

Course Section: CMSC 103 0101
 Title: SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING
 Instructor: KATZ, HENRY S
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 369
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	1	1	3.00	1596/1669	3.00	4.28	4.23	4.02	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1548/1666	3.20	4.23	4.19	4.11	3.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1118/1421	3.80	4.27	4.24	4.11	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.24	4.15	3.99	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	1.75	1552/1555	1.75	3.39	4.00	3.92	1.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1410/1543	3.00	4.11	4.06	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1353/1647	3.60	4.26	4.12	4.06	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1542/1605	2.75	4.09	4.07	3.96	2.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1407/1514	3.40	4.40	4.39	4.32	3.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.55	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	1463/1503	2.60	4.16	4.24	4.17	2.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	3.00	1403/1506	3.00	4.11	4.26	4.17	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1296/1311	1.00	3.76	3.85	3.68	1.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	3.90	4.05	3.85	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1253/1502	3.67	4.06	4.26	4.06	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1474/1489	2.33	4.13	4.29	4.07	2.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	3.81	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 1		Non-major 4
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	3

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: CMSC 104 0101
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR
 Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 370
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	22	4.74	281/1669	4.72	4.28	4.23	4.02	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	21	4.70	306/1666	4.53	4.23	4.19	4.11	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	392/1421	4.61	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	414/1617	4.39	4.24	4.15	3.99	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	3	1	4	2	7	3.53	1217/1555	3.17	3.39	4.00	3.92	3.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	390/1543	3.86	4.11	4.06	3.86	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	123/1647	4.70	4.26	4.12	4.06	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	23	4	4.15	1451/1668	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.15	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	9	17	4.65	249/1605	4.30	4.09	4.07	3.96	4.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	291/1514	4.70	4.40	4.39	4.32	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	567/1551	4.90	4.55	4.66	4.55	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	182/1503	4.55	4.16	4.24	4.17	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	21	4.69	433/1506	4.60	4.11	4.26	4.17	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	5	4	13	4.36	365/1311	4.33	3.76	3.85	3.68	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	7	5	5	3.68	1078/1490	3.67	3.90	4.05	3.85	3.68	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	2	3	4	9	3.95	1075/1502	3.90	4.06	4.26	4.06	3.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	1	1	7	8	4.11	1006/1489	4.06	4.13	4.29	4.07	4.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	10	3	0	3	2	2	3.00	923/1006	3.15	3.40	4.00	3.81	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	77/ 226	4.68	4.38	4.20	3.98	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	2	0	2	0	6	3.80	178/ 233	4.33	4.47	4.19	4.09	3.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	75/ 225	4.90	4.83	4.50	4.42	4.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	138/ 223	4.60	4.70	4.35	4.19	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 206	****	4.72	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.33	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	6	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	3	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CMSC 104 0101
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR
 Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 370
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	6	A	19	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	27	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course Section: CMSC 104 0201
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR
 Instructor: BURT, GARY
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 371
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	0	1	2	13	4.53	567/1669	4.72	4.28	4.23	4.02	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	752/1666	4.53	4.23	4.19	4.11	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	831/1421	4.61	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.24	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	4	1	9	3.94	1112/1617	4.39	4.24	4.15	3.99	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	2	1	3	2	3	3.27	1350/1555	3.17	3.39	4.00	3.92	3.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	1	4	3	2	2.53	1513/1543	3.86	4.11	4.06	3.86	2.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	634/1647	4.70	4.26	4.12	4.06	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	750/1668	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	9	1	3.79	1187/1605	4.30	4.09	4.07	3.96	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	1022/1514	4.70	4.40	4.39	4.32	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	307/1551	4.90	4.55	4.66	4.55	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	5	9	4.24	896/1503	4.55	4.16	4.24	4.17	4.24	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	3	10	4.24	926/1506	4.60	4.11	4.26	4.17	4.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	284/1311	4.33	3.76	3.85	3.68	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	5	4	2	3.58	1124/1490	3.67	3.90	4.05	3.85	3.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	1106/1502	3.90	4.06	4.26	4.06	3.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	1116/1489	4.06	4.13	4.29	4.07	3.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	9	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1006	3.15	3.40	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	4.33	4.47	4.19	4.09	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	4.60	4.70	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 206	****	4.72	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.33	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CMSC 104 0201
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR
 Instructor: BURT, GARY
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 371
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	18	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course Section: CMSC 104 0401
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 372
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	21	4.95	64/1669	4.72	4.28	4.23	4.02	4.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	399/1666	4.53	4.23	4.19	4.11	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	255/1421	4.61	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	475/1617	4.39	4.24	4.15	3.99	4.52	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	5	5	2	4	3.06	1420/1555	3.17	3.39	4.00	3.92	3.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	562/1543	3.86	4.11	4.06	3.86	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	4	17	4.68	281/1647	4.70	4.26	4.12	4.06	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	713/1668	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	10	7	4.33	591/1605	4.30	4.09	4.07	3.96	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	95/1514	4.70	4.40	4.39	4.32	4.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	512/1551	4.90	4.55	4.66	4.55	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	425/1503	4.55	4.16	4.24	4.17	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	164/1506	4.60	4.11	4.26	4.17	4.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	538/1311	4.33	3.76	3.85	3.68	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	1	2	2	7	3.60	1117/1490	3.67	3.90	4.05	3.85	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	1013/1502	3.90	4.06	4.26	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	2	2	1	10	4.27	914/1489	4.06	4.13	4.29	4.07	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	2	1	1	2	3	3.33	841/1006	3.15	3.40	4.00	3.81	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	33/ 226	4.68	4.38	4.20	3.98	4.86	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	38/ 233	4.33	4.47	4.19	4.09	4.86	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 225	4.90	4.83	4.50	4.42	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	51/ 223	4.60	4.70	4.35	4.19	4.86	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 206	****	4.72	4.15	4.01	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	A 14	Required for Majors 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 6	Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	Major
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	General 1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Under-grad 22
				P 0	Non-major 14
				I 0	Electives 2
					Other 18

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: CMSC 104 0501
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR
 Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 373
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	20	4.65	404/1669	4.72	4.28	4.23	4.02	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	5	17	4.42	662/1666	4.53	4.23	4.19	4.11	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	267/1421	4.61	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.76	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	0	5	13	4.53	475/1617	4.39	4.24	4.15	3.99	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	5	2	4	5	2	2.83	1478/1555	3.17	3.39	4.00	3.92	2.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	2	0	2	3	9	4.06	857/1543	3.86	4.11	4.06	3.86	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	167/1647	4.70	4.26	4.12	4.06	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	20	6	4.23	1394/1668	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.62	4.23	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	8	13	4.42	486/1605	4.30	4.09	4.07	3.96	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	6	19	4.65	600/1514	4.70	4.40	4.39	4.32	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	567/1551	4.90	4.55	4.66	4.55	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	6	17	4.50	556/1503	4.55	4.16	4.24	4.17	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	7	18	4.58	575/1506	4.60	4.11	4.26	4.17	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	1	6	15	4.38	357/1311	4.33	3.76	3.85	3.68	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	1	3	1	8	3.80	1003/1490	3.67	3.90	4.05	3.85	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	0	4	3	6	3.73	1219/1502	3.90	4.06	4.26	4.06	3.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	1	6	5	3.93	1107/1489	4.06	4.13	4.29	4.07	3.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	3	0	1	3	2	3.11	917/1006	3.15	3.40	4.00	3.81	3.11	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 226	4.68	4.38	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 233	4.33	4.47	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	2	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 225	4.90	4.83	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	****/ 223	4.60	4.70	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 206	****	4.72	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 112	****	4.33	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CMSC 104 0501
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR
 Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 373
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	15	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	26	Non-major	25
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course Section: CMSC 121 0101
 Title (S'06)
 Instructor: STAFF
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 374
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	2	7	4.36	781/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.02	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1666	4.60	4.23	4.19	4.11	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	184/1421	4.26	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	123/1617	4.32	4.24	4.15	3.99	4.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	0	0	7	3.90	939/1555	3.78	3.39	4.00	3.92	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	298/1543	4.10	4.11	4.06	3.86	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	435/1647	4.47	4.26	4.12	4.06	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	830/1605	4.06	4.09	4.07	3.96	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	189/1514	4.75	4.40	4.39	4.32	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	512/1551	4.65	4.55	4.66	4.55	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	637/1503	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.17	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	394/1506	4.26	4.11	4.26	4.17	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	204/1311	4.32	3.76	3.85	3.68	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1003/1490	3.90	3.90	4.05	3.85	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	632/1502	4.00	4.06	4.26	4.06	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	4.50	4.13	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	3.81	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: CMSC 121 0201
 Title (S'06)
 Instructor: STAFF
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 375
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	4.40	734/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.02	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	957/1666	4.60	4.23	4.19	4.11	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1166/1421	4.26	4.27	4.24	4.11	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1251/1617	4.32	4.24	4.15	3.99	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1133/1555	3.78	3.39	4.00	3.92	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1226/1543	4.10	4.11	4.06	3.86	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	651/1647	4.47	4.26	4.12	4.06	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	918/1605	4.06	4.09	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	679/1514	4.75	4.40	4.39	4.32	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1270/1551	4.65	4.55	4.66	4.55	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	932/1503	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.17	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1225/1506	4.26	4.11	4.26	4.17	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	587/1311	4.32	3.76	3.85	3.68	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	849/1490	3.90	3.90	4.05	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1301/1502	4.00	4.06	4.26	4.06	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1038/1489	4.50	4.13	4.29	4.07	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	4.38	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	4.47	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.83	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.70	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	4.72	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.33	4.38	4.04	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

P	3			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	0	
?	0			

Course Section: CMSC 201 0101
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: DESJARDINS, MAR (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 376
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	4.14	1052/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	293/1666	4.47	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	493/1421	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	323/1617	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	3	1	0	2.50	1521/1555	2.95	3.39	4.00	3.96	2.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	895/1543	4.41	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	617/1647	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	807/1668	4.88	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1312/1605	4.32	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	274/1514	4.73	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	954/1551	4.62	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	491/1503	4.54	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	744/1506	4.31	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	389/1311	3.63	3.76	3.85	3.96	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	445/1490	4.09	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1013/1502	3.83	4.06	4.26	4.31	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1379/1489	3.91	4.13	4.29	4.36	3.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	172/ 226	4.40	4.38	4.20	4.42	3.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	66/ 233	4.73	4.47	4.19	4.36	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	102/ 225	4.87	4.83	4.50	4.74	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	109/ 223	4.69	4.70	4.35	4.71	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	4.50	4.72	4.15	4.59	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	4.00	4.00	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: CMSC 201 0101
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 377
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	4.14	1052/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	293/1666	4.47	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	493/1421	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	323/1617	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	3	1	0	2.50	1521/1555	2.95	3.39	4.00	3.96	2.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	895/1543	4.41	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	617/1647	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	807/1668	4.88	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1605	4.32	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	445/1490	4.09	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1013/1502	3.83	4.06	4.26	4.31	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1379/1489	3.91	4.13	4.29	4.36	3.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	172/ 226	4.40	4.38	4.20	4.42	3.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	66/ 233	4.73	4.47	4.19	4.36	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	102/ 225	4.87	4.83	4.50	4.74	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	109/ 223	4.69	4.70	4.35	4.71	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	4.50	4.72	4.15	4.59	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	4.00	4.00	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 4	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	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	7

