4.19	3.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	568/1515	4.57	4.07	4.24	4.47	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	458/1511	4.71	4.05	4.27	4.49	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	975/ 994	2.33	3.61	3.94	4.07	2.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.43	4.23	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.33	4.19	4.42	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.63	4.46	4.67	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.45	4.33	4.66	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	74/ 103	4.00	4.13	4.41	4.56	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	69/ 101	4.33	4.45	4.48	4.62	4.33	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	54/ 95	4.33	4.52	4.31	4.43	4.33	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	70/ 99	4.00	4.38	4.39	4.54	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	73/ 97	3.67	4.60	4.14	4.26	3.67	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	60/ 76	3.00	3.69	3.98	4.20	3.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	21/ 77	4.50	4.11	3.93	4.31	4.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	41/ 53	4.00	4.69	4.45	4.64	4.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	19/ 48	4.50	4.71	4.12	4.35	4.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	26/ 49	4.50	4.92	4.27	4.46	4.50	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.59	4.26	4.59	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	44/ 50	3.50	4.32	4.44	4.64	3.50	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.36	4.84	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 691D 0101  
 Title DISTRIBUTED DATA MININ  
 Instructor: KARGUPTA, HILLO  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 489  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	3	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	5	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						