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: CMSC 201 0102
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: DESJARDINS, MAR
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 378
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	345/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	439/1666	4.47	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	932/1421	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	717/1617	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	3	2	1	0	2.25	1542/1555	2.95	3.39	4.00	3.96	2.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	390/1543	4.41	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	651/1647	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1668	4.88	4.67	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	851/1605	4.32	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1052/1514	4.73	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	1193/1551	4.62	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	556/1503	4.54	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	642/1506	4.31	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	846/1311	3.63	3.76	3.85	3.96	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	4	0	3.40	1215/1490	4.09	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1301/1502	3.83	4.06	4.26	4.31	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1398/1489	3.91	4.13	4.29	4.36	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	178/1006	3.30	3.40	4.00	3.99	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 226	4.40	4.38	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	4.73	4.47	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	4.87	4.83	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	4.69	4.70	4.35	4.71	****	

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	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	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	9				
				?	0						

Course Section: CMSC 201 0103
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: DESJARDINS, MAR
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 379
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	5	4.43	705/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	662/1666	4.47	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	789/1421	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	323/1617	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	0	2	1	2.67	1505/1555	2.95	3.39	4.00	3.96	2.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	390/1543	4.41	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	962/1647	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	807/1668	4.88	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	918/1605	4.32	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	505/1514	4.73	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1135/1551	4.62	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	852/1503	4.54	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	884/1506	4.31	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	731/1311	3.63	3.76	3.85	3.96	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1003/1490	4.09	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1013/1502	3.83	4.06	4.26	4.31	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	596/1489	3.91	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1006	3.30	3.40	4.00	3.99	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	4.40	4.38	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	4.73	4.47	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	4.87	4.83	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	4.69	4.70	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	4.50	4.72	4.15	4.59	****	

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	2	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 7
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 1		

Course Section: CMSC 201 0104
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: DESJARDINS, MAR (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 380
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	2	4.17	1026/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	841/1666	4.47	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	886/1421	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	863/1617	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	1	1	3.00	1427/1555	2.95	3.39	4.00	3.96	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	895/1543	4.41	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	948/1647	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668	4.88	4.67	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	918/1605	4.32	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	799/1514	4.73	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1326/1551	4.62	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	932/1503	4.54	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1069/1506	4.31	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	890/1311	3.63	3.76	3.85	3.96	1.87	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1003/1490	4.09	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1013/1502	3.83	4.06	4.26	4.31	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	953/1489	3.91	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	967/1006	3.30	3.40	4.00	3.99	2.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	77/ 226	4.40	4.38	4.20	4.42	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 233	4.73	4.47	4.19	4.36	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 225	4.87	4.83	4.50	4.74	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	109/ 223	4.69	4.70	4.35	4.71	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	4.50	4.72	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	81/ 112	4.25	4.33	4.38	4.59	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.50	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	4.00	4.00	4.22	4.20	****	

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 1		0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		7
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					

Course Section: CMSC 201 0104
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 381
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	2	4.17	1026/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	841/1666	4.47	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	886/1421	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	863/1617	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	1	1	3.00	1427/1555	2.95	3.39	4.00	3.96	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	895/1543	4.41	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	948/1647	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668	4.88	4.67	4.67	4.59	5.00	
Lecture															
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1551	4.62	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1296/1311	3.63	3.76	3.85	3.96	1.87	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1003/1490	4.09	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1013/1502	3.83	4.06	4.26	4.31	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	953/1489	3.91	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	967/1006	3.30	3.40	4.00	3.99	2.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	77/ 226	4.40	4.38	4.20	4.42	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 233	4.73	4.47	4.19	4.36	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 225	4.87	4.83	4.50	4.74	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	109/ 223	4.69	4.70	4.35	4.71	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	4.50	4.72	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	81/ 112	4.25	4.33	4.38	4.59	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.50	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	4.00	4.00	4.22	4.20	****	

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 1		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 7
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	5

Course Section: CMSC 201 0104
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 382
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	2	4.17	1026/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	841/1666	4.47	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	886/1421	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	863/1617	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	1	1	3.00	1427/1555	2.95	3.39	4.00	3.96	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	895/1543	4.41	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	948/1647	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668	4.88	4.67	4.67	4.59	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1003/1490	4.09	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1013/1502	3.83	4.06	4.26	4.31	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	953/1489	3.91	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	967/1006	3.30	3.40	4.00	3.99	2.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	77/ 226	4.40	4.38	4.20	4.42	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 233	4.73	4.47	4.19	4.36	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 225	4.87	4.83	4.50	4.74	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	109/ 223	4.69	4.70	4.35	4.71	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	4.50	4.72	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	81/ 112	4.25	4.33	4.38	4.59	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.50	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	4.00	4.00	4.22	4.20	****	

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 1		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 7
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 0105
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: DESJARDINS, MAR (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 383
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	511/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	472/1666	4.47	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	657/1421	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1287/1555	2.95	3.39	4.00	3.96	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	659/1543	4.41	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	250/1647	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1144/1668	4.88	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1172/1605	4.32	4.09	4.07	4.15	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	274/1514	4.73	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	954/1551	4.62	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	686/1503	4.54	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	407/1506	4.31	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	426/1311	3.63	3.76	3.85	3.96	3.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	298/1490	4.09	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1231/1502	3.83	4.06	4.26	4.31	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1146/1489	3.91	4.13	4.29	4.36	3.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	479/1006	3.30	3.40	4.00	3.99	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	56/ 226	4.40	4.38	4.20	4.42	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	105/ 233	4.73	4.47	4.19	4.36	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 225	4.87	4.83	4.50	4.74	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 223	4.69	4.70	4.35	4.71	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	117/ 206	4.50	4.72	4.15	4.59	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	4.25	4.33	4.38	4.59	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	4.00	4.00	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: CMSC 201 0105
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: DESJARDINS, MAR (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 383
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	2
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	7				
				?	0						

Course Section: CMSC 201 0105
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 384
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	511/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	472/1666	4.47	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	657/1421	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1287/1555	2.95	3.39	4.00	3.96	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	659/1543	4.41	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	250/1647	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1144/1668	4.88	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1605	4.32	4.09	4.07	4.15	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1514	4.73	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1551	4.62	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1503	4.54	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1506	4.31	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1311	3.63	3.76	3.85	3.96	3.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	298/1490	4.09	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1231/1502	3.83	4.06	4.26	4.31	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1146/1489	3.91	4.13	4.29	4.36	3.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	479/1006	3.30	3.40	4.00	3.99	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	56/ 226	4.40	4.38	4.20	4.42	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	105/ 233	4.73	4.47	4.19	4.36	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 225	4.87	4.83	4.50	4.74	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 223	4.69	4.70	4.35	4.71	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	117/ 206	4.50	4.72	4.15	4.59	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	4.25	4.33	4.38	4.59	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	4.00	4.00	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: CMSC 201 0105
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 384
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	2
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	7				
				?	0						

Course Section: CMSC 201 0106
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: DESJARDINS, MAR (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 385
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	2	4.17	1026/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1094/1666	4.47	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	969/1421	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	2	0	2.67	1505/1555	2.95	3.39	4.00	3.96	2.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	390/1543	4.41	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	481/1647	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1668	4.88	4.67	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	690/1605	4.32	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	308/1514	4.73	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	705/1551	4.62	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	800/1503	4.54	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	1277/1506	4.31	4.11	4.26	4.33	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	501/1311	3.63	3.76	3.85	3.96	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	849/1490	4.09	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1253/1502	3.83	4.06	4.26	4.31	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	865/1489	3.91	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	3.30	3.40	4.00	3.99	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	2
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	6				
				?	0						

Course Section: CMSC 201 0106
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 386
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	2	4.17	1026/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1094/1666	4.47	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	969/1421	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	2	0	2.67	1505/1555	2.95	3.39	4.00	3.96	2.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	390/1543	4.41	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	481/1647	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1668	4.88	4.67	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1605	4.32	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.63	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	849/1490	4.09	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1253/1502	3.83	4.06	4.26	4.31	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	865/1489	3.91	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	3.30	3.40	4.00	3.99	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	2
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	6				
				?	0						

Course Section: CMSC 201 0201
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 387
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	8	4.89	143/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	218/1666	4.47	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	392/1421	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	370/1617	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	773/1555	2.95	3.39	4.00	3.96	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1543	4.41	4.11	4.06	4.10	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	302/1647	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1668	4.88	4.67	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	373/1605	4.32	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1514	4.73	4.40	4.39	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	567/1551	4.62	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	254/1503	4.54	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	353/1506	4.31	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	189/1311	3.63	3.76	3.85	3.96	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	622/1490	4.09	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1231/1502	3.83	4.06	4.26	4.31	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	1038/1489	3.91	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	102/ 226	4.40	4.38	4.20	4.42	4.40	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	44/ 233	4.73	4.47	4.19	4.36	4.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 225	4.87	4.83	4.50	4.74	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 223	4.69	4.70	4.35	4.71	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 206	4.50	4.72	4.15	4.59	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	3
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	6				
				?	0						

Course Section: CMSC 201 0202
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 388
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	183/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1666	4.47	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1421	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.35	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	161/1617	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1021/1555	2.95	3.39	4.00	3.96	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1543	4.41	4.11	4.06	4.10	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1647	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.19	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1668	4.88	4.67	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	127/1605	4.32	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1514	4.73	4.40	4.39	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	4.62	4.55	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	191/1503	4.54	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	471/1506	4.31	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1311	3.63	3.76	3.85	3.96	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	192/1490	4.09	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	818/1502	3.83	4.06	4.26	4.31	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	684/1489	3.91	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	479/1006	3.30	3.40	4.00	3.99	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	56/ 226	4.40	4.38	4.20	4.42	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 233	4.73	4.47	4.19	4.36	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 225	4.87	4.83	4.50	4.74	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 223	4.69	4.70	4.35	4.71	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: CMSC 201 0203
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 389
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	4.20	988/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1094/1666	4.47	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	683/1421	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	641/1617	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	1514/1555	2.95	3.39	4.00	3.96	2.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	580/1543	4.41	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	651/1647	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	901/1668	4.88	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	690/1605	4.32	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	679/1514	4.73	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	788/1551	4.62	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	464/1503	4.54	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	909/1506	4.31	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	587/1311	3.63	3.76	3.85	3.96	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1490	4.09	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1371/1502	3.83	4.06	4.26	4.31	3.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	1441/1489	3.91	4.13	4.29	4.36	2.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	997/1006	3.30	3.40	4.00	3.99	2.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 226	4.40	4.38	4.20	4.42	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	83/ 233	4.73	4.47	4.19	4.36	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	127/ 225	4.87	4.83	4.50	4.74	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 223	4.69	4.70	4.35	4.71	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	4.50	4.72	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: CMSC 201 0204
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 390
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	4.20	988/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	439/1666	4.47	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1421	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	219/1617	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	1533/1555	2.95	3.39	4.00	3.96	2.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1543	4.41	4.11	4.06	4.10	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	167/1647	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1125/1668	4.88	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	373/1605	4.32	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	360/1514	4.73	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1111/1551	4.62	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	464/1503	4.54	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1069/1506	4.31	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	587/1311	3.63	3.76	3.85	3.96	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	389/1490	4.09	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	540/1502	3.83	4.06	4.26	4.31	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	434/1489	3.91	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	3.30	3.40	4.00	3.99	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	140/ 226	4.40	4.38	4.20	4.42	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 233	4.73	4.47	4.19	4.36	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 225	4.87	4.83	4.50	4.74	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 223	4.69	4.70	4.35	4.71	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	4.50	4.72	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 112	4.25	4.33	4.38	4.59	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	38/ 58	4.00	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	

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	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	5	Non-major	4
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
?	1		

Course Section: CMSC 201 0205
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 391
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	590/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	549/1666	4.47	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	557/1421	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	773/1555	2.95	3.39	4.00	3.96	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	390/1543	4.41	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	948/1647	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	844/1668	4.88	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	690/1605	4.32	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1022/1514	4.73	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1304/1551	4.62	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	556/1503	4.54	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	1069/1506	4.31	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	587/1311	3.63	3.76	3.85	3.96	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1117/1490	4.09	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1301/1502	3.83	4.06	4.26	4.31	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1168/1489	3.91	4.13	4.29	4.36	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	759/1006	3.30	3.40	4.00	3.99	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	77/ 226	4.40	4.38	4.20	4.42	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	83/ 233	4.73	4.47	4.19	4.36	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	127/ 225	4.87	4.83	4.50	4.74	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	200/ 223	4.69	4.70	4.35	4.71	3.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	76/ 206	4.50	4.72	4.15	4.59	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	6	Non-major	4
84-150	0	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	5				
				?	0						

Course Section: CMSC 201 0206
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 392
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	5	4.43	705/1669	4.38	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	142/1666	4.47	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	184/1421	4.42	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	424/1617	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	1	1	0	2.20	1543/1555	2.95	3.39	4.00	3.96	2.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	250/1543	4.41	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	481/1647	4.46	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1668	4.88	4.67	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	654/1605	4.32	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1514	4.73	4.40	4.39	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	650/1551	4.62	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	173/1503	4.54	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	744/1506	4.31	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	232/1311	3.63	3.76	3.85	3.96	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	0	1	1	2.33	1456/1490	4.09	3.90	4.05	4.11	2.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1301/1502	3.83	4.06	4.26	4.31	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1155/1489	3.91	4.13	4.29	4.36	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	3.30	3.40	4.00	3.99	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	116/ 226	4.40	4.38	4.20	4.42	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	66/ 233	4.73	4.47	4.19	4.36	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 225	4.87	4.83	4.50	4.74	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 223	4.69	4.70	4.35	4.71	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 206	4.50	4.72	4.15	4.59	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	4.25	4.33	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 5	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 7	Non-major 2
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 6		
				? 1			

Course Section: CMSC 201H 0101
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 393
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	816/1669	4.33	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	777/1666	4.33	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	746/1421	4.33	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1133/1555	3.67	3.39	4.00	3.96	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	302/1647	4.67	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1199/1514	4.00	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1304/1551	3.67	4.55	4.66	4.72	3.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	386/1503	4.67	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1277/1506	3.67	4.11	4.26	4.33	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.76	3.85	3.96	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1475/1502	2.50	4.06	4.26	4.31	2.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1279/1489	3.50	4.13	4.29	4.36	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	923/1006	3.00	3.40	4.00	3.99	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 226	5.00	4.38	4.20	4.42	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.47	4.19	4.36	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 225	5.00	4.83	4.50	4.74	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 223	5.00	4.70	4.35	4.71	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 206	5.00	4.72	4.15	4.59	5.00	

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 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 3
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	3

Course Section: CMSC 201H 0101
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 394
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	816/1669	4.33	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	777/1666	4.33	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	746/1421	4.33	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1133/1555	3.67	3.39	4.00	3.96	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	302/1647	4.67	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.59	5.00	
Lecture															
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1525/1551	3.67	4.55	4.66	4.72	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1475/1502	2.50	4.06	4.26	4.31	2.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1279/1489	3.50	4.13	4.29	4.36	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	923/1006	3.00	3.40	4.00	3.99	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 226	5.00	4.38	4.20	4.42	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.47	4.19	4.36	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 225	5.00	4.83	4.50	4.74	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 223	5.00	4.70	4.35	4.71	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 206	5.00	4.72	4.15	4.59	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	2
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 0101
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II
 Instructor: WORTMAN, DANA T
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 395
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	705/1669	4.63	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	472/1666	4.52	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	789/1421	4.30	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	717/1617	4.57	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1490/1555	3.50	3.39	4.00	3.96	2.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1260/1543	4.13	4.11	4.06	4.10	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	828/1647	4.48	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	1451/1668	4.43	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	918/1605	4.31	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	274/1514	4.46	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	650/1551	4.46	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	852/1503	4.28	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	744/1506	4.21	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	163/1311	4.35	3.76	3.85	3.96	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1154/1490	4.22	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	632/1502	4.43	4.06	4.26	4.31	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	684/1489	4.25	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	997/1006	3.28	3.40	4.00	3.99	2.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	140/ 226	4.15	4.38	4.20	4.42	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	121/ 233	4.01	4.47	4.19	4.36	4.20	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 225	4.70	4.83	4.50	4.74	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 223	4.68	4.70	4.35	4.71	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	117/ 206	4.79	4.72	4.15	4.59	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.20	****	

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	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course Section: CMSC 202 0102
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II
 Instructor: WORTMAN, DANA T
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 396
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	8	4.62	463/1669	4.63	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	715/1666	4.52	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	831/1421	4.30	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	821/1617	4.57	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	2	3	2	3.33	1326/1555	3.50	3.39	4.00	3.96	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	390/1543	4.13	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	446/1647	4.48	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	1353/1668	4.43	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	1172/1605	4.31	4.09	4.07	4.15	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	291/1514	4.46	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	986/1551	4.46	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	528/1503	4.28	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	534/1506	4.21	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	349/1311	4.35	3.76	3.85	3.96	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	800/1490	4.22	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	1	5	1	3.63	1270/1502	4.43	4.06	4.26	4.31	3.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1038/1489	4.25	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/1006	3.28	3.40	4.00	3.99	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	37/ 226	4.15	4.38	4.20	4.42	4.83	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	83/ 233	4.01	4.47	4.19	4.36	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	102/ 225	4.70	4.83	4.50	4.74	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	85/ 223	4.68	4.70	4.35	4.71	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	56/ 206	4.79	4.72	4.15	4.59	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.33	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: CMSC 202 0102
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II
 Instructor: WORTMAN, DANA T
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 396
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	6
84-150	1	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	13				
				?	0						

Course Section: CMSC 202 0103
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II
 Instructor: WORTMAN, DANA T
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 397
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	3	4.29	876/1669	4.63	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	662/1666	4.52	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	789/1421	4.30	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	612/1617	4.57	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1359/1555	3.50	3.39	4.00	3.96	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1322/1543	4.13	4.11	4.06	4.10	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	139/1647	4.48	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1257/1668	4.43	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	759/1605	4.31	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	274/1514	4.46	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1135/1551	4.46	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	978/1503	4.28	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	995/1506	4.21	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	731/1311	4.35	3.76	3.85	3.96	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	622/1490	4.22	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1013/1502	4.43	4.06	4.26	4.31	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	865/1489	4.25	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1003/1006	3.28	3.40	4.00	3.99	1.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 226	4.15	4.38	4.20	4.42	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	83/ 233	4.01	4.47	4.19	4.36	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 225	4.70	4.83	4.50	4.74	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	69/ 223	4.68	4.70	4.35	4.71	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	56/ 206	4.79	4.72	4.15	4.59	4.67	

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	1	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 7
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 202 0104
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II
 Instructor: WORTMAN, DANA T (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 398
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	389/1669	4.63	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	359/1666	4.52	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1421	4.30	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1617	4.57	4.24	4.15	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	492/1555	3.50	3.39	4.00	3.96	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	250/1543	4.13	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1647	4.48	4.26	4.12	4.19	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1329/1668	4.43	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	591/1605	4.31	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1514	4.46	4.40	4.39	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1551	4.46	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1503	4.28	4.16	4.24	4.29	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	471/1506	4.21	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1311	4.35	3.76	3.85	3.96	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	4.22	3.90	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	4.43	4.06	4.26	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	4.25	4.13	4.29	4.36	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	479/1006	3.28	3.40	4.00	3.99	4.00	

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

Course Section: CMSC 202 0104
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 399
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	389/1669	4.63	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	359/1666	4.52	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1421	4.30	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1617	4.57	4.24	4.15	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	492/1555	3.50	3.39	4.00	3.96	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	250/1543	4.13	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1647	4.48	4.26	4.12	4.19	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1329/1668	4.43	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.33	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	4.22	3.90	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	4.43	4.06	4.26	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	4.25	4.13	4.29	4.36	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	479/1006	3.28	3.40	4.00	3.99	4.00	

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 1		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 3 Non-major 3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	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 3	
			? 1		

Course Section: CMSC 202 0201
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II
 Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 400
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	6	4.63	448/1669	4.63	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	549/1666	4.52	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	710/1421	4.30	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	161/1617	4.57	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1312/1555	3.50	3.39	4.00	3.96	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	180/1543	4.13	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	862/1647	4.48	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1106/1668	4.43	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	810/1605	4.31	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1199/1514	4.46	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1083/1551	4.46	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1255/1503	4.28	4.16	4.24	4.29	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	884/1506	4.21	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	389/1311	4.35	3.76	3.85	3.96	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	622/1490	4.22	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1160/1502	4.43	4.06	4.26	4.31	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1038/1489	4.25	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	759/1006	3.28	3.40	4.00	3.99	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	4.15	4.38	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	4.01	4.47	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	4.70	4.83	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	4.68	4.70	4.35	4.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	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	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	448/1669	4.63	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1334/1666	4.52	4.23	4.19	4.29	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	0	4	2	3.75	1135/1421	4.30	4.27	4.24	4.35	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	0	3	3.38	1435/1617	4.57	4.24	4.15	4.24	3.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	2	0	1	2.67	1505/1555	3.50	3.39	4.00	3.96	2.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1260/1543	4.13	4.11	4.06	4.10	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	1	1	3	3.50	1393/1647	4.48	4.26	4.12	4.19	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1190/1668	4.43	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1357/1605	4.31	4.09	4.07	4.15	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	1082/1514	4.46	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1551	4.46	4.55	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1066/1503	4.28	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	799/1506	4.21	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	846/1311	4.35	3.76	3.85	3.96	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	849/1490	4.22	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1148/1502	4.43	4.06	4.26	4.31	3.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1038/1489	4.25	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	891/1006	3.28	3.40	4.00	3.99	3.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	116/ 226	4.15	4.38	4.20	4.42	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	193/ 233	4.01	4.47	4.19	4.36	3.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	102/ 225	4.70	4.83	4.50	4.74	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	85/ 223	4.68	4.70	4.35	4.71	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 206	4.79	4.72	4.15	4.59	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.33	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: CMSC 202 0202
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II
 Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 401
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	6				
				?	0						

Course Section: CMSC 202 0203
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II
 Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 402
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	269/1669	4.63	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	549/1666	4.52	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	557/1421	4.30	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	323/1617	4.57	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	659/1543	4.13	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	481/1647	4.48	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1190/1668	4.43	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	239/1605	4.31	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1082/1514	4.46	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1551	4.46	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	277/1503	4.28	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	642/1506	4.21	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	389/1311	4.35	3.76	3.85	3.96	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1490	4.22	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	4.43	4.06	4.26	4.31	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1038/1489	4.25	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	140/ 226	4.15	4.38	4.20	4.42	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	203/ 233	4.01	4.47	4.19	4.36	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 225	4.70	4.83	4.50	4.74	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	109/ 223	4.68	4.70	4.35	4.71	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 206	4.79	4.72	4.15	4.59	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: CMSC 202 0203
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 403
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	269/1669	4.63	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	549/1666	4.52	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	557/1421	4.30	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	323/1617	4.57	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	659/1543	4.13	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	481/1647	4.48	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1190/1668	4.43	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1490	4.22	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	4.43	4.06	4.26	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1038/1489	4.25	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	140/ 226	4.15	4.38	4.20	4.42	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	203/ 233	4.01	4.47	4.19	4.36	3.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 225	4.70	4.83	4.50	4.74	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	109/ 223	4.68	4.70	4.35	4.71	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 206	4.79	4.72	4.15	4.59	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: CMSC 202 0204
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II
 Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 404
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	269/1669	4.63	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	243/1666	4.52	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	814/1421	4.30	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	323/1617	4.57	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	773/1555	3.50	3.39	4.00	3.96	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	895/1543	4.13	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	862/1647	4.48	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1382/1668	4.43	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	239/1605	4.31	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	441/1514	4.46	4.40	4.39	4.39	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1551	4.46	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	277/1503	4.28	4.16	4.24	4.29	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	909/1506	4.21	4.11	4.26	4.33	3.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	264/1311	4.35	3.76	3.85	3.96	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	622/1490	4.22	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	486/1502	4.43	4.06	4.26	4.31	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	865/1489	4.25	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	479/1006	3.28	3.40	4.00	3.99	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	140/ 226	4.15	4.38	4.20	4.42	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	146/ 233	4.01	4.47	4.19	4.36	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	187/ 225	4.70	4.83	4.50	4.74	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 223	4.68	4.70	4.35	4.71	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 206	4.79	4.72	4.15	4.59	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	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	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 202 0204
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 405
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	269/1669	4.63	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	243/1666	4.52	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	814/1421	4.30	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	323/1617	4.57	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	773/1555	3.50	3.39	4.00	3.96	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	895/1543	4.13	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	862/1647	4.48	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1382/1668	4.43	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	4.31	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1457/1514	4.46	4.40	4.39	4.39	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1525/1551	4.46	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1423/1503	4.28	4.16	4.24	4.29	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1490/1506	4.21	4.11	4.26	4.33	3.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	622/1490	4.22	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	486/1502	4.43	4.06	4.26	4.31	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	865/1489	4.25	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	479/1006	3.28	3.40	4.00	3.99	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	140/ 226	4.15	4.38	4.20	4.42	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	146/ 233	4.01	4.47	4.19	4.36	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	187/ 225	4.70	4.83	4.50	4.74	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 223	4.68	4.70	4.35	4.71	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 206	4.79	4.72	4.15	4.59	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: CMSC 202 0205
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II
 Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 406
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	478/1669	4.63	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	181/1666	4.52	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1118/1421	4.30	4.27	4.24	4.35	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1617	4.57	4.24	4.15	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1427/1555	3.50	3.39	4.00	3.96	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1543	4.13	4.11	4.06	4.10	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	167/1647	4.48	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668	4.43	4.67	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	170/1605	4.31	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	360/1514	4.46	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	788/1551	4.46	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	464/1503	4.28	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	286/1506	4.21	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	389/1311	4.35	3.76	3.85	3.96	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1417/1490	4.22	3.90	4.05	4.11	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1013/1502	4.43	4.06	4.26	4.31	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1279/1489	4.25	4.13	4.29	4.36	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	206/ 226	4.15	4.38	4.20	4.42	3.20	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	121/ 233	4.01	4.47	4.19	4.36	4.20	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 225	4.70	4.83	4.50	4.74	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	164/ 223	4.68	4.70	4.35	4.71	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	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	0	4	3	6	4.15	1039/1669	4.00	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	715/1666	4.04	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	453/1421	4.16	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	641/1617	3.92	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1192/1555	3.29	3.39	4.00	3.96	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	690/1543	4.02	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	446/1647	4.38	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	1039/1668	4.81	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	725/1605	3.81	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	424/1514	4.40	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	862/1551	4.54	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	482/1503	4.06	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	10	4.58	566/1506	4.21	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	1027/1311	3.18	3.76	3.85	3.96	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	849/1490	3.61	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1148/1502	3.84	4.06	4.26	4.31	3.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1038/1489	3.88	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	447/1006	3.76	3.40	4.00	3.99	4.13	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	4.38	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 233	****	4.47	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	4.83	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.70	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	4.72	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.33	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: CMSC 203 0101
 Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES
 Instructor: ARTOLA, PAUL
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 407
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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	9				
				?	0						

Course Section: CMSC 203 0201
 Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES
 Instructor: CHANG, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 408
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	11	16	4.37	781/1669	4.00	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	9	15	4.20	957/1666	4.04	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	6	5	18	4.41	670/1421	4.16	4.27	4.24	4.35	4.41		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	1029/1617	3.92	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	9	6	3	6	2	2	2.53	1519/1555	3.29	3.39	4.00	3.96	2.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	1	4	7	6	4.00	895/1543	4.02	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	7	17	4.41	634/1647	4.38	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1668	4.81	4.67	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	2	8	17	1	3.61	1312/1605	3.81	4.09	4.07	4.15	3.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	5	5	20	4.50	799/1514	4.40	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	5	4	21	4.53	1168/1551	4.54	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	10	10	7	3.67	1277/1503	4.06	4.16	4.24	4.29	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	11	13	4.13	1002/1506	4.21	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	16	3	3	5	2	0	2.46	1234/1311	3.18	3.76	3.85	3.96	2.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1003/1490	3.61	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1013/1502	3.84	4.06	4.26	4.31	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	953/1489	3.88	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	6	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/1006	3.76	3.40	4.00	3.99	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	4	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	3	Under-grad	30	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	2						

Course Section: CMSC 203 0301
 Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES
 Instructor: YESHA, YAACOV
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 409
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	4	4	0	3.09	1589/1669	4.00	4.28	4.23	4.34	3.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	3	4	1	3.27	1538/1666	4.04	4.23	4.19	4.29	3.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	1112/1421	4.16	4.27	4.24	4.35	3.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1497/1617	3.92	4.24	4.15	4.24	3.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	4	2	2	3.44	1272/1555	3.29	3.39	4.00	3.96	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	6	0	3.60	1226/1543	4.02	4.11	4.06	4.10	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	1043/1647	4.38	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	901/1668	4.81	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	6	2	0	3.11	1493/1605	3.81	4.09	4.07	4.15	3.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	1	6	2	3.73	1334/1514	4.40	4.40	4.39	4.39	3.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	1392/1551	4.54	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.09	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	6	0	3.36	1374/1503	4.06	4.16	4.24	4.29	3.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	4	4	0	3.33	1361/1506	4.21	4.11	4.26	4.33	3.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	5	3	1	3.56	914/1311	3.18	3.76	3.85	3.96	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	3	2	0	2.75	1404/1490	3.61	3.90	4.05	4.11	2.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	4	3	0	3.13	1388/1502	3.84	4.06	4.26	4.31	3.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	1	3	2	0	2.63	1459/1489	3.88	4.13	4.29	4.36	2.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	810/1006	3.76	3.40	4.00	3.99	3.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 226	****	4.38	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 233	****	4.47	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 225	****	4.83	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.70	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	4.72	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.33	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: CMSC 203 0301
 Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES
 Instructor: YESHA, YAACOV
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 409
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course Section: CMSC 203 0401
 Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES
 Instructor: FREY, DENNIS
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 410
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	9	18	4.38	769/1669	4.00	4.28	4.23	4.34	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	16	13	4.31	801/1666	4.04	4.23	4.19	4.29	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	5	11	11	3.81	1112/1421	4.16	4.27	4.24	4.35	3.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	2	1	9	8	4.15	911/1617	3.92	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	2	10	11	4	3.63	1163/1555	3.29	3.39	4.00	3.96	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	3	9	8	4.25	659/1543	4.02	4.11	4.06	4.10	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	12	18	4.55	435/1647	4.38	4.26	4.12	4.19	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	23	4.74	978/1668	4.81	4.67	4.67	4.59	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	2	11	12	4.31	631/1605	3.81	4.09	4.07	4.15	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	6	22	4.61	663/1514	4.40	4.40	4.39	4.39	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	25	4.77	843/1551	4.54	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	10	20	4.61	451/1503	4.06	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	25	4.77	326/1506	4.21	4.11	4.26	4.33	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	2	1	7	3	4	3.35	1018/1311	3.18	3.76	3.85	3.96	3.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	956/1490	3.61	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	790/1502	3.84	4.06	4.26	4.31	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	500/1489	3.88	4.13	4.29	4.36	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	5	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/1006	3.76	3.40	4.00	3.99	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.47	4.19	4.36	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.20	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	11	General	1	Under-grad	32	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	1						

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	6	3	7	2	3.16	1582/1669	2.81	4.28	4.23	4.28	3.16	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	7	6	0	2.84	1602/1666	2.61	4.23	4.19	4.20	2.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	6	5	6	1	3.00	1357/1421	3.00	4.27	4.24	4.25	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	3	5	3	2	3.14	1494/1617	3.24	4.24	4.15	4.22	3.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	4	3	2	3	2	2.71	1497/1555	2.52	3.39	4.00	4.03	2.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	1	2	7	2	3.43	1294/1543	3.10	4.11	4.06	4.14	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	6	5	7	1	3.16	1512/1647	2.70	4.26	4.12	4.14	3.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	1	0	12	5	4.00	1530/1668	3.88	4.67	4.67	4.68	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	5	1	9	3	0	2.56	1558/1605	2.44	4.09	4.07	4.09	2.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	8	4	3	2	2.74	1481/1514	2.60	4.40	4.39	4.46	2.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	6	6	5	3.68	1475/1551	3.34	4.55	4.66	4.70	3.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	7	5	5	2	0	2.11	1488/1503	2.05	4.16	4.24	4.28	2.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	8	2	2	3	2.58	1450/1506	2.37	4.11	4.26	4.30	2.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	3	5	6	0	1	2.40	1245/1311	2.37	3.76	3.85	3.97	2.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	4	0	1	0	2.00	1473/1490	1.86	3.90	4.05	4.11	2.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	4	0	1	0	2	2.43	1482/1502	2.64	4.06	4.26	4.28	2.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	2	1	1	2	3.14	1384/1489	3.43	4.13	4.29	4.35	3.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.47	4.19	4.13	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 12	Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C 2	General 0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D 1	Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 4
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
				Other	18

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: CMSC 313 0201
 Title COMP ORGAN & ASSEMB LA
 Instructor: BURT, GARY
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 412
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	5	1	3	4	0	2.46	1651/1669	2.81	4.28	4.23	4.28	2.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	2	5	2	0	2.38	1643/1666	2.61	4.23	4.19	4.20	2.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	2	4	2	3.00	1357/1421	3.00	4.27	4.24	4.25	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	2	1	1	2	3	3.33	1448/1617	3.24	4.24	4.15	4.22	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	1	3	3	0	2.33	1539/1555	2.52	3.39	4.00	4.03	2.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	2	3	0	2	2.78	1485/1543	3.10	4.11	4.06	4.14	2.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	2	3	1	1	2.25	1607/1647	2.70	4.26	4.12	4.14	2.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	11	0	3.77	1613/1668	3.88	4.67	4.67	4.68	3.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	3	3	5	1	0	2.33	1573/1605	2.44	4.09	4.07	4.09	2.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	5	1	4	2	1	2.46	1488/1514	2.60	4.40	4.39	4.46	2.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	4	1	2	3	3	3.00	1525/1551	3.34	4.55	4.66	4.70	3.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	7	1	3	2	0	2.00	1492/1503	2.05	4.16	4.24	4.28	2.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	2	5	1	0	2.15	1487/1506	2.37	4.11	4.26	4.30	2.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	5	1	4	1	1	2.33	1253/1311	2.37	3.76	3.85	3.97	2.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	3	1	0	0	1.71	1485/1490	1.86	3.90	4.05	4.11	1.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	1	1	2	1	2.86	1431/1502	2.64	4.06	4.26	4.28	2.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1209/1489	3.43	4.13	4.29	4.35	3.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.47	4.19	4.13	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.47	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: CMSC 331 0101
 Title PRIN OF PROG LANGUAGES
 Instructor: MCSHANE, MARGE
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 413
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	4	5	13	11	3.85	1320/1669	3.93	4.28	4.23	4.28	3.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	8	11	11	3.85	1273/1666	3.93	4.23	4.19	4.20	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	5	17	9	3.88	1072/1421	3.94	4.27	4.24	4.25	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	5	5	14	5	3.57	1349/1617	3.62	4.24	4.15	4.22	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	9	13	6	3.59	1182/1555	3.59	3.39	4.00	4.03	3.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	6	8	7	4.05	869/1543	4.02	4.11	4.06	4.14	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	7	12	11	3.82	1232/1647	3.66	4.26	4.12	4.14	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	713/1668	3.75	4.67	4.67	4.68	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	3	1	7	14	4	3.52	1352/1605	3.76	4.09	4.07	4.09	3.52	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	6	23	4.55	751/1514	4.27	4.40	4.39	4.46	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	6	11	15	4.21	1354/1551	4.23	4.55	4.66	4.70	4.21	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	3	15	10	3.94	1137/1503	3.97	4.16	4.24	4.28	3.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	8	11	14	4.18	965/1506	4.34	4.11	4.26	4.30	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	2	4	8	6	10	3.60	890/1311	3.93	3.76	3.85	3.97	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	2	4	5	3	3.64	1097/1490	4.32	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	1241/1502	4.35	4.06	4.26	4.28	3.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	893/1489	4.65	4.13	4.29	4.35	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	8	1	0	4	2	0	3.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.47	4.19	4.13	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.33	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.12	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: CMSC 331 0101
 Title PRIN OF PROG LANGUAGES
 Instructor: MCSHANE, MARGE
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 413
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	17
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	33	Non-major	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	1						

Course Section: CMSC 331 0201
 Title PRIN OF PROG LANGUAGES
 Instructor: VICK, SHON
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 414
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	0	2	4.00	1173/1669	3.93	4.28	4.23	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1094/1666	3.93	4.23	4.19	4.20	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	969/1421	3.94	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1301/1617	3.62	4.24	4.15	4.22	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	895/1543	4.02	4.11	4.06	4.14	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1393/1647	3.66	4.26	4.12	4.14	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	2.60	1662/1668	3.75	4.67	4.67	4.68	2.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	918/1605	3.76	4.09	4.07	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1199/1514	4.27	4.40	4.39	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1338/1551	4.23	4.55	4.66	4.70	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1066/1503	3.97	4.16	4.24	4.28	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	642/1506	4.34	4.11	4.26	4.30	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	445/1311	3.93	3.76	3.85	3.97	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	4.32	3.90	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	4.35	4.06	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	4.65	4.13	4.29	4.35	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	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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 341 0101
 Title DATA STRUCTURES
 Instructor: FREY, DENNIS
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 415
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	6	13	4.30	852/1669	4.45	4.28	4.23	4.28	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	6	12	4.36	740/1666	4.25	4.23	4.19	4.20	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	4	14	4.41	683/1421	4.41	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	1	2	3	11	4.22	831/1617	4.33	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	0	7	4	4	3.47	1249/1555	3.53	3.39	4.00	4.03	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	638/1543	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.14	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	9	10	4.17	940/1647	4.43	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1668	4.97	4.67	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	0	1	9	4	4.00	918/1605	4.10	4.09	4.07	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	600/1514	4.61	4.40	4.39	4.46	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	20	4.78	825/1551	4.82	4.55	4.66	4.70	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	0	7	14	4.39	730/1503	4.36	4.16	4.24	4.28	4.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	6	14	4.30	868/1506	4.50	4.11	4.26	4.30	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	2	3	5	8	4.06	562/1311	4.15	3.76	3.85	3.97	4.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/1490	3.75	3.90	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1502	3.78	4.06	4.26	4.28	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1489	3.38	4.13	4.29	4.35	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 7	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 1	Other	18
			? 1		

Course Section: CMSC 341 0201
 Title: DATA STRUCTURES
 Instructor: EDELMAN, MITCHE
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 416
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	2	6	16	4.48	618/1669	4.45	4.28	4.23	4.28	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	7	9	3.96	1150/1666	4.25	4.23	4.19	4.20	3.96	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	10	11	4.20	863/1421	4.41	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	612/1617	4.33	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	2	8	1	8	3.65	1141/1555	3.53	3.39	4.00	4.03	3.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	1	3	4	7	3.94	981/1543	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.14	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	2	17	4.36	713/1647	4.43	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	641/1668	4.97	4.67	4.67	4.68	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	5	8	4	3.94	1022/1605	4.10	4.09	4.07	4.09	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	10	13	4.44	892/1514	4.61	4.40	4.39	4.46	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	806/1551	4.82	4.55	4.66	4.70	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	9	2	12	4.13	987/1503	4.36	4.16	4.24	4.28	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	4	15	4.38	799/1506	4.50	4.11	4.26	4.30	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	4	8	11	4.30	414/1311	4.15	3.76	3.85	3.97	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1036/1490	3.75	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1196/1502	3.78	4.06	4.26	4.28	3.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	3	2	0	3	3.38	1328/1489	3.38	4.13	4.29	4.35	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	5	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	4.38	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.47	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	4.83	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	****	4.70	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 206	****	4.72	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.33	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: CMSC 341 0201
 Title DATA STRUCTURES
 Instructor: EDELMAN, MITCHE
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 416
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	12
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	9	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	22				
				?	0						

Course Section: CMSC 341 0301
 Title DATA STRUCTURES
 Instructor: FREY, DENNIS
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 417
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	7	9	4.56	522/1669	4.45	4.28	4.23	4.28	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	648/1666	4.25	4.23	4.19	4.20	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	441/1421	4.41	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	717/1617	4.33	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1257/1555	3.53	3.39	4.00	4.03	3.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	325/1543	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.14	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	213/1647	4.43	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1668	4.97	4.67	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	565/1605	4.10	4.09	4.07	4.09	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	441/1514	4.61	4.40	4.39	4.46	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	594/1551	4.82	4.55	4.66	4.70	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	500/1503	4.36	4.16	4.24	4.28	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	273/1506	4.50	4.11	4.26	4.30	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	547/1311	4.15	3.76	3.85	3.97	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1490	3.75	3.90	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1502	3.78	4.06	4.26	4.28	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1489	3.38	4.13	4.29	4.35	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.38	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.47	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.83	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.70	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.72	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.33	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: CMSC 341 0301
 Title DATA STRUCTURES
 Instructor: FREY, DENNIS
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 417
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Course Section: CMSC 341H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: OATES, TIMOTHY
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 418
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	8	4.73	306/1669	4.73	4.28	4.23	4.28	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	281/1666	4.73	4.23	4.19	4.20	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	356/1421	4.70	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	288/1617	4.70	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	3	0	3	3.10	1413/1555	3.10	3.39	4.00	4.03	3.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	759/1543	4.17	4.11	4.06	4.14	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	241/1647	4.73	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	882/1668	4.82	4.67	4.67	4.68	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	210/1605	4.70	4.09	4.07	4.09	4.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	751/1514	4.55	4.40	4.39	4.46	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	512/1551	4.91	4.55	4.66	4.70	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	210/1503	4.82	4.16	4.24	4.28	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	394/1506	4.73	4.11	4.26	4.30	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	298/1311	4.45	3.76	3.85	3.97	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	389/1490	4.60	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	754/1502	4.40	4.06	4.26	4.28	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	800/1489	4.40	4.13	4.29	4.35	4.40	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.47	4.19	4.13	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.33	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: CMSC 341H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: OATES, TIMOTHY
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 418
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	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	11				
				?	0						

Course Section: CMSC 345 0101
 Title SOFTWARE DESIGN/DEVELO
 Instructor: MITCHELL, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 419
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	7	9	4.26	901/1669	4.23	4.28	4.23	4.28	4.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	854/1666	4.16	4.23	4.19	4.20	4.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	863/1421	4.00	4.27	4.24	4.25	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	5	8	4.11	970/1617	4.10	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	4	3	6	3.69	1118/1555	3.61	3.39	4.00	4.03	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	7	8	4.05	863/1543	3.80	4.11	4.06	4.14	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	6	2	8	3.74	1285/1647	3.84	4.26	4.12	4.14	3.74	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	428/1668	4.97	4.67	4.67	4.68	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	678/1605	4.19	4.09	4.07	4.09	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	631/1514	4.49	4.40	4.39	4.46	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	825/1551	4.69	4.55	4.66	4.70	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	604/1503	4.34	4.16	4.24	4.28	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	2	11	4.16	988/1506	4.05	4.11	4.26	4.30	4.16	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	1	3	3	7	3.75	791/1311	3.74	3.76	3.85	3.97	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	535/1490	4.16	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	438/1502	4.47	4.06	4.26	4.28	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	329/1489	4.68	4.13	4.29	4.35	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	299/1006	4.27	3.40	4.00	4.10	4.42	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 19 Non-major 2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 18	
			? 0		

Course Section: CMSC 345 0201
 Title SOFTWARE DESIGN/DEVELO
 Instructor: MITCHELL, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 420
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	8	8	4.20	988/1669	4.23	4.28	4.23	4.28	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	5	9	4.05	1065/1666	4.16	4.23	4.19	4.20	4.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	2	1	6	5	3.80	1118/1421	4.00	4.27	4.24	4.25	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	8	8	4.10	970/1617	4.10	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	5	8	3	3.53	1217/1555	3.61	3.39	4.00	4.03	3.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	6	4	5	3.56	1243/1543	3.80	4.11	4.06	4.14	3.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	4	4	9	3.95	1102/1647	3.84	4.26	4.12	4.14	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1668	4.97	4.67	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	11	5	4.11	851/1605	4.19	4.09	4.07	4.09	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	1003/1514	4.49	4.40	4.39	4.46	4.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	1111/1551	4.69	4.55	4.66	4.70	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	10	7	4.20	932/1503	4.34	4.16	4.24	4.28	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	8	6	3.95	1121/1506	4.05	4.11	4.26	4.30	3.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	8	2	7	3.74	801/1311	3.74	3.76	3.85	3.97	3.74	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	4	6	6	3.89	965/1490	4.16	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	3	4	10	4.22	900/1502	4.47	4.06	4.26	4.28	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	684/1489	4.68	4.13	4.29	4.35	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	447/1006	4.27	3.40	4.00	4.10	4.13	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 14	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	19
			? 0		

Course Section: CMSC 411 0101
 Title: COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE
 Instructor: SQUIRE, JON S
 Enrollment: 55
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 421
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	8	9	10	4.00	1173/1669	4.18	4.28	4.23	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	8	14	4.14	1001/1666	4.40	4.23	4.19	4.22	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	6	16	4.41	683/1421	4.50	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	3	2	8	8	4.00	1029/1617	4.26	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	6	7	5	3	3.24	1368/1555	3.26	3.39	4.00	4.08	3.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	5	4	8	4.18	747/1543	4.17	4.11	4.06	4.18	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	9	14	4.42	617/1647	4.54	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	570/1668	4.66	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	6	10	6	4.00	918/1605	4.25	4.09	4.07	4.16	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	7	17	4.48	830/1514	4.62	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	1014/1551	4.84	4.55	4.66	4.73	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	9	13	4.30	843/1503	4.37	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	6	8	12	4.15	995/1506	4.35	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	1	3	7	12	4.17	501/1311	4.21	3.76	3.85	3.88	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1490	****	3.90	4.05	4.26	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1502	****	4.06	4.26	4.46	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1489	****	4.13	4.29	4.52	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.21	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.38	4.20	4.61	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.47	4.19	4.40	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.83	4.50	4.39	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.70	4.35	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.72	4.15	4.20	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.33	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	3.94	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****	

Course Section: CMSC 411 0101
 Title: COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE
 Instructor: SQUIRE, JON S
 Enrollment: 55
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 421
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	9
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	2						

Course Section: CMSC 411 0201
 Title: COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE
 Instructor: SQUIRE, JON S
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 422
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	6	11	4.35	793/1669	4.18	4.28	4.23	4.39	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	372/1666	4.40	4.23	4.19	4.22	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	466/1421	4.50	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	475/1617	4.26	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	2	4	5	4	3.28	1350/1555	3.26	3.39	4.00	4.08	3.28	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	759/1543	4.17	4.11	4.06	4.18	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	313/1647	4.54	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	8	4.40	1274/1668	4.66	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	4.50	373/1605	4.25	4.09	4.07	4.16	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	441/1514	4.62	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1551	4.84	4.55	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	653/1503	4.37	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	14	4.55	594/1506	4.35	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	4	3	11	4.26	439/1311	4.21	3.76	3.85	3.88	4.26	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1490	****	3.90	4.05	4.26	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/1502	****	4.06	4.26	4.46	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1489	****	4.13	4.29	4.52	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.21	****	

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General	0
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		Under-grad 20
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	18
			? 0		

Course Section: CMSC 421 0101
 Title PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS
 Instructor: KALPAKIS, KONST
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 423
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	15	4.70	345/1669	4.05	4.28	4.23	4.39	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	8	4.15	993/1666	3.74	4.23	4.19	4.22	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	9	6	3.95	1015/1421	4.00	4.27	4.24	4.38	3.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	2	7	6	3.89	1179/1617	3.37	4.24	4.15	4.22	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	3	1	7	6	3.78	1045/1555	3.50	3.39	4.00	4.08	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	1	1	0	5	2	3.67	1195/1543	3.55	4.11	4.06	4.18	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	5	4	3	8	3.70	1300/1647	3.60	4.26	4.12	4.14	3.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	428/1668	4.65	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	565/1605	3.74	4.09	4.07	4.16	4.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	715/1514	3.85	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	825/1551	4.26	4.55	4.66	4.73	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	823/1503	3.69	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	942/1506	3.38	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	6	6	4	3.71	818/1311	3.25	3.76	3.85	3.88	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1490	3.40	3.90	4.05	4.26	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	2	0	2	0	3.00	****/1502	4.30	4.06	4.26	4.46	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1489	4.40	4.13	4.29	4.52	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.21	****	

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 7		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	0
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	19
			? 1		

Course Section: CMSC 421 0201
 Title PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS
 Instructor: BURT, GARY
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 424
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	5	5	5	3.88	1307/1669	4.05	4.28	4.23	4.39	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	6	4	4	3.50	1466/1666	3.74	4.23	4.19	4.22	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	4	8	4.13	916/1421	4.00	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	4	3	1	4	3.23	1478/1617	3.37	4.24	4.15	4.22	3.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	4	3	3	3.21	1378/1555	3.50	3.39	4.00	4.08	3.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	3	2	2	6	3.85	1068/1543	3.55	4.11	4.06	4.18	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	6	5	2	3.31	1484/1647	3.60	4.26	4.12	4.14	3.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	1151/1668	4.65	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	7	6	2	3.56	1330/1605	3.74	4.09	4.07	4.16	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	7	4	4	3.63	1363/1514	3.85	4.40	4.39	4.45	3.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	1384/1551	4.26	4.55	4.66	4.73	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	5	8	2	3.63	1293/1503	3.69	4.16	4.24	4.27	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	6	3	3	3.19	1386/1506	3.38	4.11	4.26	4.29	3.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	1	2	5	3	3.46	961/1311	3.25	3.76	3.85	3.88	3.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1117/1490	3.40	3.90	4.05	4.26	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	754/1502	4.30	4.06	4.26	4.46	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	800/1489	4.40	4.13	4.29	4.52	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.21	****	

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 11		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 2		

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	4	6	3	3.56	1454/1669	4.05	4.28	4.23	4.39	3.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	8	7	1	3.56	1445/1666	3.74	4.23	4.19	4.22	3.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	4	3.94	1033/1421	4.00	4.27	4.24	4.38	3.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	0	7	4	1	3.00	1516/1617	3.37	4.24	4.15	4.22	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	6	6	1	3.50	1227/1555	3.50	3.39	4.00	4.08	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	4	3	4	2	3.14	1379/1543	3.55	4.11	4.06	4.18	3.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	7	3	3.80	1250/1647	3.60	4.26	4.12	4.14	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	1248/1668	4.65	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	3	4	5	1	3.31	1441/1605	3.74	4.09	4.07	4.16	3.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	5	3	4	3	3.33	1418/1514	3.85	4.40	4.39	4.45	3.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	6	5	4	3.87	1450/1551	4.26	4.55	4.66	4.73	3.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	4	6	1	3.13	1412/1503	3.69	4.16	4.24	4.27	3.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	1	4	3	2	2.73	1438/1506	3.38	4.11	4.26	4.29	2.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	4	4	1	1	2.58	1215/1311	3.25	3.76	3.85	3.88	2.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1288/1490	3.40	3.90	4.05	4.26	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	920/1502	4.30	4.06	4.26	4.46	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	800/1489	4.40	4.13	4.29	4.52	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.21	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 226	****	4.38	4.20	4.61	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.47	4.19	4.40	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	4.83	4.50	4.39	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.70	4.35	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 206	****	4.72	4.15	4.20	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.33	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	3.94	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****	

Course Section: CMSC 421 0301
 Title PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS
 Instructor: YESHA, YELENA
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 425
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	Graduate	2	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	8
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

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	1	1	13	5	4.10	1103/1669	4.10	4.28	4.23	4.39	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	11	4	3.85	1273/1666	3.85	4.23	4.19	4.22	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	12	5	4.10	932/1421	4.10	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	10	5	3.90	1168/1617	3.90	4.24	4.15	4.22	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	3	9	4	3.68	1118/1555	3.68	3.39	4.00	4.08	3.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	2	10	4	3.83	1076/1543	3.83	4.11	4.06	4.18	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	7	6	6	3.85	1205/1647	3.85	4.26	4.12	4.14	3.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	1	17	4.70	1039/1668	4.70	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	5	8	4	3.83	1148/1605	3.83	4.09	4.07	4.16	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	775/1514	4.53	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	1216/1551	4.47	4.55	4.66	4.73	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	9	6	4.11	1015/1503	4.11	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	7	8	4.05	1047/1506	4.05	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	1	4	4	5	3.73	801/1311	3.73	3.76	3.85	3.88	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	956/1490	3.91	3.90	4.05	4.26	3.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	693/1502	4.45	4.06	4.26	4.46	4.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	909/1489	4.27	4.13	4.29	4.52	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	8	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.21	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 226	****	4.38	4.20	4.61	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.47	4.19	4.40	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	4.83	4.50	4.39	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 223	****	4.70	4.35	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 206	****	4.72	4.15	4.20	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.33	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	3.94	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****	

Course Section: CMSC 426 0101
 Title PRINC COMPUTER SECURIT
 Instructor: SIVALINGAM, KRI
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 426
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	14	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course Section: CMSC 432 0101
 Title OBJECT-ORIENT PROGRAM
 Instructor: VICK, SHON
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 427
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	0	4	4	2	3.55	1462/1669	3.55	4.28	4.23	4.39	3.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	3	2	3.42	1507/1666	3.42	4.23	4.19	4.22	3.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	4	1	3.18	1325/1421	3.18	4.27	4.24	4.38	3.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	5	2	3.55	1356/1617	3.55	4.24	4.15	4.22	3.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1326/1555	3.33	3.39	4.00	4.08	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1101/1543	3.80	4.11	4.06	4.18	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	6	1	3.55	1377/1647	3.55	4.26	4.12	4.14	3.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	1	1	0	6	2	3.70	1622/1668	3.70	4.67	4.67	4.70	3.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	7	0	3.78	1195/1605	3.78	4.09	4.07	4.16	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1199/1514	4.00	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	936/1551	4.73	4.55	4.66	4.73	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	9	1	3.91	1168/1503	3.91	4.16	4.24	4.27	3.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	965/1506	4.18	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	3	2	3	3.50	939/1311	3.50	3.76	3.85	3.88	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	3.90	4.05	4.26	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1208/1502	3.75	4.06	4.26	4.46	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1191/1489	3.75	4.13	4.29	4.52	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: CMSC 433 0101
 Title: SCRIPTING LANGUAGES
 Instructor: HOOD, DANIEL J
 Enrollment: 59
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 428
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	28	4.76	256/1669	4.76	4.28	4.23	4.39	4.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	25	4.62	425/1666	4.62	4.23	4.19	4.22	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	9	19	4.52	547/1421	4.52	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	288/1617	4.70	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	5	3	3	5	7	3.26	1354/1555	3.26	3.39	4.00	4.08	3.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	562/1543	4.35	4.11	4.06	4.18	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	8	25	4.71	260/1647	4.71	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	214/1668	4.97	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	13	15	4.43	461/1605	4.43	4.09	4.07	4.16	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	29	4.85	291/1514	4.85	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	29	4.88	594/1551	4.88	4.55	4.66	4.73	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	9	24	4.73	312/1503	4.73	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	5	9	17	4.24	917/1506	4.24	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	3	4	20	4.63	209/1311	4.63	3.76	3.85	3.88	4.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	****/1490	****	3.90	4.05	4.26	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	****/1502	****	4.06	4.26	4.46	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/1489	****	4.13	4.29	4.52	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	28	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 30
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 4	C 3	General 12	Under-grad 34 Non-major 4
84-150	21	3.00-3.49 12	D 1		
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 16	
			? 0		

Course Section: CMSC 435 0101
 Title: COMPUTER GRAPHICS
 Instructor: OLANO, MARC
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 429
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	13	4.93	102/1669	4.93	4.28	4.23	4.39	4.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	293/1666	4.71	4.23	4.19	4.22	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	728/1421	4.36	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.24	4.15	4.22	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	2	0	6	4.11	698/1555	4.11	3.39	4.00	4.08	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	180/1543	4.75	4.11	4.06	4.18	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	139/1647	4.86	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	79/1605	4.92	4.09	4.07	4.16	4.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	151/1514	4.92	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.55	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	451/1503	4.62	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	433/1506	4.69	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	0	1	11	4.62	214/1311	4.62	3.76	3.85	3.88	4.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	558/1490	4.40	3.90	4.05	4.26	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1013/1502	4.00	4.06	4.26	4.46	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1038/1489	4.00	4.13	4.29	4.52	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 1
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	8
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 1		13
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	8

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: CMSC 441 0101
 Title ALGORITHMS
 Instructor: CHANG, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 430
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	11	21	4.61	478/1669	4.61	4.28	4.23	4.39	4.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	28	4.82	173/1666	4.82	4.23	4.19	4.22	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	27	4.79	242/1421	4.79	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	265/1617	4.71	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	2	5	8	11	3.86	980/1555	3.86	3.39	4.00	4.08	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	134/1543	4.83	4.11	4.06	4.18	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	25	4.70	270/1647	4.70	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	131/1605	4.82	4.09	4.07	4.16	4.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	27	4.84	308/1514	4.84	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	512/1551	4.90	4.55	4.66	4.73	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	0	8	22	4.61	451/1503	4.61	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	11	18	4.52	632/1506	4.52	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	10	1	1	2	7	8	4.05	562/1311	4.05	3.76	3.85	3.88	4.05	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1490	****	3.90	4.05	4.26	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	1	4	0	1	0	2.17	****/1502	****	4.06	4.26	4.46	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1489	****	4.13	4.29	4.52	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	31	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.21	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.47	4.19	4.40	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 15	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 14		Graduate
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	21	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	33
			P 0		Major
			I 0		Non-major
			? 0		1
#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				Other	32

Course Section: CMSC 442 0101
 Title INFO & CODING THEORY
 Instructor: LOMONACO JR, SA
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 431
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	12	4.71	318/1669	4.71	4.28	4.23	4.39	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	206/1666	4.79	4.23	4.19	4.22	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	184/1421	4.86	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	114/1617	4.91	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	389/1555	4.45	3.39	4.00	4.08	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	202/1543	4.73	4.11	4.06	4.18	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	324/1647	4.64	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	631/1605	4.30	4.09	4.07	4.16	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	392/1514	4.79	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	650/1551	4.86	4.55	4.66	4.73	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	243/1503	4.79	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	225/1506	4.86	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	174/1311	4.70	3.76	3.85	3.88	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	849/1490	4.00	3.90	4.05	4.26	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.06	4.26	4.46	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.13	4.29	4.52	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 13	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 2
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	10
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		

Course Section: CMSC 443 0101
 Title CRYPTOLOGY
 Instructor: STEPHENS, ARTHU
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 432
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	6	4.44	676/1669	4.44	4.28	4.23	4.39	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	359/1666	4.67	4.23	4.19	4.22	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	511/1421	4.56	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	370/1617	4.63	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	0	4	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.39	4.00	4.08	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	783/1543	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.18	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	424/1647	4.56	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1382/1668	4.25	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	840/1605	4.11	4.09	4.07	4.16	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	739/1514	4.56	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	1350/1551	4.22	4.55	4.66	4.73	4.22	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1005/1503	4.11	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	934/1506	4.22	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	483/1311	4.20	3.76	3.85	3.88	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1490	****	3.90	4.05	4.26	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1502	****	4.06	4.26	4.46	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1489	****	4.13	4.29	4.52	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.21	****	

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	7
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 1		

Course Section: CMSC 444 0101
 Title INFORMATION ASSURANCE
 Instructor: SHERMAN, ALAN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 433
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	4.60	478/1669	4.60	4.28	4.23	4.39	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1512/1666	3.40	4.23	4.19	4.22	3.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	394/1617	4.60	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	438/1555	4.40	3.39	4.00	4.08	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	298/1543	4.60	4.11	4.06	4.18	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1275/1647	3.75	4.26	4.12	4.14	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	901/1668	4.80	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	918/1605	4.50	4.09	4.07	4.16	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1199/1514	4.00	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.55	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1330/1503	3.50	4.16	4.24	4.27	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1403/1506	3.00	4.11	4.26	4.29	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	939/1311	3.50	3.76	3.85	3.88	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	5.00	3.90	4.05	4.26	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.06	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.13	4.29	4.52	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.21	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	65/ 112	4.50	4.33	4.38	4.74	4.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	62/ 97	4.20	4.20	4.36	4.69	4.20	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	33/ 92	4.80	4.80	4.22	4.48	4.80	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	45/ 105	4.60	4.60	4.20	4.27	4.60	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	46/ 98	4.00	4.00	3.95	3.86	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: CMSC 444 0101
 Title INFORMATION ASSURANCE
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 434
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	4.60	478/1669	4.60	4.28	4.23	4.39	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1512/1666	3.40	4.23	4.19	4.22	3.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	394/1617	4.60	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	438/1555	4.40	3.39	4.00	4.08	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	298/1543	4.60	4.11	4.06	4.18	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1275/1647	3.75	4.26	4.12	4.14	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	901/1668	4.80	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1605	4.50	4.09	4.07	4.16	4.50	
Lecture															
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1311	3.50	3.76	3.85	3.88	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	5.00	3.90	4.05	4.26	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.06	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.13	4.29	4.52	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.21	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	65/ 112	4.50	4.33	4.38	4.74	4.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	62/ 97	4.20	4.20	4.36	4.69	4.20	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	33/ 92	4.80	4.80	4.22	4.48	4.80	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	45/ 105	4.60	4.60	4.20	4.27	4.60	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	46/ 98	4.00	4.00	3.95	3.86	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: CMSC 445 0101
 Title SOFTWARE ENGINEERING
 Instructor: SIDHU, DEEPIINDE
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 435
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	4	4	2	2	1	2.38	1658/1669	2.38	4.28	4.23	4.39	2.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	3	2	2	1	2.31	1652/1666	2.31	4.23	4.19	4.22	2.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	6	1	3	1	2.62	1400/1421	2.62	4.27	4.24	4.38	2.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	1	2	2	2	2.46	1594/1617	2.46	4.24	4.15	4.22	2.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	2	4	3	3.23	1368/1555	3.23	3.39	4.00	4.08	3.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	7	3	1	0	1	1.75	1539/1543	1.75	4.11	4.06	4.18	1.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	7	3	1	0	2	2.00	1619/1647	2.00	4.26	4.12	4.14	2.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	6	7	0	0	2.54	1663/1668	2.54	4.67	4.67	4.70	2.54	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	4	5	3	0	0	1.92	1594/1605	1.92	4.09	4.07	4.16	1.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	4	3	3	1	2	2.54	1485/1514	2.54	4.40	4.39	4.45	2.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	3	5	3	3.62	1483/1551	3.62	4.55	4.66	4.73	3.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	5	2	2	2	2.77	1451/1503	2.77	4.16	4.24	4.27	2.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	3	4	0	2	2.46	1462/1506	2.46	4.11	4.26	4.29	2.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	6	2	0	1	2	2.18	1265/1311	2.18	3.76	3.85	3.88	2.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1490	****	3.90	4.05	4.26	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1502	****	4.06	4.26	4.46	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1489	****	4.13	4.29	4.52	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: CMSC 451 0101
 Title AUTOMATA THRY& FORM LA
 Instructor: YESHA, YAACOV
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 436
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	6	3	3.79	1359/1669	3.79	4.28	4.23	4.39	3.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	841/1666	4.29	4.23	4.19	4.22	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	493/1421	4.57	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	946/1617	4.13	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	4	0	1	3	3	3.09	1414/1555	3.09	3.39	4.00	4.08	3.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	543/1543	4.38	4.11	4.06	4.18	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	728/1647	4.36	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	631/1605	4.30	4.09	4.07	4.16	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	1003/1514	4.36	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	825/1551	4.79	4.55	4.66	4.73	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	1030/1503	4.07	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	942/1506	4.21	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.76	3.85	3.88	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1490	****	3.90	4.05	4.26	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1502	****	4.06	4.26	4.46	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1489	****	4.13	4.29	4.52	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	6
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: CMSC 455 0101
 Title NUMERICAL COMPUTATIONS
 Instructor: STEPHENS, ARTHU
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 437
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	4	2	4.33	816/1669	4.33	4.28	4.23	4.39	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	777/1666	4.33	4.23	4.19	4.22	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	557/1421	4.50	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	899/1617	4.17	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1427/1555	3.00	3.39	4.00	4.08	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	759/1543	4.17	4.11	4.06	4.18	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	759/1647	4.33	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1438/1668	4.17	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	789/1605	4.17	4.09	4.07	4.16	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1295/1514	3.83	4.40	4.39	4.45	3.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1456/1551	3.83	4.55	4.66	4.73	3.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1380/1503	3.33	4.16	4.24	4.27	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1209/1506	3.83	4.11	4.26	4.29	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1227/1311	2.50	3.76	3.85	3.88	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1490	****	3.90	4.05	4.26	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1502	****	4.06	4.26	4.46	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1489	****	4.13	4.29	4.52	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.21	****	

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 1		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 6
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: CMSC 461 0101
 Title DATABASE MANGMT SYSTEM
 Instructor: KARGUPTA, HILLO
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 438
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	4	4.44	676/1669	4.44	4.28	4.23	4.39	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	922/1666	4.22	4.23	4.19	4.22	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	746/1421	4.33	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	770/1617	4.29	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	698/1555	4.11	3.39	4.00	4.08	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	490/1543	4.43	4.11	4.06	4.18	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	583/1647	4.44	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1240/1668	4.44	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	373/1605	4.50	4.09	4.07	4.16	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	892/1514	4.44	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1152/1551	4.56	4.55	4.66	4.73	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	905/1503	4.22	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	326/1506	4.78	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	791/1311	3.75	3.76	3.85	3.88	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	849/1490	4.00	3.90	4.05	4.26	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	486/1502	4.67	4.06	4.26	4.46	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	865/1489	4.33	4.13	4.29	4.52	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	2	Under-grad	9	Non-major	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	5				
			? 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	5	11	11	18	3.87	1313/1669	3.87	4.28	4.23	4.39	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	8	19	16	4.04	1071/1666	4.04	4.23	4.19	4.22	4.04	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	12	12	22	4.22	847/1421	4.22	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	1	0	7	9	15	4.16	911/1617	4.16	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.16	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	4	4	10	12	13	3.60	1178/1555	3.60	3.39	4.00	4.08	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	8	17	18	4.16	771/1543	4.16	4.11	4.06	4.18	4.16	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	4	20	19	4.20	926/1647	4.20	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1	43	4.93	499/1668	4.93	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	15	18	6	3.68	1261/1605	3.68	4.09	4.07	4.16	3.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	8	10	27	4.37	993/1514	4.37	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.37	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	3	7	35	4.63	1069/1551	4.63	4.55	4.66	4.73	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	10	18	17	4.11	1015/1503	4.11	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	6	9	11	19	3.89	1179/1506	3.89	4.11	4.26	4.29	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	4	3	11	6	16	3.67	839/1311	3.68	3.76	3.85	3.88	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	6	0	6	7	5	3.21	1288/1490	3.21	3.90	4.05	4.26	3.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	3	2	5	3	12	3.76	1202/1502	3.76	4.06	4.26	4.46	3.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	2	0	4	5	13	4.13	999/1489	4.13	4.13	4.29	4.52	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	17	1	1	0	3	1	3.33	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.21	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.38	4.20	4.61	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.47	4.19	4.40	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.83	4.50	4.39	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	****	4.70	4.35	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	4.72	4.15	4.20	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.33	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.00	4.22	3.94	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****	

Course Section: CMSC 471 0101
 Title ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENC
 Instructor: FININ, TIMOTHY
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 439
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	23	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	10	Major	30
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	22	Under-grad	36	Non-major	16
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	2						

Course Section: CMSC 473 0101
 Title NATURAL LANG PROCESSIN
 Instructor: NIRENBURG, SERG
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 440
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	8	4.46	647/1669	4.46	4.28	4.23	4.39	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	993/1666	4.15	4.23	4.19	4.22	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	3	6	3.85	1095/1421	3.85	4.27	4.24	4.38	3.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	455/1617	4.55	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	558/1555	4.25	3.39	4.00	4.08	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.11	4.06	4.18	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	2	6	3.77	1270/1647	3.77	4.26	4.12	4.14	3.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.09	4.07	4.16	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	939/1514	4.42	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	460/1551	4.92	4.55	4.66	4.73	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	702/1503	4.42	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	757/1506	4.42	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	764/1311	3.80	3.76	3.85	3.88	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	667/1490	4.29	3.90	4.05	4.26	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.06	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.13	4.29	4.52	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: CMSC 481 0101
 Title: COMPUTER NETWORKS
 Instructor: PATWARDHAN, ANA
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 441
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	7	3	3.73	1379/1669	3.73	4.28	4.23	4.39	3.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	5	4	3.73	1343/1666	3.73	4.23	4.19	4.22	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	946/1421	4.07	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	3	7	2	3.64	1312/1617	3.64	4.24	4.15	4.22	3.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	5	3	3	3.58	1187/1555	3.58	3.39	4.00	4.08	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	7	2	3.40	1303/1543	3.40	4.11	4.06	4.18	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	728/1647	4.36	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	2	6	6	1	3.40	1400/1605	3.40	4.09	4.07	4.16	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	1148/1514	4.14	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	1254/1551	4.43	4.55	4.66	4.73	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	4	4	4	3.64	1285/1503	3.64	4.16	4.24	4.27	3.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	1	5	3	3.36	1357/1506	3.36	4.11	4.26	4.29	3.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	5	3	2	1	2.91	1160/1311	2.91	3.76	3.85	3.88	2.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	2	1	0	0	1.80	1482/1490	1.80	3.90	4.05	4.26	1.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1160/1502	3.83	4.06	4.26	4.46	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1038/1489	4.00	4.13	4.29	4.52	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	8
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0		15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	8

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: CMSC 486 0101
 Title MOBILE RADIO COMM
 Instructor: GREEN, FRANK E.
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 442
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	5	4	4.09	1110/1669	4.09	4.28	4.23	4.39	4.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	854/1666	4.27	4.23	4.19	4.22	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	466/1421	4.60	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	2	0	2	0	2	3.00	1516/1617	3.00	4.24	4.15	4.22	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	0	3	3	3.44	1272/1555	3.44	3.39	4.00	4.08	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	3	0	3	3.38	1311/1543	3.38	4.11	4.06	4.18	3.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	933/1647	4.18	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	1477/1668	4.10	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.10	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	1092/1605	3.90	4.09	4.07	4.16	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	751/1514	4.55	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	986/1551	4.70	4.55	4.66	4.73	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	835/1503	4.30	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.76	3.85	3.88	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1490	****	3.90	4.05	4.26	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1502	****	4.06	4.26	4.46	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1489	****	4.13	4.29	4.52	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: CMSC 491A 0101
 Title ARTISTIC RENDERING
 Instructor: RHEINGANS, PENN
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 443
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	345/1669	4.70	4.28	4.23	4.39	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	319/1666	4.70	4.23	4.19	4.22	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	280/1421	4.75	4.27	4.24	4.38	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	161/1617	4.80	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	141/1555	4.80	3.39	4.00	4.08	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	298/1543	4.60	4.11	4.06	4.18	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	367/1647	4.60	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	239/1605	4.67	4.09	4.07	4.16	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	189/1514	4.90	4.40	4.39	4.45	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	512/1551	4.90	4.55	4.66	4.73	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	220/1503	4.80	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	286/1506	4.80	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	142/1311	4.75	3.76	3.85	3.88	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	192/1490	4.83	3.90	4.05	4.26	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	306/1502	4.83	4.06	4.26	4.46	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	348/1489	4.83	4.13	4.29	4.52	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	479/1006	4.00	3.40	4.00	4.21	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 6
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 3
Grad.	6	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 491S 0101
 Title WEB SERV ORIEN COMPUTI
 Instructor: HALEM, MILTON
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 444
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	4	2	3.45	1502/1669	3.45	4.28	4.23	4.39	3.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	9	1	0	2.91	1591/1666	2.91	4.23	4.19	4.22	2.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1421	****	4.27	4.24	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	3	3	3.45	1398/1617	3.45	4.24	4.15	4.22	3.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1395/1555	3.17	3.39	4.00	4.08	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1060/1543	3.86	4.11	4.06	4.18	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	4	2	1	2.91	1548/1647	2.91	4.26	4.12	4.14	2.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	713/1668	4.91	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	4	1	2	0	2.71	1544/1605	2.71	4.09	4.07	4.16	2.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	3	3	2	3.36	1413/1514	3.36	4.40	4.39	4.45	3.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	936/1551	4.73	4.55	4.66	4.73	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	5	5	0	0	2.36	1478/1503	2.36	4.16	4.24	4.27	2.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	3	1	1	2.45	1464/1506	2.45	4.11	4.26	4.29	2.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	2	3	1	0	2.57	1217/1311	2.57	3.76	3.85	3.88	2.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1088/1490	3.67	3.90	4.05	4.26	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	818/1502	4.33	4.06	4.26	4.46	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	973/1489	4.17	4.13	4.29	4.52	4.17	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.20	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.80	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.60	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.86	****	

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 7	Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 10	Under-grad 4	Non-major 5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	7	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			

Course Section: CMSC 611 0101
 Title ADV COMPUTER ARCHITECT
 Instructor: YOUNIS, MOHAMED
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 445
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	13	14	4.23	951/1669	4.23	4.28	4.23	4.35	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	20	4.48	577/1666	4.48	4.23	4.19	4.19	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	21	4.48	582/1421	4.48	4.27	4.24	4.33	4.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	5	6	15	4.26	801/1617	4.26	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	4	4	4	13	3.92	905/1555	3.92	3.39	4.00	4.07	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	5	8	15	4.24	669/1543	4.24	4.11	4.06	4.27	4.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	9	19	4.53	446/1647	4.53	4.26	4.12	4.15	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	288/1605	4.62	4.09	4.07	4.13	4.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	76/1514	4.97	4.40	4.39	4.37	4.97	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	358/1551	4.93	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	9	20	4.63	425/1503	4.63	4.16	4.24	4.22	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	22	4.67	471/1506	4.67	4.11	4.26	4.24	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	1	1	3	6	11	4.14	519/1311	4.14	3.76	3.85	3.89	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	576/1490	4.39	3.90	4.05	4.18	4.39	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	567/1502	4.58	4.06	4.26	4.46	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	411/1489	4.78	4.13	4.29	4.44	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	10	1	2	0	1	5	3.78	651/1006	3.78	3.40	4.00	4.11	3.78	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 3	A 22	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7	Graduate	14
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	D 0	Under-grad	17
Grad.	14	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	30
			? 0		

Course Section: CMSC 621 0101
 Title ADV OPERATING SYSTEMS
 Instructor: JOSHI, ANUPAM
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 446
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	11	16	4.54	556/1669	4.54	4.28	4.23	4.35	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	18	4.57	472/1666	4.57	4.23	4.19	4.19	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	15	4.32	755/1421	4.32	4.27	4.24	4.33	4.32	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	13	9	4.07	987/1617	4.07	4.24	4.15	4.24	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	9	12	4.19	622/1555	4.19	3.39	4.00	4.07	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	9	12	3.89	1027/1543	3.89	4.11	4.06	4.27	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	13	9	4.04	1027/1647	4.04	4.26	4.12	4.15	4.04	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	570/1668	4.93	4.67	4.67	4.83	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	13	9	4.41	499/1605	4.41	4.09	4.07	4.13	4.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	11	16	4.54	763/1514	4.54	4.40	4.39	4.37	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	8	19	4.64	1055/1551	4.64	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	12	12	4.25	879/1503	4.25	4.16	4.24	4.22	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	12	13	4.36	819/1506	4.36	4.11	4.26	4.24	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	5	2	3	9	2	3.05	1110/1311	3.05	3.76	3.85	3.89	3.05	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	5	9	3	3.88	965/1490	3.88	3.90	4.05	4.18	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	522/1502	4.63	4.06	4.26	4.46	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	196/1489	4.94	4.13	4.29	4.44	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	10	0	2	0	3	1	3.50	****/1006	****	3.40	4.00	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 2	A 21	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		Graduate 12
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		16
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	28
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	3	3	1	3.00	1596/1669	****	4.14	4.23	4.02	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	2	2	2	3.10	1570/1666	****	3.93	4.19	4.11	3.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	3	0	2	1	2.44	1410/1421	****	4.00	4.24	4.11	2.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	1	3	2	3.10	1500/1617	****	4.02	4.15	3.99	3.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	4	1	3.20	1383/1555	****	4.12	4.00	3.92	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	5	1	3.30	1331/1543	****	3.98	4.06	3.86	3.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	1	5	0	3.00	1526/1647	****	3.81	4.12	4.06	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	3	6	0	3.50	1638/1668	****	4.72	4.67	4.62	3.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	1391/1605	****	3.90	4.07	3.96	3.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	4	2	1	3	3.30	1424/1514	****	4.30	4.39	4.32	3.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	4	1	4	3.80	1462/1551	****	4.63	4.66	4.55	3.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	1	4	3.80	1210/1503	****	4.15	4.24	4.17	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	0	3	3	3.50	1319/1506	****	4.07	4.26	4.17	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	0	1	3	1	3.14	1091/1311	****	4.14	3.85	3.68	3.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	4	2	1	3.25	1265/1490	****	4.11	4.05	3.85	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	4	2	1	3.38	1346/1502	****	4.32	4.26	4.06	3.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	0	3	2	1	3.00	1398/1489	****	4.23	4.29	4.07	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	891/1006	****	4.20	4.00	3.81	3.20	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	3.81	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.51	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	****	4.04	4.35	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.53	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 97	****	4.23	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.93	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 105	****	4.17	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	3.80	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 58	****	3.70	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 52	****	3.53	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 40	****	2.40	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.48	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	4.67	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	4.00	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CMSC 681 0101
 Title Advanced Comp. Network
 Instructor: Sidhu, D
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 2
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	2	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	8	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						